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The purpose of this study was to identify, investigate, and analyze the life and contributions of Alexander Albert Liveright (1907-1969). It was limited to selected experiences that characterized him as an adult educator.

The dissertation primarily examines Liveright's speeches, books, articles, reports, research papers and correspondence; government documents; and newspaper articles located in the Archives and Manuscripts of Continuing Education at Syracuse University. From these data a synthesis and interpretation were developed.

Chapter Two deals with Liveright's early years and his employment as a civil servant. During the 1930s Liveright counseled the jobless and developed and administered public and private employment services. In 1942 Liveright was recruited by the U.S. War Manpower Commission to develop and direct the Baltimore area office, which under his leadership served as a model for other areas in the country.
Chapter Three concerns Liveright's involvement in workers' education. Liveright directed the University of Chicago's Union Leadership Training Project from 1948-1953 and assisted in originating the idea for the Inter-University Labor Education Committee. During these, his middle years, he began writing in adult education publications and authored *Union Leadership Training* and *Strategies of Leadership*. He was also at this time drawn to Myles Horton's Highlander--first as participant, then as teacher, and finally in the 1960s as board member.

Chapter Four concludes with Liveright's later years and his mission to bring liberal education to adults. From 1956-1968 Liveright was the director of the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults. In his endeavor to liberalize adult education, Liveright called conferences and meetings, commissioned papers, published, and traveled and spoke throughout the U.S. and internationally, attempting to clarify some central direction and philosophy for the field.

Liveright was unwavering in his dedication to "human potential" and in his service to adults in many organizations. Through his writings and professional and educational undertakings, Liveright has earned a position of significance among American adult educators.
For the past thirty years, I have been fortunate enough to have been involved in work in which it has always been possible to devote some portion of my time to identifying and nurturing persons with hidden potentials. For some years, in personnel, guidance and placement work, this was my major task. For others, as an administrator of various "off-beat" organizations, it was again my opportunity and privilege to identify such persons and to help develop and place them. I suggest that one of the greatest satisfactions in life is identifying a hidden human potential and then having some part in the creation of a situation in which it is possible for him to develop and flourish. I imagine, as all of us look back on our past experiences, it is the situations where we spotted a coming teacher, community leader, student or artist, and helped to create a situation in which he could develop, that stand out as the golden moments. It is those occasions which we remember and cherish.

Alexander Albert Liveright, October 4, 1961
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INTRODUCTION: HISTORICAL CONTEXT

During the last sixty to eighty years, the United States has experienced more change, and more rapid change, than during any other comparable span of time in its history. Anyone writing of these years would be tempted to present a chronicle of dramatic events: World War I, the boom of the 1920s, the Great Depression, the New Deal, World War II, the cold war, the civil rights movement, the Vietnam conflict, the student rebellions of the 1960s. The middle years of the twentieth century (1921-1961) represent an era that went from crisis to crisis—and also a period identified by Knowles (1962) as the "era of greatest expansion and innovation in adult education." This, the "modern era" of adult education, was marked by "... changing patterns in rising tempo in population, technology, economic conditions, international relations, social arrangements, communications, philosophical and religious ideas, and government" (p. 76). It was during this period, surrounded by a dynamic atmosphere, that Alexander Albert Liveright dedicated his attention to adult and continuing
education.

The modern era was further described by Webster Cotton in his historical examination of the supporting literature, *On Behalf of Adult Education*, in 1968. In his examination of twentieth century adult education, Cotton identified three periods or general philosophical orientations. Cotton's three periods provide a useful framework in which to examine the activities and contributions of A. A. Liveright to the field of adult and continuing education.

The first period, 1919-1929, was one of idealism and great optimism about the future, a by-product of World War I: the intellectual atmosphere of moral enthusiasm and social idealism generated by the war commitment had carried over into post-war times. This idealism represented a radical re-orientation from the pre-war emphasis on remedial adult education, and adult educators such as W.H. Kilpatrick, Joseph K. Hart, and Eduard C. Lindeman led the movement for social reform.

Lindeman's 1926 classic *The Meaning of Adult Education* remains one of the most valued works produced during this period of idealism. The principal aim of adult education, Lindeman felt, must be the reform of society, and the principal responsibility of the adult learner, the development of social intelligence (i.e., a
practical understanding of society). Lindeman saw adults involved in education as it related to daily life:

Every adult person finds himself in specific situations with respect to his work, his recreation, his family-life, his community-life, et cetera--situations which call for adjustments. Adult education begins at this point. Subject matter is brought into education, is put to work, when needed. Texts and teachers play a new and secondary role in this type of education; they must give way to the primary importance of the learner. (pp. 8-9)

The face of adult education was changing. It is no surprise, then, to find its very nature changing, developing. Knowles (1964) identifies the founding of the American Association for Adult Education in 1926 as that point in education history when adult and continuing education became more clearly defined as a field of practice. It was Lindeman's influence that was felt in the Association's early development. Early organizers rejected the more narrowly defined base of liberal adult education by recognizing the cultural, vocational, and recreational areas as legitimate areas within adult education (Knowles, 1962).

For example, as early as the period immediately following the Civil War the labor movement began to take shape. Under the leadership of Samuel Gompers the American Federation of Labor developed and by 1900 its membership had grown to over one-half million. However,
as a result of Gompers' distrust of intellectuals, the A.F. of L.'s commitment to workers' education did not develop until after World War I (Knowles, 1962).

The tradition of workers' education had already been established by auxiliary agencies of the labor movement such as the Women's Trade Union League (by 1903), the International Ladies Garment Workers (by 1916), and the Amalgamated Clothing Workers (by 1919). Soon, workers' educational programming was emphasized by national and international unions and universities.

Yet higher education involvement in workers' education was not an entirely new concept; it in fact dated back as far as 1879, when Johns Hopkins University established the Workingmen's Institute. As a regular university activity, however, workers' education began with the modern period, following World War I (Kerrison and Levine, 1960). The University of California at Berkeley in 1920, Bryn Mawr College's Summer School for Women Workers in Industry in 1921, the School for Workers at the University of Wisconsin in 1924, and Rutgers University's Labor Institute in 1931 were among the prominent universities engaged during adult education's period of idealism in the modern era.

The impetus from these early colleges and universities provided the entry of other institutions of
higher education into the field. At the close of World War II substantial numbers of universities began to move into workers' education. The Industrial Relations Center of the University of Chicago was, by the early 1940s, studying, experimenting, and developing the techniques and methods of union leadership. As a result of the Industrial Relations Center's activities and in cooperation with the University of Chicago's University College came the Union Leadership Training Project in 1946 (Harbison and Houle, 1951). Arthur Carstens directed the Project, which dealt with the design of discussion materials on union administration, collective bargaining, community relations, minority problems, and human relations. Carstens accepted a position at the University of California and in 1948 a Project consultant--A. A. Liveright--accepted responsibility for the Project's direction. Following three years of experiences with international and national unions in both the A.F. of L. and the Congress of Industrial Organizations and various educational programs for union leaders, Liveright wrote his handbook *Union Leadership Training*.

Cotton's second period, the period 1930-1946, was ushered in by the Great Depression. As in the period of idealism, optimism and enthusiasm were in evidence during
the early 1930s; however, as the years progressed, the mood of those writing became more somber (Cotton, 1968). It became the difficult task of adult educators to turn their enthusiastic efforts at theory-building into practice. It was a transitional period in which the American adult education idea became better established while the practice of ideas was recognized as difficult to realize.

In 1933, Teachers College received a $6000 grant from the American Association for Adult Education and a second grant of $15,000 in 1934-35 to help realize the practice of ideas—to finance fellowships and appoint a full professorship to the area of adult education teacher-training (Knowles, 1962). Lyman Bryson was selected as the first professor of adult education and the first Doctor of Philosophy degrees were awarded to Wilbur C. Hallenbeck and William H. Stacy in 1935. Bryson and Hallenbeck are identified with the "professional" period, which emerged as a reaction to the idealism of the social reformist orientation.

Lyman Bryson expressed his reaction in 1931:

Enthusiasts are trying to make of [adult education] a remedy for all social and intellectual ills. The desire to make it a cure-all is certain to end in disappointment. The reaction will come when it is discovered once again that, even with the aid of this latest magic, painful and lengthy labors are needed to bring meager results. (p. 161)
This statement reflects the "professional" adult educator, i.e., the voices of those thinking of themselves as educators rather than social reformers. Writings of the professional adult educator appealed for a more definitive description of the field of study and practice.

While some adult educators were attempting to clearly define the field, and while institutions founded primarily for purposes other than the education of adults were responsible for the largest part of adult education, e.g., universities and labor unions, a fraction of adult and continuing education programs continued to be offered by institutions founded exclusively for the education of adults. One of the more notable developments during the modern era was the establishment of adult residential schools. A sample historical account of these would include the Danish folk school movement in the United States, the Chautauqua Institute, the Bryn Mawr Summer School, and the Goddard College Adult School.

Among the others is the Highlander Folk School. Influenced by such intellectuals as George S. Counts, Eduard C. Lindeman, and Joseph K. Hart, Myles Horton founded Highlander in 1932 (Adams, 1975). By bringing leaders of industrial and farm unions, co-operatives, and
religious and interracial groups to Highlander, Horton and his staff attempted to practice a democracy which would be carried back into the community.

In 1959, while the memories of Senator Joseph McCarthy's activities, as well as those of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, remained fresh, Horton's "radical" ideas were tried by the state of Tennessee. Some interesting witnesses were called by both the state and defense. A. A. Liveright was called to testify in defense of Highlander and Horton.

Finally, Cotton sees the period 1947-1964 as characterized by an intensified movement toward professionalization and institutionalization. This period was marked by an increased emphasis on research in an attempt at building a sounder theoretical and philosophical foundation for adult education. Mezirow and Berry (1960) contend that "[t]he period 1945-1957 has witnessed the most spectacular growth in the history of the adult education movement in the United States, both in numbers participating and in development toward professionalization" (p. vii). They continued by writing,

Three major educational institutions were created in 1951, the Adult Education Association of the U.S.A., the Fund for Adult Education, and the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, which together sparked the most intensive professional
activity ever experienced in American adult education with publications, conferences, research, program experimentation and training programs. (pp. vii-viii)

The Adult Education Association served "to further the concept of education as a process continuing throughout life" (Knowles, 1960, p. 565). It served as a clearinghouse for information about adult and continuing education nationally and internationally. Through its commissions it conducted research; the Research Commission of the AEA sought to focus greater attention upon the research among adult educators.

In 1951, funding from the Ford Foundation established the Fund for Adult Education and marshalled it with "that part of the total education process which begins when schooling was finished" (Fund for Adult Education, 1951). More specifically, the Fund was established to provide aid and support to the idea and practice of continuing adult liberal education (Knowles, 1960).

In an effort to carry out its purposes, the Fund pursued several strategies. Among the many were subsidies for a number of institutions. The Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults was established in 1951 from the Fund for Adult Education and, throughout its history, its primary financial support remained the
Fund. In close cooperation with colleges and universities seeking to develop or modify adult and continuing education programming, the Center's general purpose was to assist American higher education in developing greater effectiveness and a deeper sense of responsibility for adult liberal education (Charters, 1977). There were three directors of the Center: John S. Diekhoff, 1952-1953; John B. Schwertman, 1953-1956; and A. A. Liveright from 1956 until the Center's dissolution in 1968.

During the five decades of the modern era, adult and continuing education became an integral part of American educational systems and life. World Wars I and II, the Great Depression, the New Deal, the cold war, and the rebellious 1960s provide the historical backdrop for A. A. Liveright's life and contributions; education and democracy, education and social change, education and federal aid and state's rights provide the educational context in which he lived and worked.
CHAPTER I REFERENCES


New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.


CHAPTER II

THE EARLY YEARS: IN THE SERVICE OF ADULTS

On a gray day--March 4, 1933--Franklin Delano Roosevelt took the oath of office and became the thirty-second president of the United States. His victory in November of 1932 had been a landslide, won by what was at the time the largest electoral majority ever in a presidential election. Pledged the new leader: "I am prepared under my constitutional duty to recommend the measures that a stricken nation in the midst of a stricken world may require" (Roosevelt, 1938).

Even as the new president spoke, the doors of more than fourteen thousand banks were locked, all stock exchanges and investment houses were closed, business throughout the country had come to a near standstill, and millions of men and women stood in bread lines. There were more unemployed men and women in the United States in March of 1933 than there had ever been in the nation's history. Countless were without work; no one knew exactly how many--some said twelve, some thirteen, some fourteen million. Robert R. Nathan (1936), Chief of Income Section, Division of Economic Research of the
Commerce Department, estimated for the Committee on Economic Security the first quarter's monthly figures as follows: January--14,492,000 unemployed; February--14,597,000; March--15,071,000. Applying Nathan's data, 25.5 percent of the American labor force was out of work in 1933, and 29.2 percent in the high month of March.

These statistics, however, measured only the more serious part of the unemployment problem. Many millions more were working only part-time. During the Great Depression President Hoover's administration, private industry, and many labor unions adopted a policy of "worksharing." Here, too, no one knew exactly how many millions of workers were on "short-time."

This massive joblessness had a profound social and economic impact upon the American worker, undermining the position of workers and nearly reducing labor unions to impotence (Taft, 1964). Labor was experiencing poverty and deprivation on a scale never known before or since in America.

In many respects, the issue of labor unions, of workers' "rights" and workers' education, may seem somehow irrelevant to our contemporary world, dominated as it is by such overriding concerns as nuclear war and peace, the quest for racial equality, capitalism and
communism, and so on. The idea of "workers' relief" and "workers' education" appears, curiously enough, almost antiquated today—a quaint slogan, perhaps of some historical interest, based on conditions and issues and political movements which may no longer exist or which have long been forgotten.

But in that campaign of 1932, Roosevelt had devoted systematic attention to the problems of workers. Unlike then-President Hoover, Roosevelt voiced a theory of the causes and nature of the Great Depression in which domestic unemployment was the central theme. The new president would have his work cut out for him.

While politicians campaigned across the nation twenty-five year old A. A. Liveright (For personal background, see Appendix A) was embarking on his own campaign, a drive that would carry him through nearly two decades. It was in fact during the critical months just prior to the election that Liveright left his job in the personnel department at one of Manhattan's large department stores (and his thesis for a master's degree in guidance and counseling at Columbia) to accept the challenges of an "experimental employment office" in Philadelphia.

The office was one of three similar programs started
by the federal government in cooperation with the Spelman Foundation of Manhattan (the other two offices were established in Rochester, N.Y., and in Wisconsin).

Liveright, as division head in Philadelphia, was to determine, by experiment, whether a free state employment office might prove a practical and valuable resource for workers during the current depressed condition.

Reflecting later on his experiences—his successes and failures—with the Philadelphia office, he contended that a state employment office should be developed, operated, and administered strictly along business lines:

. . . personnel work has to follow business methods. An employment office should map out and follow a regular sales campaign in contacting prospective employers. It is vitally necessary to see that you are covering every possible contingency which might arise for the employer. A good office must have on hand every type of worker that any employer might want.

That [was] our aim . . . [and] in order to do this we must keep free of politics and we cannot do our work well from a relief or welfare angle. We must fit the person to the job regardless of whether he is on the relief rolls or whether he is living on large accumulated savings.

A public employment office must be frank with its applicants. I believe in advising sincerely as to the possibility of getting a job in his particular field, and also as to the best place to seek employment. I do not believe in raising false hopes. ("Civil Servant," 1935)

Liveright was suggesting that an employment office must be more than a placement service. The employment officer must be a trained professional understanding the
ramifications of placement; the inter-relationships among jobs; methods of classifying them; variations in working conditions; and the requirements of various types of work. The employment counselor should also possess certain skills involved in the art of matching the individual and job. In January, 1936, addressing the New York Vocational Guidance Association, Liveright reminded those counselors attending their Association's third annual meeting of the responsibility shared by public and private employment agencies and organizations. His point was that the placement counselor works not in a vacuum but in a dynamic community where the quality of employment services depends on many. The counselor must know how to work with these agencies, how to utilize their resources in placement activity, and how to lend support to other agencies with consonant aims.

Following the successful establishment of Philadelphia's free employment office he resigned his position three years after its opening. It is interesting to note that during that time his work within the agency had taken him from program development to public relations—a skill he would utilize effectively in many future projects. Having met the challenges in Philadelphia, he left the task of administration to others, seeking now to put his experiences in program
development to work elsewhere. In April, 1935, he came to the borough of Queens in New York City as manager of the New York State Employment Service branch office in Long Island City. The Queens office, then primarily devoted to private placements, had originally been established in 1933 as a branch of the National Re-Employment Service for Civil Works Administration and Public Works Administration placements. In 1934, the State Employment Service assumed responsibility for the agency and began looking for a manager to redirect its purpose ("State Service," 1935).

Liveright and his assistants, including research workers and statisticians, "studied seasonal fluctuations with the chief industries of the community and classified the various types of jobs in those industries in order to more intelligently meet placement problems" (McAvoy, 1935). Simply put, his new challenge was to perfect a comprehensive system of employment to "fit the right man for the right job."

In evaluating the program's effectiveness and practices before his arrival, Liveright admitted that hasty employment in relief and emergency projects had "placed many a round peg in a square hole"—a condition he wished to change. He added:

Many persons confuse the state service with relief
projects, causing a misunderstanding as to why needy cases are not given preference. The only factor to be considered is the aptitude of an applicant for the job offered. (McAvoy, 1935)

In an article in the Brooklyn Eagle (Grutzner, 1935), two months after beginning in the Queens office, Liveright considered the difficulty in assisting the tremendous number of unemployed. "Times like these make for an employers' market," he was quoted as saying. It seems that, with more people looking for work than there were jobs available, a few employers had not unsurprisingly set up some pretty high standards. While most employers that Liveright and his assistants contacted while conducting their needs assessment asked merely for the necessary ability and an honest day's work from those they gave jobs, inevitably in an employers' market some expectations became particularly restrictive when attempting to "fit the right man for the right job."

For example, among the jobs listed on the morning of June 6, 1935 at the Queens headquarters of the New York State Employment Service were:

1. Waitresses, for Long Island City restaurant. Must be blue-eyed blondes and sufficiently attractive so the rushed office worker will linger for a second cup of coffee.

2. Barbeque chef. None but a white-haired Negro
need apply. Must be a master of southern roasting.

Liveright conceded that the jobs for blue-eyed, blonde waitresses were easy to fill from the nearly 60,000 applicants on file every day in the Queens office. On the other hand, he explained, "it may take a few days to find a barbeque chef to meet the exacting requirements."

Based on his staff's investigations, Liveright initiated two steps. First, he drafted an advisory committee of borough employees, employers, and business and civic leaders to aid in unemployment problems within the borough. Secondly he established community offices, fashioned after the Philadelphia office, and staffed by administrators and counselors familiar with the needs of each individual neighborhood. It was his aim to make those in Queens industries aware that the highest level of worker could be found at the local branch of the state's service. In addition, in conjunction with the Department of Public Education, he developed local training programs for adults utilizing the branch's services.

Said Liveright:

This is, we hope, the first step in our program of serving the employment needs of Queens county. By establishing this type of small community office, we feel that we can handle more efficiently domestic and day work placements. We are trying, in every
sense of the word, to bring our service to the door of the employer.

He added:

Training classes for day workers will be run in conjunction with this office, and it is our hope that the various communities making use of the day work branch will take an active part in formulating its policies. ("State to Open," 1935)

Liveright's concern for these workers extended not only to training and placement but to working conditions. His growing interest in workers' rights was expressed in Long Island's Daily Press on June 9, 1935 in which he is reported as asking the community's advisory committee to formulate, more or less, a few "rules" governing employment; evidently, there had been some employers who were asking unreasonably long hours of their workers, and paying very low wages ("Free Placement," 1935).

He turned next to the task of creating the uncommon office— one in which workers might find not simply effective but personalized service. Less than three months after assuming the position of branch manager, Liveright opened the first "experimental community office." Speaking at the opening day ceremony, William Lange, Director of the New York State Employment Service, proclaimed that "the opening of this new branch, advocated by Mr. Liveright, marks the beginning of an entirely new approach to the solution" of employment
"State Opens," 1935). Liveright urged that:

... this office will only be successful so long as it remains a small one, catering to the needs of a limited well-defined community. As soon as it is about to grow to that size where it loses its personal touch with the community and its workers, then it will be time for the opening of another community office.

The experimental community office at Sunnyside relied on a specially trained staff. Each job applicant was given a complete "hearing," during which every effort was made to discover not only what experience he or she had but also what his or her interests were, what his or her home life was like, and what education he or she had. At these hearings, an attempt was made to teach requirements for various jobs, to review the advantages of training and the places where vocational training and adult education could be obtained, and to present information from men and women engaged in various work. In other words, the applicant received not simply placement, but planning, e.g., just exactly what sort of jobs were available, what education and training was necessary for each job, what the hours and wages were, and what the possibilities for promotion were. This was something of a radical challenge to the traditional role of the employment service and suggested that the new model's mission ought to evolve from supplier or matcher of labor to developer of manpower. The state of New York
provided the resources and the new Queens manager, Liveright, provided the ingenuity and creativity, i.e., a program approaching workers' education. Liveright's approach suggests that the employment counselor has not met his or her responsibility fully until he or she has provided the appropriate counsel. As practiced by Liveright, then, placement is part of an education.

Liveright continued to operate his successful experiment in Sunnyside as he did in Philadelphia, i.e., along the lines of a business. His marketing strategy included a borough-wide visiting campaign to all employers, supplemented by active radio, newspaper, and direct mail publicity. His contention was simple: "Only by making every possible effort to centralize jobs in the Queens area will we be fulfilling our obligation to the applicants registered" ("Boro Job," 1935). His advertising campaign rather creatively utilized the space reserved for "Letters to the Editor," and the Long Island Daily Press' "Mr. Fixit," a sort of Dear Abby column whereby readers received advice. Liveright regularly appeared in Mr. Fixit's column in answer to queries ranging from the Works Progress Administration (WPA) and the Emergency Relief Bureau to training opportunities for youth and adults.

And, his contention was effective. On July 24,
1935, the *Daily Press* reported that while placements throughout the state of New York showed a decrease, the branch in Sunnyside and Long Island City showed marked increases ("New Jobs," 1935). Liveright was especially pleased that the most significant increases were made with the employment of women.

In a matter of a few short months a young, ambitious, and creative civil servant had again proven his mettle. But this was within a relatively small sphere; it was the Queensboro Council of Social Agencies that would provide Liveright with the opportunity to extend his influence to the broader community. As council vice-president Liveright was now in regular contact with professional associations, hospital executives, religious leaders, and university professors and administrators.

He recognized early that the needs of the unemployed adult were almost as broad as life itself and that service provisions for adults would have to be based upon vital adult interests. Again, placement would not suffice. New techniques and leadership would have to be developed and the activities offered would have to range through many fields: vocational, educational, cultural, recreational, social, and civic. At the same time it was recognized by the Council that the inadequacies of the
existing system had been made obvious by the depression. It was evident that the regular system had not as yet made adequate provision for the rehabilitation and education of the unemployed adult. It had also become apparent that only through a more concerted effort, under federal auspices, could the enormous problem be faced with any anticipation of success. In any case, if only for the sake of morale, it was desirable that Council leaders feel themselves drawn more meaningfully into the problems of their communities.

In August of 1935 ("Johnson's Aide," 1935), Liveright and other Council members met with General Hugh S. Johnson and staff. Johnson, former head of President Roosevelt's National Recovery Administration, now directing the Works Progress Administration in New York City, was in charge of a plan to stimulate business. Liveright and committee pointed out to the WPA that Queens had been grossly neglected in the past insofar as adult education was concerned. The committee was asking for enough staff to man twenty-five community centers which would combine both adult education and recreation. While not all they asked for was received, the program presented to General Johnson was directly in line with the newly extended activities of the community-wide Queensboro Council and the commitment to community
development of vice-president Liveright. Shortly thereafter, the WPA educational programming in the city of New York, including the Queens borough, had been extended to include vocational training for unemployed adults and vocational rehabilitation for the handicapped (Campbell, Bair, and Harvey, 1939).

In November, 1935, the Sunnyside "experiment" was declared a success and a model for setting up similar offices throughout the state of New York ("732 Workers," 1935). Unfortunately, the training and adult education programs as originally conceived by Liveright were faltering. One can only imagine his disappointment in the fact that while teachers were at hand and applicants anxious, something as trivial as space was unavailable. On the other hand, the Sunnyside branch clearly demonstrated that community cooperation could go a long way toward creating similar services. Very soon thereafter Liveright announced the opening of a new branch office of the New York State Employment Service in Far Rockaway to provide local residents prompt, efficient, and cost-free employment services.

Liveright's message was logical: The community is where an individual lives; the community must recognize the individual as unique in nature and must approach them as such, i.e., a society wishing to provide employment
for all who want to work must arrange some means for bringing workers and jobs together. Whether a person's problems involve making a living, financial assistance, training opportunities, or an education, he or she needs to be helped as an individual.

He recognized, like those campaigning for office, that the problem of keeping workers employed and jobs filled is an especially difficult one in any complex society, and that incalculable waste occurs if workers drift aimlessly because they cannot utilize the system. Liveright was an innovator in that he sought the means with which to connect and identify the worker with the system; that is, he attempted not only to place the worker but to educate him in his place, and equally to create within the system itself an awareness and appreciation of the worker's position. His expertise in program development created a model that did more than operate like a mechanical sorter, simply shifting workers about. He recognized that the Depression's most serious impact might be upon the morale of the American worker—that depression of the spirit was at least as severe as that of the economy. Yet, as Liveright demonstrated, it was possible to address both symptoms simultaneously: his method—a "business" orientation tied to a keen recognition for the community and for a
free society where the welfare and interests of the individual are regarded as of paramount importance—could provide an integrated balance with which to combat the ills of a troubled workforce.

Liveright's effectiveness did not go unnoticed by the state's administration. He was soon elevated to Assistant Regional Director. One can only speculate as to why he subsequently resigned this position after only three years with the State Employment Service. Perhaps he was less motivated by the idea of administering programs and more motivated by the challenge of design and development, or re-development, for in December, 1937 he accepted the leadership of the newly founded and problem-ridden Jewish Vocational Service and Employment Center (JVS&EC) in Chicago.

In September, 1935, the JVS&EC had been formed by combining the Vocational Department of the Jewish Child Welfare Society and the Vocational Department of the Jewish Social Service Bureau with the B'nai B'rith funded Jewish Free Employment Bureau (Hayden, 1936). This coordinated vocational bureau was organized and directed by a Board of Directors representing various agencies and, until his death in September, 1937, by Executive Director Edward E. Edelman (Jewish Vocational Service and Employment Center, 1941).
During the remainder of 1937, a Committee of the Board conducted an extensive study of the agency and a search for leadership. The Board's committee outlined several problem areas: 1) morale, 2) internal disorganization, 3) disintegration, 4) personnel, 5) program promotion, 6) role clarification, and others. Liveright accepted the challenging position of Executive Director. A Special Report (1941) of the Board of the JVS&EC outlined significant and effective action taken by its new leader.

Staff morale problems were the first to be "eradicated." Liveright "did much to eliminate the general air of disorganization." Prior to Liveright's direction "little cooperation between divisions was apparent . . . divisions operated as separate units, rather than as parts of a united organization." In less than a year the new director was "eliminating the old departmental biases . . . breaking down disintegration." Liveright developed a regular training program for staff, a system of evaluation, and invited speakers to make presentations on labor law, unemployment compensation, industrial relations, psychiatry, technological trends, and a variety of other subjects. Again, the utilization of his public relations skills accounted for considerable development through community and employer visits and
direct mail.

In an attempt to develop the JVS&EC's relationship with other agencies Liveright worked as a member of the Illinois State Employment Service's Technical Advisory Committee, as Chief Personnel Consultant to the National Youth Administration, and on the advisory committee of the Chicago office of the Works Progress Administration. Under his direction, the JVS&EC formed a close relationship with the Chicago Relief Administration. And, for the next four years he would lecture at Northwestern University in the areas of occupational research, organization of the labor market, and vocational guidance.

Perhaps Liveright's most significant contribution to the Center was his reorganization of and the energy he injected into the Refugee Program. Very shortly after Adolf Hitler's rise to power in Germany in January, 1933, the American government had been confronted with a domestic and international problem for which it was uniquely experienced: a wave of refugees fleeing from political, racial, and religious persecution. Earlier, the post-World War I mass movements of refugees—notably of Russians—had left the American government and private organizations with programs of Americanization for the foreign-born. Even so, the appearance of another large
influx of refugees from the Third Reich represented a complicated dilemma.

The Refugee Division was reorganized as a service unit within the agency to render special placement and counseling services to any recent arrival who presented an employment handicap because of unfamiliarity with the English language and lack of experience in American business and industry. People coming from countries which had been directly affected by the German Reich, either because of restrictions imposed on Jews or because of the war were first evaluated and an attempt was made to "fit" refugees into jobs that were available on the basis of previous experience and individual qualifications. Because of the limited funding available to the agency the refugee division and the Americanization program involved very little job training. Instead, the agency arranged financing for training programs with the Jewish Social Service Bureau and other organizations.

From all indications each division reflected improvement. A Center Report clearly reflects Liveright's involvement and commitment to the refugee-Americanization program. In 1938, around 800 refugees were involved; and by 1939, the agency had increased that to over 1200.
Whether Liveright's special interest can be attributed to his Jewish faith, some humanitarian instinct, or a professional excitement for change and reorganization is not clear. It is clear, however, that he practiced humanistic values; he provided opportunities for agency members, as well as the agency itself, to develop to full potential; he increased the effectiveness of the agency in terms of all its goals; he created an environment in which it proved possible for exciting and challenging work. He was able to communicate with the members of the organization and with others to help the Center clarify and reach its objectives. It was as if the organization's members no longer had the same awareness of the agency in which they worked. Liveright was instrumental in assisting a group of people in achieving a set of goals and in interacting through a more effective and structured relationship.

Later, in considering the complexities of long-term education and employment for minority groups and the unpleasant basic facts which must be faced in dealing with race relations and "intergroup relations," Liveright, then Executive Director of the American Council on Race Relations in Chicago and a member of the executive committee of the Illinois Council for Fair Employment Practice Committee, wrote:
... neither a citizens' group nor ... committee can alone do the job, [instead] intelligent pressure ... is required. It is up to the professionals in the field to adapt their techniques to the increasing opportunities for activity, to face the problem squarely, and to develop the kind of program which can meet the problems courageously. (1946, p. 109, p. 116)

He continued to develop and establish the JVS&EC for four years. But as the United States escalated its involvement in World War II Liveright, characteristically responding to the most pressing concerns of those around him, sought to involve himself locally in the war effort: in 1942, he accepted the directorship of Volunteer Recruitment for the Chicago Office of Civilian Defense. This would be, however, only the beginning of Liveright's service to the nation at war.

World War II presented a formidable new challenge to organize America's labor market to meet war and civilian production needs while more than 10 million employable workers were removed from the civilian work forces to the armed forces. In order to provide for the effective distribution of manpower, President Roosevelt, on April 18, 1942, established a War Manpower Commission (WMC) with Paul V. McNutt, Federal Security Administrator and former Governor of Indiana, as its Chairman. This Commission was given broad powers and authority to decide upon the human needs of industry, agriculture, and even,
within its prescribed limitations, of the military forces. To meet its responsibility the Commission was directed to, among other things:

1. Estimate the requirements of manpower for industry, military, and agriculture;
2. Coordinate the collection and compilation by federal agencies of data concerning the labor market; and
3. Establish policies and prescribe regulations governing all federal programs relating to the recruitment, training, and placement of workers in industry and agriculture. ("War Manpower," 1942)

Simply, its overwhelming task was to direct masses of workers to war-needed jobs from those of the everyday world of peace and to woo non-workers to vacated positions. In August, 1942, Commission Chairman McNutt reminded Americans of the "cold facts":

This will probably be a long, hard war . . . To keep one man fighting it has been estimated that as many as 18 workers are needed behind the lines . . . If you are an average American and not in the War now, you'll be in it eventually--whether you be man or woman, rich or poor. (McNutt, 1942, p. 27)

Projections varied, but it was generally estimated that the United States would have to mobilize some 42,000,000 workers and fighters if its three war fronts--battle lines, factory, and farm--were to be kept going at full strength. The figure included 10,000,000 fighting men, 20,000,000 factory workers, and 12,000,000 farm workers. In contrast, there were only about 36,000,000 American men in the ages 15 to 49 years,
representing the greatest bulk of the skilled and able-bodied.

In July, 1942, McNutt designated Baltimore, center for important war material production, as the nation's first "critical labor supply area" ("Flashes," 1942). For example, in nearby Hagerstown--home of one of the country's most productive manufacturers of military aircraft, Fairchild Engine and Airplane--the National Defense Training Center was completing training courses with 15 workers daily ("Workers Wanted," 1942); however, the facility maintained that more than 2,000 trained workers would be needed within the next thirty days ("To Interview," 1942). Additionally, farmers were quitting the fields for employment in the more lucrative "war industries" at an alarming rate. Thus, the State Farm Bureau was needing 4,000 workers to harvest Maryland's bumper tomato and soybean crop; in fact, it was reported ("Tomato Harvest," 1942) that the state was facing the most acute farm labor shortage in its history. Fortunately, the critical situation would eventually be resolved through the cooperative efforts of federal and state agricultural agencies and the Maryland Extension Service. And, Maryland's War Production Board was reporting that less than half of Baltimore's 300 small war industries were operating at 50 percent of their full

Maryland, and the nation, had let experienced farm workers follow the lure of higher wages to the cities, to become rank apprentices at a new trade. It had let draft boards pluck skilled and precious war workers from industry. It had let the Navy's busy recruiting trucks roam the country, picking and choosing with little thought to national policy.

War production in 1943 was expected to double that of 1942. Hence, it was not surprising to encounter reports that a "national war service bill" was being drawn up which would permit the virtual draft of the whole effective adult population for some kind of war service.

To insure the most effective utilization of local labor resources by developing complete coordination between various manpower agencies operating in the Baltimore area and to develop an experimental "voluntary" plan to maximize manpower and serve as a model for other large industrial areas of the country, McNutt recruited a man whose reputation was well-known. Liveright's accomplishments with Philadelphia's experimental employment offices, the creation of the New York State Employment Service "community branches," the reorganization of Chicago's Jewish Vocational Service and
its successful vocational recruiting and training campaign, and most recently his success at Chicago's Civilian Defense Office with organizing community "block" defense centers and the training of unit leaders were drawing the attention of local, state, and federal labor and manpower officials.

On July 23, 1942 McNutt appointed Liveright to direct the Baltimore area office and to be responsible for "setting up machinery to secure the full cooperation of management, labor, and the public in total mobilization of the area's manpower resources" ("Baltimore Labor," 1942). Liveright accepted the task of the quickly-burdened Commission—a commission with no legislative controls and policies, one with no real coercive authority because both management and labor had refused to permit it. With his new "powers" he would be expected to end labor pirating and labor hoarding, and to speed up training. To develop a huge new army of skilled workers--some 32,000 in the next four months ("32,000 Worker," 1942)--to complement the limited supply in Baltimore and to replace those taken by military service, he said that:

... workers not ordinarily used in the local labor market must be given the necessary training and opportunity for employment. This means that the patriotic hands and skills of women, Negroes, the handicapped and the older workers must be fully and
immediately utilized. ("City Labor," 1942)

He relied on voluntary action and cooperation between government, management, and labor. In conjunction with the Board of Education and the Maryland Office of Vocational Training, Liveright was involved in providing intensive war-work training through the public schools. Instructors were drawn almost entirely from private plants, which sent men to the schools to train workers in actual production techniques. Most courses, about eight weeks in length, were studies in aircraft riveting, woodworking, sheetmetal work, small parts assembly, electric and acetylene welding, and general machineshop practices.

Despite the promise of the new system, Governor O'Connor of Maryland viewed the Baltimore farm worker manpower program with "apprehension" ("'Raids' on Farm," 1942). Liveright responded that he and the Commission would "... do everything possible to avoid drawing labor from farms. Our policy in Maryland calls for all possible aid to farm communities." Cooperating with the Department of Agriculture, Liveright also developed training for farm workers, e.g., machinery reconditioning, and with the National Youth Administration's assistance thousands of young men and women and boys and girls were recruited for apprentice
training and farm work. Additionally, still working with Governor O'Connor, the state agreed to commute short-term sentences of some Maryland convicts if they reported for farm work and continued in that employment. Interestingly, employment and penitentiary officials later reported that "farmers are actually bidding against each other for the parole of prisoners incarcerated from their locality, who are known to be good farm workers" ("Parolees," 1942).

Because Baltimore's manpower problems, like those of the entire nation, were general labor problems, Liveright, in addition to being concerned with mobility and training and upgrading and placement, found himself by necessity enmeshed in problems of hourly wages, wage and price controls, housing and community facilities, and racial and religious restrictions against employment. Here, he relied on consultation. In fact, it was Liveright's belief that the government could depend upon the people themselves for wholehearted cooperation in the war effort. With this in mind he presented a plan for the country's first local manpower management-labor advisory committee. Following consultation with management and labor leaders in the area, Liveright selected members for the committee which would equally represent the interests of management and labor.
Management was represented by corporate presidents, vice-presidents, and general managers, while labor members were presidents, district directors, and business representatives from the CIO and AFL ("War Manpower Commission Formed," 1942). Liveright served as chairman of the eight member committee—a plan referred to by the Governor as the "democratic way" ("O'Conor Praises," 1942).

Immediate problems facing Liveright's committee included the development of programs for the transfer and training of workers into essential jobs. This transfer of workers represented a unique opportunity to deal with union policy. Any scheme for all-out labor mobilization would include the transfer of workers with strategic skills from non-war to war industries. But when workers are transferred on a general scale from non-war industries, it is inevitable that some AFL workers will prove useful in war plants then organized by the CIO, or visa versa. Were unions in the CIO plants to require AFL recruits to join the CIO unions and abandon their AFL affiliation? Such rivalries might make themselves felt in rather damaging ways. While such problems were not easy to solve on a national level, a committee representing both AFL and CIO leadership cooperating with Maryland's Labor Victory Board permitted arrangements
which would allow members from both unions to work side by side without friction.

Under the leadership of Liveright the advisory committee signed the first labor-management agreement in the nation under the War Manpower Commission's drive to make the best use of labor supplies ("Agreement Signed," 1942). The first provision of the cooperative plan to cope with the labor shortage was a promise not to employ a worker from another war production plant without a written release from the former employer. The signer also agreed to make every possible effort to train and employ "women and Negroes" for maximum utilization of Baltimore labor. Similar agreements were sent to labor unions and the managements of all large industrial firms in the area. A few weeks later Liveright's "Amity Proposal" would be adopted by all of Maryland's AFL and CIO officials to outlaw inter-union jurisdictional disputes in all defense production plants for the duration of the war. It was the country's first pact aimed at such problems and a model of voluntary cooperation soon adopted by many industrial concerns throughout the country. Governor O'Conor praised Liveright's committee:

Too much cannot be said about the splendid accomplishments of Maryland Labor... If any relationship between Labor and Capital can truly be
said to approach an ideal, it is that relationship which exists here in Maryland and which, unquestionably is responsible for the outstanding record of production that Maryland has achieved. ("O'Connor Extols," 1942)

A step-up in training programs to prepare women for jobs in vital war industries in Maryland was also developed by the advisory committee and the state director of vocational training. As a result of these negotiations an old WPA office building was converted into a training center to be used as a facility for women workers. Enrollment was continuous and classes conducted twenty-four hours a day.

The demand for women workers increased. The newspapers reported that plants doing strictly war work in the Baltimore area would need some 12,000 to 13,000 trained women workers during the next year. Relying on his Civilian Defense experiences, Liveright assisted the State's Civilian Mobilization Committee in organizing neighborhood groups to visit all homes in the city of Baltimore to locate all available women, some having never worked before. Following the successful recruitment, training, and placement of women workers in Baltimore area industry, local aircraft company executives would take vocal opposition to the "west coast" suggestion of segregating women workers and suggesting that they were less skilled and "flirtatious."
Perhaps even a more serious problem faced by Liveright was that of training and placing black workers. Unfortunately, few war plants in Baltimore were abiding by President Roosevelt's executive order and hiring all available men and women without regard to race, creed, or color. In fact, some industry leaders were demanding a change in the forty-hour week, favoring a forty-eight-hour week, in a deliberate attempt to maintain production without changing training and hiring practices. The advisory committee again demonstrated its effectiveness by proving itself an example. The Bartlett Hayward division of Koppers Company and the Western Electric Company, both represented on Liveright's committee, expanded their operation and production, not to mention their commitment to change, by creating training and positions for the up-to-then untapped pool of black labor ("Plant to Add," 1942). Recruitment of unskilled and semi-skilled black workers was a priority. A shipbuilding training center to include burning and cutting, electric welding, acetylene welding, shipfitting, marine pipe-fitting, and marine electrical work—all transferable and non-war skills—would soon address one of Liveright's long-felt needs in the area. Liveright was insistent about the minority worker:

Those employers who are not now employing Negroes
must make their plans to use them. It grows increasingly apparent that we cannot continue to import labor into Baltimore. Since Negroes constitute a large segment of our population, and since there is a definite need for them in war work, it is inexcusable for their productive capacity to be wasted while crowding our city with workers from the outside to take the jobs Negroes should hold here. ("Training Setup," 1942)

Perhaps Liveright was only being logical; this may not have been a reflection of his interest in a "social cause." After all, the United States had not white men and women enough to put eight million in the army and 144 million in essential war work. The total population of the United States was only 120 million whites. There would be a shortage of 24 million war workers. Did Liveright have a mind for arithmetic?

Perhaps he was a patriot. In what appears to be a moment of frustration, he expressed his feelings toward the industrial manager "pirating" labor, toward the "non-essential" industry refusing to encourage employees to transfer their needed skills to "essential" jobs, toward underproductive plant management convinced that the war could be ended without utilizing minority workers, and toward the individual American unwilling to surrender seniority in his present job and work in a closed shop or learn new skills:

Baltimore’s war industries are making the material of war and for every additional plane and ship we make here, there will be a saving in American lives...
The need for more labor brings the problem into the life of every skilled laborer in the community. The man who isn't using these skills to save American lives and win the war may be the cause of a soldier losing his life for the lack of another plane or another ship. ("Will Siphon Labor," 1942)

However, it seems more than simple numbers or spirited patriotism. Following the Baltimore Commission's announcement that twenty-two war industries had signed agreements that covered the training and placement of male and female black workers, an editor for the Afro-American wrote:

A.A. Liveright who has served as director of this project has carried out an exceedingly difficult assignment. In my opinion he is the most skillful government official in this field . . .

Fortunately, he had an excellent background for approaching the problem of the colored community as he has worked effectively with colored leaders in Chicago, Philadelphia, and more recently in Baltimore. ("WMC Area Director," 1942)

The Governor credited Liveright's appointment with creating a "spirit of cooperation . . . [one that would] go a long way toward helping us arrive at the proper answer to the labor problems that now face us and to any others that may arise" ("Labor Supply," 1942).

The author of the "Baltimore Plan" stayed in Baltimore only long enough to create, and to develop a program to be administered by a permanent area director, Royden A. Blunt. The appointment of Blunt represented the second stage of Liveright's Baltimore
experiment—Washington's moving out of the situation and "turning the Baltimore area back into the hands of Baltimoreans" ("Plant Heads," 1942), putting the body under the leadership of both management and labor. Liveright, while regarding this shift as a positive development, nevertheless was concerned that the new leadership maintain with particular care the representation of the workers. His growing interest in the protection of labor unions was clearly evident as he commended the new director: "Mr. Blunt is an outstanding representative of local industry. He has maintained excellent relationships with the men in his plant, which is a union shop. He stands for progressive management" ("Blunt Named," 1942). So too did Liveright.

Three months after accepting the Baltimore labor problem, Liveright moved on to Buffalo's problems concerning the supply of skilled workers for war industries. While an arbitrary application of the Baltimore plan may have been convenient and successful, it was not Liveright's style. Instead, in only a matter of a few days he had met with Buffalo's labor and management leaders to establish a "Buffalo plan." Again, his plan utilized existing local agencies, with the United States Employment Service taking the brunt of the work. In Buffalo the plan was created in less than a
month when he turned the administration over to Buffalo leadership.

Liveright next accepted the assistant executive director's position of the War Manpower Commission in the Washington office. He continued to troubleshoot and consult as a member of Washington's Field Services. When Louis B.F. Raycroft resigned as director of the WMC's third region—comprising Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware—Liveright moved back to his home in Philadelphia to temporarily serve as the region's director. Over the next two-and-a-half years Liveright provided his services as a manpower consultant to many organizations, including the Selective Service System, Works Progress Administration, the United States Civil Service Commission, and numerous national and local trade union leaderships. In addition, he served as negotiator for the Nonferrous and Lumber Stabilization agreements between labor and management.

The sudden surrender of the Japanese in 1945 practically caught the War Manpower Commission and other government agencies napping. Just how abrupt or how difficult the transition from war to peace would be was difficult to predict. It would of course involve the reorganization of life on a peacetime basis, i.e., the reorientation of war workers to peacetime occupations,
the resettling of men and women who had left their homes for work in defense plants and who would not be reabsorbed in peacetime production of converted defense plants, the readjustment of women now in industry to home life or to new skills or to retraining, and the readjustment of Service men and women to peacetime living. It was a grave problem, the problem of aiding some 30 million adults who were going to be discharged from the Armed Forces and from war production jobs.

In preparing for the shift in manpower, Liveright's new responsibilities were defined as the establishment of an adult counseling program. Title IV of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (GI Bill of Rights) called for, among other things, "effective job counseling and placement services" for the veterans of World War II (United States Code, 1976). Immediately following its enactment the federal employment service, then under the leadership of the War Manpower Commission and consultation of Liveright, began developing procedures for employment counseling. Liveright took advantage of the wealth of material on counseling and vocational guidance which had been developed by the schools and other organizations. Procedures were developed for the introduction of an adult counseling program early in 1945. Early efforts in developing an effective adult
counseling program in the public employment service were limited to a few states. Eventually a supervisor of employment counseling was designated on the staff of the Commission in every state and counselors assigned as rapidly as they could be selected—often from returning veterans—and receive the necessary training.

With hostilities ended, the President ordered the end of the War Manpower Commission and transferred the United States Employment Service back to the Department of Labor. About two years later the employment services borrowed by the federal government were returned to the states as originally established under the authority of the Wagner-Peyser Act in 1933. Each state was required to maintain adequate counseling services for veterans and other adult applicants. Liveright's counseling program provided the foundation.

As might have been expected, peacetime conditions encouraged Congress to cut the budgets of the Employment Services. Jobs were deleted; whether Liveright "lost" his job or elected to shift his interest is not clear. Regardless, he, no doubt, left the federal government with a greater awareness of labor, management, and manpower development. His role as civil servant was completed.

For the next two years, the thirty-eight-year-old
Liveright devoted an increasing amount of attention to the subject of race relations. His sensitivity to racial and religious discrimination had probably been especially heightened following his experiences just prior to and during World War II. He returned to Chicago and accepted leadership for the newly created American Council for Race Relations, "an organization set-up to analyze and develop techniques for community organizations" (Liveright, 1946).

Specifically the Council, backed by a Who's Who of American and international leaders in race relations including Clarence E. Pickett of the American Friends Service Committee, sociologist Charles S. Johnson, Edwin R. Embree, and Will W. Alexander, stood for a wide variety of interests: scientific study, cooperation with public and private agencies in disseminating information, assistance to local communities in organizing, developing program materials for schools, and popular education on the race question by means of radio, press, and movies ("Another Organization," 1944). As executive director, Liveright worked with officials and leaders of the Urban League, the NAACP, the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, the National Council of Christians and Jews, the American Friends Service Committee, the American Jewish Committee, the Japanese American Citizens League, the
University of Chicago, and others to "sweep out of public practices those racial and religious discriminations that betray our essential American democracy" (Bickham, 1947).

Conclusion

As illustrated throughout the "early years," A. A. Liveright was a man of ability, achievement, and ambition. While still a young man, he had established himself as a potentially strong leader in the field of manpower development, his innovations bringing him local and national exposure. His accomplishments during this period were impressive. Each reflected not only a skill in responding to the tasks placed before him but a dedication and sensitivity that would mark the emerging professional throughout his life. And, perhaps most importantly, at two crucial periods in the nation's history, namely, during the Great Depression and World War II, Liveright's efforts enabled countless men and women to receive the training and development both they, and their country, so urgently required.

New York State Employment Service Community Offices

It is not clear whether Liveright's innovative projects furnished a blueprint which could or can be duplicated; they do indicate that something practical can
be done about unemployment and adult training at the community level. Liveright made it clear, through the use of advisory committees, for example, that local leaders can be brought to see and solve a problem. The Queens borough organized with little friction; they united resources; they developed ways of getting community support and other means of action, all without too much strain. Liveright's community adult services did show their usefulness. Before they had been operating one month, adults by the score were being assisted.

Jewish Vocational Service and Employment Center

In this setting, Liveright was instrumental in assisting a group of people in achieving a set of goals and interacting through a more effective and structured relationship. At a personal level, the creation of the refugee program was a demonstration of both leadership and personal values. It was a hard-core effort in a great arena—a concentrated attempt at upgrading and otherwise advancing the job ladder by way of counseling and job training for the disadvantaged American and Jewish-American worker.

War Manpower Commission
During Liveright's early years, and specifically during World War II, the American work force and worker underwent changes which are in all probability the most spectacular in the history of the nation. With an entire people galvanized into action, it seems inevitable that Liveright would too have been involved.

Under Liveright, the Baltimore office of the WMC implemented a program of action designed to furnish man and woman power to our war industries as needed. It was, as one of Liveright's colleagues proclaimed, Baltimore's chance "to make history" ("Employment Service," 1942). And, in fact, while some (Adams, 1951; "WMC's Big Stick," 1944) have claimed that the government's administrative machinery, i.e., the WMC, Federal Employment Service, and other agencies, never proved entirely satisfactory, at least two items must be remembered, to say nothing of the fact that the movement and expansion of the labor force is often given tremendous credit in winning the war.

First, the Commission, under Liveright's direction, clearly demonstrated that within a carefully designed framework, labor and management could maintain productive participation. Liveright's development of the labor-management advisory committee provided those directly involved with a specific mechanism to achieve the manpower requirements without government compulsion
policies. The best judgment of workers and employers were brought to bear on government decisions. Eventually, a network of labor-management committees became an integral and accepted part of manpower development throughout World War II and again during the Korean invasion. Still today, labor and management point to World War II as evidence that free labor policies prove the merits of a voluntary manpower program over any system based on compulsion.

The work of a civil servant is important and, without doubt, has its moments of excitement, but it rarely lifts an individual to the forefront of a great crusade. This forefront is the second item worthy of review. Liveright managed to bring together some of the lessons learned over a few short years at the "grass-roots" level to deal with one of the nation's most pressing social issues--how best to fit the disadvantaged jobless, i.e., the unskilled, unemployed, minority worker, into the country's employment pattern. He squared off, face-to-face, with one of the toughest opponents yet--the heavyweight problem of fitting thousands of unlearned and untrained men and women into the nation's segregated industries. His entry into one of the thickest problems surrounding society was not purely coincidental; the success of his Baltimore plan
can be attributed to research, planning, full support of many labor and management officials, some creative thinking, the intelligent use of facilities and talents at hand, and **timing**.

While segregated, the nation too was united, united against Germany and Japan and perhaps more willing to accommodate the disadvantaged worker. Liveright would not let such opportunity pass him by. His program did constitute a wrench in the established procedures and privileges of the day; but, he had timing on his side.

Of course there was and is no single hard-and-fast "right way" to assist minority and women workers but Liveright accomplished training procedures in two ways, or in a combination of two: classroom training programs and on-the-job programs. Historically, in fact, these two approaches have formed the backbone of all government manpower training programs. His methodology was not new; it was, perhaps, simply extended. The steps taken were just beginnings, but they opened new pathways that would lead to new opportunities. Practically speaking, Liveright's actions implied that men were interchangeable. Humanistically, he was saying something more penetrating--it was a question of workers' rights, of human rights.

But questions do arise. Was the result worth the
effort? What solid gains were made? How far along the road to full employment did Liveright and the WMC take the minority worker?

The plan emphasized training, of course, but its first and foremost concern was employment—getting them on the payroll. Liveright seemed to believe that a prolonged period of full employment might present an alternate means of softening discrimination. He realized that for most jobs the most important kind of learning is what is learned on the job rather than what was learned in the classroom; in other words, workers needed two kinds of skills: work and social. It was his hope that even what he must have known would be temporary work for many men and women would equip them with the social and other skills they needed to compete for employment in the future.

Eventually, of course, the economic cycle turned; the labor market slackened; industries' interest in special training and hiring programs also slackened; many of the stern realities of World War II which had virtually dictated the broadened job policies of the last decade or so were no longer in evidence. Liveright quickly felt the change; on the other hand, he too may have been somewhat heartened by any new lessons the experience may have taught corporate America. The record
was spotty, not yet good enough to meet his needs; he continued his commitment to the minority worker and citizen at the American Council on Race Relations. The timing was different.

Liveright was a practitioner. In fact, he was a great practitioner, for he had an exceptional capacity for stripping a complex problem to its essentials and devising a solution that worked, all with great speed.

He developed an appreciation for the American worker and grew to believe in the historic mission of the labor unions in bringing a measure of democracy into workers' rights. He recognized that workers and union members must be willing to debate openly and vigorously where there are differences of view. In the early years Liveright's attention focused on training and placement of the adult worker; during the "middle years" the focus would shift to enabling the worker to debate openly. It would shift to education for the adult worker.
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CHAPTER III

THE MIDDLE YEARS: THE EMERGING ADULT EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL

One of the most significant aspects of the 1930s and 1940s was the tremendous growth of the labor movement (Bernstein, 1970). Granted, long before Roosevelt's New Deal administration, labor unions were recognized in America not only as lawful organizations but as socially useful organizations; however, with the advent of the New Deal and the passage of a flood of labor legislation--foremost among which was Senator Robert F. Wagner's National Labor Relations Act of 1935--the 1930s ushered in an ever-growing complexity of labor-management relations, including the creation of an AFL rival or "dual" federation: John L. Lewis' Committee for Industrial Organizations (Congress of Industrial Organizations--the CIO). During the New Deal, AFL membership rose to about 4,000,000 and by 1937 the CIO came roaring on, its ranks swelling to over 3.5 million. In fact, union membership in general experienced an upsurge resulting in an enormous challenge to labor officials and educators--the challenge of millions of
potential students untrained in the daily operations of union organization and in the laws governing industrial relations.

During World War II, labor union membership doubled. In those years, the nation's energy was consumed by war; and, in return for a pledge to avoid strikes, strikes which might sacrifice the war effort, unions gained the support of the War Labor Board in reaching out to organize new areas, even where unions had failed before. Union security and the no-strike agreement dominated labor relations throughout most of the conflict. The end of the war heralded a new era in labor relations: unions had demonstrated that they had become a permanent, secure, and powerful feature in American life.

It was also during the New Deal, specifically in the autumn of 1933, that a rather unexpected impetus was given to hundreds of unemployed school teachers through the inclusion of a workers' education program in the list of adult education activities provided from federal relief funds. Through these workers' education programs, administered by the WPA under the direction of Hilda W. Smith, classes drew from groups of workers in factories, offices, and stores. Forces were joined to bring education to a higher proportion of union and non-union workers than had ever been reached before this time, or
possibly since. But these classes were, essentially, training in general knowledge and in recreational activities for workers rather than specific preparation for union service.

Up until this time, the United States had not had such extensive projects as, for example, had been developed in England through the tutorial classes or in the Scandinavian countries through the movement for residential folk high schools, where people from farms and factories could attend with the help of governmental funds. Workers' education in the United States was actually comparatively new in 1935. For example, a program was first established at the university level at Johns Hopkins, the Workingman's Institute, in 1879. It was not until 1920 that the University of California followed suit and still shortly thereafter when Tufts and Bryn Mawr created similar programs. Inspired by "social reformers," the aim of these earliest programs was social change (Dwyer, Galvin, and Simeon, 1977). About this same time (1907), the Rand School of Social Science in New York City and Brookwood Labor College (1921) in Katonah, New York, were created by early "progressives" to educate for socialist ends "a new order of society" (Beard, 1939, pp. 196-97). But only after World War II did even more universities turn their attention to
educating workers—no doubt, a result of the emerging interest in labor, management, and industrial relations training. Universities and educators were becoming increasingly concerned with the immediate problems and needs of union officials, i.e., collective bargaining, labor laws and their implementation, and union administration (Schneider, 1941).

In 1931, the Rutgers University Extension Division, cooperating with New Jersey's Federation of Labor and the Workers' Education Bureau, conducted the first annual AFL-Rutgers Labor Institute. It became a model for institutes in higher education around the country (Miller and Taylor, 1945), and by the end of World War II most emerging programs were showing a trend toward such union-university cooperation (Ware, 1949). Well-known colleges and universities were establishing workers' education programs: Harvard, Yale, Syracuse, Cornell, Roosevelt, Wayne, Antioch, and the Universities of California, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Pennsylvania State.

Speaking before the University Labor Education Conference in Washington, D.C. in May, 1947, Edwin E. Witte, Chairman of the Economics Department at the University of Wisconsin, concluded, "I can only reiterate my strong convictions that labor education in all aspects is one of the most important responsibilities of the
present-day university" (p. 16). And, according to Arthur A. Elder, director of Workers' Educational Service at the University of Michigan "... workers' education was at a higher level during 1947 than ever before" (p. 406).

In 1947, A. A. Liveright was working as a private consultant for the University of Chicago's workers' education program. The University of Chicago's central objective regarding workers' education was to design leadership development programs which could be carried on within companies and within unions all with the commitment to labor-management cooperation.

It is clear that by this time Liveright had emerged from his earlier years with a philosophical and operational commitment to labor-management cooperation. His experiences in personnel placement, vocational guidance, and especially manpower development allowed him to witness and participate in the democratic alternative to governmental compulsion--cooperation. An underlying belief in all of Liveright's actions in workers' education stems from the values rooted in his deep sense of democratic cooperation:

Unions are one of the principal bulwarks of democracy. They give workers a stronger and more articulate voice in seeking their economic goals.
They can also open up broader avenues of participation for workers in community and national affairs. They can only do so successfully, however, in a democracy. At the same time the preservation and enhancement of the democratic ideal in this country may well depend on the extent to which labor unions are both strong and democratic. (1951, p. 2)

Again he reminded labor and management that men must be willing and able to debate openly and vigorously where there are differences of view; they must not shirk from questioning when they believe such critical questioning is justified. Cooperation and democracy within companies and within unions would only exist as workers exercised their rights within both, participating in both, and making their voices heard.

At the University of Chicago, Frederick H. Harbison, executive officer of the Industrial Relations Center, and Cyril O. Houle, dean of University College also viewed labor unions and private enterprise and cooperation through collective bargaining as the very cornerstones of American democracy (1951). They reasoned that cooperation between skilled "key men," ranging from management's top policy-making executives and superintendents and foremen to labor's leaders in international unions, locals, committee members, and shop stewards, were of vital importance to the American economy. American democracy was dependent upon how well these people did their jobs. They reasoned still further
that the problems connected with training managers and with training union officials were different. The labor leader's job, like that of management's, had broadened and become more complicated, i.e., the administration and leadership of a trade union had become a profession. Their decision was to separate the training of labor officials from the training of managers.

Co-sponsored by the University's Industrial Relations Center and University College, the Union Leadership Training Project was developed in 1946 to identify training needs and build and test training tools, techniques, and materials. Initially directed by one of the program developers, Arthur Carstens, Liveright was asked to accept its leadership in 1948 when Carstens left Chicago for Los Angeles and the Institute of Industrial Relations at the University of California.

The Project, like other university workers' education programs at the time, was dependent upon union assistance and funding; the United Steelworkers of America-CIO contributed most of the funds to finance its earliest activities. Eventually, the Project's base of funding was broadened to include awards from the American Jewish Committee and an especially generous gift from the Carnegie Corporation. No longer "beholdened" to the Steelworkers, the Project was better able to experiment
with various methodologies in union leadership development and work with many more unions. The Project's staff developed discussion materials in union administration, collective bargaining, community relations, and human relations.

Liveright took the Project beyond its commitment to developing discussion materials. He stressed the need for and importance of training programs for union officers that could be integrated into the very structure of union organization; he wanted to help union officials in setting up their own educational programs. Liveright maintained that the role of the university, and the Project specifically, was to provide faculty and space and an atmosphere to test program effectiveness:

... in the long run, the job of the university is, we believe, to help unions to start and carry on more programs for themselves ... In the final analysis, union leadership training programs must be carried on within the unions themselves ... union education directors should not overlook the many union officers who have the ability and the potential to run education programs themselves ... We believe that in some basic subjects these union officers can do as good a job--and often better--than many professional teachers ... [R]esponsibility for building a stronger and more democratic labor movement in this country is an enormous one ... We believe that one of the best ways to fulfill this responsibility is to widen and integrate sound union leadership training programs within the local union. (1951, pp. 7-9).

Liveright's point is well made. These union members were beginning to expect and to take a role in decision
making in their futures. Why not, then, their education? It was worth the effort to organize these scattered forces, to find union members, union leaders, students who could serve and have a voice in instructional and educational deliberations. After all, these workers were adults with experiences—a valuable, and often untapped resource, a hidden potential. Liveright was convinced that they had ideas, and that they could make a contribution if the University of Chicago and union educators would seek their assistance. He and they did.

For the next six years Liveright participated in scores of leadership development programs across the country, all the while depending upon the expertise and experiences of thousands of educators and union leaders and members. From these programs, he and his staff at the Union Leadership Training Project developed discussion materials in a number of areas, including:

1. Collective Bargaining
2. Union Leadership and Administration
3. Grievance Principles and Problems
4. Seniority Principles and Problems
5. Labor and the Community
6. Handling Minority Problems in the Shop and in the Union
7. Working with People
8. Unions and Co-ops

Additionally, Liveright was sensitive to the needs of those union members who were in isolated communities and unable to attend "on-campus" classes and workshops. Liveright, the Project staff, the Home-Study Department of the University, and the Communications Workers of America developed correspondence courses during the spring of 1950. All materials were tested by the Project before publication in a number of union settings, and then used widely throughout the labor movement. And under Liveright's direction, training procedures were developed for union officers to use these materials, each with the reminder that a well-rounded, leadership training program includes all kinds of teaching techniques.

A highly significant contribution to workers' education and to union and university educators is Liveright's (1951) Union Leadership Training--a direct outgrowth of a conference in 1949 where the participants agreed that a manual on techniques for training union officials was necessary. Again, Liveright drew on firsthand participation in training programs. As a handbook, Union Leadership Training was designed to provide tools and techniques, and to all those interested in advancing workers' education a practical and concise
guide. Part I guides the reader in setting up a program; in Part II, Liveright outlines in great detail a variety of programming techniques and considers the value of each in numerous situations; Part III presents an insightful review of discussion, e.g., discussion leaders, materials, planning, and training; and Part IV addresses an area that was rarely considered up to that time, but critical according to Liveright—evaluation. Evaluation was a continuing and crucial problem in workers' education (and in all areas of adult education, for that matter). Simply put, Liveright's program of evaluation was a systematic research effort. It involved experimenting with a variety of teaching methods and materials, a measurement of the effects of the program, and an analysis of the relationships of activities to objectives. In Liveright's model, evaluation was built into all programming.

His realistic and straightforward approaches to programming ranged from structured activities, such as lectures and films, to an interesting and yet unstructured technique that he was especially comfortable with and regularly practiced. Throughout his writings and addresses Liveright fondly reminisced of late-night, spontaneous, off-the-record, and highly productive "bull sessions." Participants could get "down and dirty";
prejudices were revealed, and values clarified. Of course these were not "scheduled," but he was quite deliberate in setting the stage, a stage that encouraged candid discussion. Liveright was always keenly aware of the kinds of atmospheres most inviting and conducive to learning.

One "bull session" seems especially noteworthy. Barbash (1955) implies that as a result of informal conversations held during the winter of 1950-51, Liveright and Frederick Harbison originated the idea for an educational undertaking of such size and significance that it would be the first time that universities, the AFL, and the CIO would work together on such a program. Their philosophical bull sessions examined the character of workers' education. Was it to be dominated largely by a "bread and butter" orientation? Or, were they to take responsibility for a crucially important change--extending workers' education to include liberal education or, more specifically, an attempt to liberate the minds of workers and promote citizen participation in a democratic society?

This question offered a bold challenge to educators of workers and adult educators, and one that was incidentally well-received by representatives of the Fund for Adult Education (FAE) of the Ford Foundation, the
University of Chicago, and three other universities—California at Los Angeles, Wisconsin, and Penn State. Conceived as a "research experimentation center" in workers' education, the Board of Directors of the Fund for Adult Education approved a request for a $95,000 grant in July 1951 for the "Inter-University Program of Union Leadership Training for Democratic Citizenship" (Barbash, 1955). Three representatives from each university made for a board of directors and Liveright was appointed part-time executive officer. (He also was responsible for the University of Chicago's involvement: production of materials in international relations and democratic participation.) An equal number of AFL and CIO representatives were designated.

The purposes of the experiment were to

1. Promote cooperative educational programs between labor unions and universities,

2. Widen the extent and scope of labor education activities, primarily to include foreign affairs, economics, and community participation,

3. Develop new techniques and tools to make educational efforts in these areas more effective and lasting, and

4. Assist labor leaders in establishing and conducting educational programs within their
organizations.

(It is interesting to note that the foundation's purposes were very much similar to that of an already existing institute--Liveright's Union Leadership Training Project at Chicago.)

On the advice of Liveright, the Inter-University Labor Education Committee (IULEC) was eventually enlarged to allow for more regional representation throughout the country. Additional funding was granted and Cornell, Rutgers, Roosevelt, and the University of Illinois were included.

Liveright and Harbison's newly created foundation attempted to address that part of education which up to that time was not normally considered "content teaching." Rather, it had to do with the growth and development of workers. They were attempting to help people mature and engage in active processes, i.e., leadership and citizenship training. While giving labor a hand in establishing its own structure for workers' education Liveright and Harbison were also addressing a wide field of needs that labor had not or could not meet at all or, at least, not as well as the universities, e.g., the University of Chicago's foreign affairs materials project. Liveright was suggesting that traditional workers' education had failed. It had failed to provide
an adequate emphasis on furnishing a liberalizing educational experience, one that could prepare a greater number of citizens to participate in government.

According to Mire (1956), the IULEC experimental programs resulted in several significant achievements:

1. Substantial program expansion in three areas: foreign affairs, economics, and community participation.

2. Experimentation and success in alternative classroom activities, e.g., research-action projects; fact finding; integration of education into functions of unions, including membership meetings; and establishment of labor education councils.

3. Cooperation of different unions in joint educational programming.

4. A labor and university awareness of the potential benefits derived from cooperation.

Liveright served as executive officer for about one year; then, as he had done in the past, he turned the leadership over to one of its own--Joseph Mire, who had come to the IULEC from the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees-AFL. Liveright had again demonstrated his exceptional skills at program development. Representing the University of Chicago, he, Harbison, and Harlan M. Blake continued on the IULEC board until the expiration of the FAE grant in July,
1954. He continued to direct the Union Leadership Training Project until March 9, 1953, when Maurice F. X. Donohue, then acting dean of University College and Frederick Harbison announced Liveright's resignation. For the previous six months Liveright had been on leave of absence due to ill health. Harbison said in announcing the resignation:

The University of Chicago's work among unions, under Liveright's leadership, has assumed a national and international character. Unions throughout the United States, western Europe and Asia are now using union leadership training materials prepared by the University's Union Education Service under Liveright's direction. (University of Chicago news release, March 9, 1953)

During Liveright's involvement with the IULEC, he faced an interesting problem, one that may have affected him deeply. The problem was that of the role of labor in the IULEC. Barbash (1955) reported that neither the AFL nor CIO were ever consulted regarding the early planning and funding of the foundation. The AFL and CIO expressed their dissatisfaction and Barbash paraphrased their objection:

We find it difficult to understand how it is possible to plan a major enterprise in workers' education involving the leadership and the rank and file of the unions without consulting and bringing in, from the very beginning, the representatives of the AFL and CIO. (p. 139)

Barbash also reported a IULEC board meeting of November, 1951:
A basic and fundamental problem which both groups [i.e., AFL and CIO] felt strongly about was the fact that the Fund for Adult Education was making grants in the field of workers' education without any prior clearance or consultation with unions or union education directors. (p. 139)

Of course, such "distrust" of universities can easily be traced back to the Samuel Gompers era, but Liveright, nonetheless, seemed frustrated as he took "A Long [and hard] Look at Labor Education" in March, 1954. While experience had proven to him that workers were "more than eager to sample and delve more deeply into the product offered by labor educators," his "headaches and disappointments" point to a "central problem:"

... lack of support by labor leaders for labor education and lack of long-term union philosophy, goals, and programs--results not only in limiting the number of persons reached but in difficulties in conducting present programs . . . (p. 102)

Almost wistfully he compared the breathless and "superpragmatic" American labor education movement to the "strong" European model. Critical of the United States' efforts, he pointed not simply at the problem with:

... the present emphasis on immediate economic gains and the general lack of any stated long-term political or social goals [but to the fact that] there is also lacking an effective group of thinkers and intellectuals directly inside or even on the fringes of the labor movement in the United States, trying to crystallize some long-term goals as has been the case in Europe. Efforts toward the development of such joint thinking and action in the labor education field . . . have been thwarted by the labor leadership either through boycott or envelopment. (1954, p.103)
But Liveright was far too involved and sincere to leave the field with only a critical review; the next month he followed-up with a number of suggestions on solving some of the rather controversial observations he had made earlier. His examination included several possibilities:

1. A unified "Grand Plan" or philosophy for American labor.
2. A professional organization of labor educators in unions and universities.
3. Additional funding.
4. University withdrawal from the field, or
5. Complete dependence upon universities and local school systems.

A careful and logical assessment of each option pointed to a sixth possibility, one that Liveright favored: a "double-barreled approach," including cooperative union-university demonstration programs and top-level conferences concerning issues and needs. The first dimension of this approach was not necessarily new but rather an expansion of existing cooperative programs. The second dimension, calling for conferences of selected members for small-group, formal meetings and "bull sessions" for the purpose of careful planning and a
thorough going-over, appears to be a fruit of the lesson learned from AFL and CIO concern over exclusive university planning of the IULEC. In fact the proposal was not so innovative; when reviewing the IULEC and the Union Leadership Training Project at Chicago and other similar institutes, it becomes apparent that there were already mechanisms in place to practice his ideas. What was important, however, was his continued support for workers' education and his insistence on union-university cooperation.

As we study Liveright's experiences in the labor movement and labor education it becomes increasingly obvious that his involvement goes far beyond his activities with university educators and "industrial" labor unionists. The Montana Farmers Union education program, for example, captured his interest and commitment for about ten years during the later part of the 1940s and early 1950s. The little information available regarding his experiences here clearly documents its stimulation, excitement, and fascination to him. The educational programming at the Montana Farmers Union represents what Liveright would probably consider a near-perfect lifelong learning opportunity on a community-wide basis.

The State Training School at Great Falls was an
extremely energetic program that impressed Liveright with not one simple goal but with a variety: creating awareness and stimulating action in the social and economic fields; developing cooperatives; preserving the "family-type farm"; "world peace"; strengthening of the Farmers Union organization; educating the children and training them to assume responsible and important positions with the Union and community; and, developing religious goals (Liveright, 1956). It was a program that included youth as well as adults, one that related economic and social realities to religious and moral considerations aimed at understanding and action, and recreation and information. No doubt it appealed to Liveright's humanistic instincts. His annual retreat to Montana was probably more than valuable experience on which to build programs; it was a time to revive his spirit and commitment. Following a week with Montana farm families as both leader and participant in classes in Citizenship, Leadership Training, Farm Legislation, Co-ops, and Propaganda Analysis, including evenings of square dancing, impromptu skits, singing, and inspirational activities, and long, late-into-the-night bull sessions, Liveright must have returned to Chicago a rejuvenated man.

It seems in Montana there was a model: "a life-long
program." The program was a cooperative effort with a philosophy and direction covering all aspects of youth and adult life. It utilized a variety of techniques and methods (many of which are examined in Union Leadership Training) integrated into the organization and community, always moving from education to action. But, Liveright recognized its uniqueness and place; while he considered such programming the very life-blood of the Montana farmer, it could not necessarily be adopted in toto by another organization. However, his experiences in Montana underlined the importance of an educational program for younger people and for all aspects of adult life; there were practical lessons and concrete ideas gathered in Montana and an affirmation of a crystalizing philosophy.

Another of Liveright's valued educational institutions was the Highlander Folk School at Monteagle, Tennessee. Highlander was a labor school (Adams, 1975), its chief purpose to take trade union members and better equip them to help their organizations strive for improved conditions for the working man. Highlander was an idea; it was a democratic conviction that community and political representation can best be strengthened by supporting labor unions and co-ops and by providing both white and black leadership with the skills and
understanding necessary to work together. And, Highlander was a man; Myles Horton got the idea to establish a southern people's school to solve people's problems.

Its stated purposes included adult education, the training of rural and industrial leaders, and general academic education. During the 1930s, the school was primarily concerned with activities in the field of organized labor. Its early and direct support of labor was indicated by representation on its executive council—the American Federation of Hosiery Workers, Amalgamated Clothing Workers, Chattanooga Printing Pressmen, United Mine Workers, and the Nashville Trades and Labor Council-AFL.

Following World War II, Highlander shifted its activities from the labor field to the area of racial problems. The executive council reflected the change. A number of prominent black men and women joined the board. While the New Deal had made significant steps in improving the overall economic conditions of black people, Highlander leadership was convinced that only a full assault on racism and its chief perpetrators, namely institutions, would bring results. Highlander and Horton picked up where federal legislation had left-off.

It is no wonder that Liveright was drawn to
Highlander, first as a participant, then teacher, and finally in the 1960s as an active board member alongside such notables as sociologist Lewis Jones; dean of Morehouse, B.R. Brazeal; Grace Hamilton of Atlanta's Urban League; TVA economist, Lewis Sinclair; Highlander's director of education, Charles Gomillion; Septima Poinsetta Clark; Helen Sheats; and others.

In the late 1950s, just prior to Liveright's nomination to the board, Highlander drew fire from Southern white racists. There were vicious campaigns in Tennessee to destroy the institution; the charges were that the school was "communistic" and that it was misleading young people, and so on. In a "legal" attempt to close Highlander in July, 1959, Tennessee state troopers and sheriff deputies came to Highlander in search of whiskey. Septima Clark, conducting a workshop on school desegregation, was arrested and charged with illegally possessing and selling whiskey and resisting arrest. The Tennessee Legislature ordered an investigation into Highlander. The state was to determine whether the school was operated on an interracial basis and whether it was engaged in civil rights activities; allegedly, interracial activities constituted subversion. Ultimately, the state's complaint charged that: Highlander was operating in
violation of certain compulsory segregation statutes; lewd and immoral conduct consistently took place on Highlander property; the school had engaged in the sale of liquor without a license; and, Highlander had been operated for the personal profit of Horton. A number of interesting "educators and ministers" were called to testify in defense of Highlander and Horton. Liveright, then the Director of the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults (CSLEA), and according to John Thompson of the Highlander staff, "a very impressive witness since he is a big wheel in the whole adult education movement here and abroad" (Thompson, 1959), was called to the witness stand on behalf of the defendants. Cecil Branstetter, attorney representing Highlander, questioned Liveright regarding his knowledge of adult educators' salaries, Highlander's educational programming, and Horton's responsibilities (State of Tennessee v. Highlander Folk School, 1959). Simply put, Liveright testified that Horton's salary was "considerably below the average" as compared to deans and directors of similar organizations. In answering, Liveright depended on findings of a joint project conducted by the CSLEA and a research committee of the Association of Universities Evening Colleges.

Responding to questions regarding Highlander's
programming, Liveright contended, "I think it was a very effective and important educational program. And, I'm very happy that on occasions I was part of the teaching staff there." Comparing Horton's responsibilities and effectiveness to other adult education program leaders, Liveright added:

I believe he has in many ways greater responsibilities since they do not have the complete responsibility for raising money and operating the enterprise and are usually responsible to a president of an institution. Secondly, I believe that he is one of the outstanding teachers of adults in the country.

His testimony concluded, Liveright was excused from the witness stand by what must have been a disappointed prosecuting attorney: "Come down, Mr. Doright."

Following the trial, the Circuit Court of Grundy County ordered the revocation of the Highlander Folk School charter. The decision was appealed to the State Supreme Court and the decision was affirmed. As a successor to Highlander Folk School, the Highlander Research and Educational Center was chartered. It had the same president, Horton, and substantial continuity in its officers, directors, and activities; and it engaged in civil rights activities. The "new" Highlander continued the training of community leaders, especially those interested in voter registration. Because of these activities, the Highlander Center was unpopular within
the community, and, in fact, throughout the State.

On the other hand, Liveright's support for and conviction concerning Highlander and Horton were stronger than ever. He quickly accepted Horton's nomination to serve on the board, regularly travelling from Chicago to attend meetings at the Highlander Center in Knox County, Tennessee.

Again, this time ten years after the first trial, the 1967 Joint Committee of the General Assembly of the State of Tennessee organized and created, under the authority of Joint Resolution No. 14, an investigation of subversive activities on the part of the Highlander Center. The resolution would "provide for a committee to investigate the activities of the Highlander Research Center of Knox County and organizations affiliated therewith." It continued by stating that "it has been reported that the Highlander Research Center . . . and persons and organizations affiliated therewith, may be involved in activities subversive to the government of our State."

Spearheaded by Liveright, he, Charles G. Gomillion, Scott Bates, Myles Horton, and Lewis Sinclair filed suit against the Joint Committee on behalf of the Highlander Center and as individuals. Liveright and the others contended that Joint Resolution No. 14 was
unconstitutional.

Following weeks of deliberation in the case of Dr. A. A. Liveright, et al. v. Joint Committee of the General Assembly of the State of Tennessee, William E. Miller, United States District Chief Judge, found

... that Resolution No. 14, Gen. Sess. 1967, is void on its face for vagueness and overbreadth in that it has the effect, on the basis of the facts alleged, of "chilling" First Amendment freedoms. It is peculiarly susceptible of a "sweeping and improper application."

Liveright and his colleagues can be credited with a significant legal point regarding the unconstitutionality of the proceedings against Highlander Center. While the Highlander Center survived and continued to provide important opportunities for minorities and the poor without the state of Tennessee raiding the premises, Horton and Highlander, and even Liveright, would unfortunately feel "marked" with the attitudes and biases of a prejudiced and an apparently unforgiving society.

Liveright's early involvement in workers' education was fairly consistent with that that had been conducted for a good many years in the past--a curricula dominated by "bread and butter" subjects. However, as the lives of people in the mid-twentieth century became more complex and interdependent, so too did union organization and the task of those involved in union education as they became
concerned with an ever-widening range of problems. Less and less was collective bargaining with management a complete answer to the needs of labor. There was no reason, Liveright was suggesting, that the University of Chicago's Union Leadership Training Project and other institutions of higher education should not recognize the needs of union members and give them the appropriate education in economics, political science, and labor law. After all, it seems that both universities and trade unions would be greatly benefited from such offerings; union members had every right to utilize the facilities provided by tax-supported schools, and universities and colleges could have been rescued from "academic sterility" and the neglect of the labor movement so often accused by labor leaders.

Since World War II, labor had come of age. And in an integrated society, Liveright knew that labor could no longer divorce its interests from management or larger society. Hence, Liveright's purpose in his workers' education programming was not simply to train the individual union rank and file member and/or potential leader as to how to function in a labor-management situation, but also how to be effective in the community and society in which they lived. Union organization, working conditions and such were still important, but
since labor's place in the political system was changing, its leadership must be provided with the information and techniques to deal with their entire national life. In this sense, workers' education was concerned not only with the education of workers to function effectively as union members but also to equip them with the skills necessary as citizens. Liveright's point placed him in company with some other rather significant students of labor education; in 1929, John Dewey had emphasized that labor education should not be different from other types of effective educational experiences. Dewey maintained that to be sound, workers' education must strive to develop the type of experiences which promote the ability of its participants to think clearly, critically, and with understanding.

Liveright strived to emphasize the necessity of expanding labor education to include some provision for a more liberating experience for the individual and for the union, thus extending and strengthening the role of the citizen and organized labor in a free and democratic society. His views, and indictments, may imply a too extreme position, but they contain some elements of truth for an evaluation of workers' education and adult education. While there are fundamental differences between the objectives of "general" adult education and
the objectives of workers' education, Liveright's concern for the worker as citizen resembles the concern of many adult educators. In or out of the labor movement, it seems that part of the common problem is developing and promoting a philosophy of lifelong learning for adults living in a rapidly changing society. After Liveright left workers' education this would prove an ever-present theme in his writings and speeches.

Liveright was a labor educator. But it was also during this period that he began to identify himself as an adult educator. In 1951, he became a member of the Adult Education Association. Soon thereafter he became quite active in the Association, chairing its committee on Professional Development and in 1954 coordinating its annual conference. As the profession of adult education began to emerge so too did A. A. Liveright, the adult educator.

Under the supervision of Cyril Houle and other scholars at the University of Chicago, such as Ralph Tyler, Benjamin Bloom, and Herbert Thelan, Liveright began his doctoral studies in the autumn of 1953. Perhaps most significant among his research in the field during this period was that funded by the Fund for Adult Education—his dissertation topic examining lay leaders in adult education. Specifically, his thesis emphasized
the idea that there is no one "best" lay-leader for all adult education programs and for all learning situations; rather, the kind of lay-leader and the manner in which he or she operates is determined by an understanding of the type of learning situation in which he or she is expected to participate (Liveright, 1954). In 1956, at the age of 49, Liveright received his PhD. His research continued with leadership and his findings were published in *Strategies of Leadership in Conducting Adult Education Programs*, 1959.

*Strategies of Leadership* is a textbook on leadership based on Liveright's investigation of various adult education programs including PTA's, Bible Schools, Great Books groups, and others, including the Montana Farmers Union. As with other publications, Liveright discussed the significance of leadership in a free and democratic society.

He maintained his involvement with union and workers' education and continued his contacts with such leaders as Mark Starr, Irvine L. Kerrison, Hilda Smith, and countless others, but began new and lasting associations with such adult educators as Robert Blakely, Paul Sheats, James Whipple, and Alexander Charters. His identification among America's leaders in adult education was established.
Conclusion

Liveright was a pioneer in new techniques of union education designed to assist officials in taking responsibility for their own leadership. Unlike the earlier days of union-university educational planning in which programming was directed more at the rank-and-file members, Liveright's focus tended to address the functional groups within the total membership, i.e., officers and committeemen. Under Liveright's direction, the Union Leadership Training Project emphasized "how-to-do-it-yourself" materials and techniques. During the "middle years," Liveright had opportunity after opportunity to attend and lead conferences and institutes all across the United States. These events afforded him fruitful occasions for making contacts with the leaders of workers' education in many settings.

In 1951, the Inter-University Labor Education Committee was established. Liveright and Frederick Harbison, with the cooperation from four universities, and funding from the Fund for Adult Education created the IULEC with the avowed purpose to encourage the extension of workers' education in three specific areas: international affairs, economic understanding, and community participation. This rather formal relationship
between a group of universities and the major union federations was without precedent. The presence of representatives from various cooperative trade unions and university educators suggest that Liveright was keenly aware that workers' education was not an independent, unique phenomenon, but instead an essential part of the overall labor movement. And, it is reasonable to infer that an increasing contact between labor and university "intellectuals" was a wholesome sign, perhaps one of mutual enrichment.

In the main, his leadership at the University of Chicago's union education services and IULEC, his various publications, including *Union Leadership Training* and *Strategies of Leadership* (all of which would probably appeal to those groups having specific interest in workers' education, those concerned with adult education, and to those in teachers colleges and other schools offering courses in educational leadership and curriculum development), and the numerous handbooks and curricula materials published at the Union Leadership Training Project are based upon original sources, personal observations, teaching experience with adults, and contacts with different phases of the labor movement. Two particularly interesting, and significant, experiences for Liveright were his involvements with the
Montana Farmers Union education program and the Highlander Folk School/Research and Education Center. While Liveright was already especially conscious of the need for education and training for public responsibility, the experiences in Montana and at Highlander in Tennessee may have awakened serious reflection, including the idea that education must be liberating, i.e., it must inspire labor's mind and each worker's mind to stand independent and yet unified. The farmers' union and Highlander promoted the idea and methods of discussion and cooperative group thinking. Liveright was acutely aware of the potential power within the labor movement and also aware of the power in ideas for the labor movement.

His message seems clear: an effective labor member, labor leader, and labor movement is based on education, a lifelong, "liberating" education. A lifelong education for the worker would include union administration and organization and what a study of history, politics, and economics means in the world of that time, and an examination of values and prejudices and civil responsibility.

A study of Liveright's "middle years" suggests a line of demarcation. During this dynamic period in American adult education, he began to associate himself
regularly with the field and its leaders. These experiences provided Liveright with the opportunity to develop an adult education "psychology."
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By 1960 educational reform had excited much talk and some action throughout the United States; civil rights had become a dominant issue in American politics, one that at times threatened to disrupt historical patterns socially, economically, and educationally. The question of equal rights had become the major political issue, and its impact helped to redirect the currents of educational thought.

A few years earlier, in 1954, the United States Supreme Court, headed by Chief Justice Earl Warren, reversed the fifty-eight-year-old ruling that had permitted school segregation. Although the task was not to be easy, the federal government had determined to settle for nothing less than full constitutional rights for all people. There seemed to be every indication that the nation and its educational opportunities were heading for a major political and educational reorientation.

In 1957, technological advances by the Soviets, and specifically the launching of Sputnik, created widespread concern among Americans and American policy-makers. As
the sputniks were launched, the United States, fearing
the encroachment of Communism, and recognizing its own
shortcomings, passed the National Defense Education Act,
authorizing student loans, institutional grants for
equipment, and graduate fellowships.

Prompted by international events and domestic issues
encompassing the Korean War, the Cold War, the "baby
boom," and the civil rights movement, education, and
particularly the schools, became one of the most
important institutions for promoting national and
international policy. Increasingly, the federal
government and American educational leaders were
struggling, faced with problems seemingly inherent in the
twentieth century's efforts to achieve the ideals of
equality in education and power in world affairs.

This message of new challenges confronting old
verities was memorably declared at the inaugural address
of President John F. Kennedy:

Let the word go forth from this time and place, to
friend and foe alike, that the torch has been passed
to a new generation of Americans--born in this
century, tempered by war, disciplined by a hard and
bitter peace, proud of our ancient heritage.
(Kennedy, 1962)

Most Americans, and educators, looked ahead with
high expectations. While Cold War anxieties remained and
the issues of race relations loomed forbodingly, the
signs seemed promising. The millions of young people born just after World War II who were entering college and adulthood in the 1960s expected a time of prosperity. While the two preceding decades had been marked by long and heated debate over the role of federal government in education, by the mid-1960s the obstacles to a broad plan of federal involvement were not so insurmountable. The Vocational Education Act of 1963 expanded what had begun with the Smith-Hughes Act. That same year the Higher Education Facilities Act was passed; the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 provided a work-study program; and, in April, 1965, President Lyndon B. Johnson signed into law the landmark Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The first law of its kind in the country's history, it provided 1.3 billion dollars to meet Johnson's national goal of full educational opportunity.

Equally important, but overshadowed by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, was the signing into law of the Higher Education Act of 1965. The act covered a broad range of problems, but ideally its purpose was to stimulate a whole new sense of mission among many of the nation's colleges and universities. It challenged colleges and universities to wrestle hard with key issues.

It was a period pulsating with tensions around
educational philosophies, theories, and experiments. Tension increased between the technical and cultural elite; critics and reformers from within higher education and from outside again debated whether schools should provide equality and opportunity through intellectual or vocational training.

One agency committed to the task of helping colleges and universities become more effective instruments for the liberal education of adults was the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults. In clarifying its existence, the Center (1963) argued that higher continuing education encompassed two broad kinds of purposes—specialized work training and liberal education:

Continuing education for work is well provided. The modern world's sharp specializations of labor have made obvious the need for specialized education; its increasing complexities make obvious the need for education at high levels; its quickening rates of change are making obvious the need for education that continues throughout life. We can be fairly confident that in the United States continuing specialized education--vocational, technical, professional--will be well supported and well provided. And certainly, this is both right and proper.

But the equally demanding need for liberal education is neglected. In the press of getting jobs done, and in the complexities to do them faster and better, we tend to lose sight of what more we are trying to do. What we are trying to do is preserve and to improve
a society whose end is the individual human being valued in his own right, whose goal is equal opportunity for all individuals to develop their capacities to the fullest extent and highest reach, and whose means are the free and responsible exercise of the rights of self government. (pp. 1-2)

The Center helped American and Canadian higher education develop a deeper sense of responsibility for the liberal education of adults through various projects, consultation services of the staff, a number of publication series (e.g., Notes and Essays, Reports, Research Reports, and Occasional Papers), its newsletter ("Continuing Education for Adults"), and services of its clearinghouse on adult education information. Established in 1951, and for over fifteen years, it was the sole agency with such a purpose. Supported by the Fund for Adult Education, the Center was proposed and developed by the Association of University Evening Colleges and the National University Extension Association. Over the years it had a highly competent and seasoned staff including such scholars as George E. Barton, Morton Gordon, James T. Carey, Marilyn Vaughan Miller, Harry L. Miller, Francis H. Horn, Russell F.W. Smith, Richard Starr, Leonard K. Olsen, Ida S. Hill, James B. Whipple. F.H. Goldman, Kenneth Haygood, Peter E. Siegle, S.S. Shiffman, Alexander N. Charters, and others.

John S. Diekhoff, a Milton Scholar from Queens
College, was the Center's first director. In 1952 he became Dean of Western Reserve University's evening school, Cleveland College, and John B. Schwertman, a special assistant to the President at Chicago's Roosevelt College assumed the Center's leadership in 1953 until his death in 1956. Some may have been surprised that an educator of workers had been selected as the new leader of America's premier liberal education agency, but in 1957, following his impressive and especially valuable study of CSLEA organization and operations, A. A. Liveright was appointed director.

Rather than attempt a lengthy description of CSLEA and its history, (For a more detailed history of the Center and its programs, see Novak, 1984; Whipple, 1967.) it seems more appropriate to consider one of Liveright's own brief recollections. In 1964, after twelve years of FAE funding and a Chicago operating base, the Center, under Liveright's direction, associated itself with Boston University. On October 16, 1964 he addressed Boston University's board of trustees:

Our Center was established in 1951 to stimulate colleges and universities to expand their programs of liberal education for adults and since that time, it has become the major source of information, ideas and stimulation in the field of higher adult education. The Center has an organic relationship with the two professional associations in its field, the AUEC and NUEA and the Presidents of these two associations serve on the Board of the Center, thus
providing us with an entree and hunting license to work with the four hundred odd universities and colleges in the U.S. and Canada which are members of these associations. The Center has, amongst other accomplishments, been effective: in changing the climate in the field of university adult education with respect to liberal adult education; in stimulating new and imaginative programs in the field; in developing a new and professional body of literature of liberal education; in providing channels of communication . . .; in stimulating Negro Colleges in the South to assume increasing responsibility for community and adult education; in organizing an International Congress of University Adult Education . . .; and, as Reginald Phelps who is in charge of Extension at Harvard says, "in performing the task of gadfly to the field of university adult education with great gusto."

Convinced that the liberal education of adults represented the most important and challenging educational task confronting higher education in North America, and convinced of the need for a missionary enterprise, Liveright, with the Center as his base of operation, set out upon what seems to be a carefully plotted mission. As to the importance of liberal education, Liveright ("The Challenge," nd) maintained that there could be little argument.

All educators, subconsciously and at a relatively submerged level, are convinced of the essentiality of continuing liberal education in a free society. They subscribe to the importance of the maximum development of the individual. They believe basically in the importance of individual, intellectual and emotional fulfillment. They recognize that the major factor which differentiates a free society from a totalitarian one is this continuing opportunity for the development and fulfillment of the individual which can best be accomplished by a continuing liberal education.
The major problem confronting those of us who are dedicated to furthering the cause and program of liberal adult education is that of making this implicit belief explicit, of translating a subconscious feeling into a highly conscious one, of moving from mere belief to aggressive and imaginative action.

Perhaps Liveright's claim was well-founded. After all, even in the post-Sputnik era, there really had been no significant decline in interest in liberal education. In fact, Liveright maintained that more and more of those who were speaking for the professions and business and industry were in agreement that liberal education provided a necessary ingredient that often times made for the most effective functioning of the specialist, whatever his or her field of work might be. Among the most pertinent effects upon Liveright, and his views on the education of adults during these times of technological change, was his persistence in re-emphasizing liberal education's general importance, its special and urgent significance to the opportunities within technology. Therefore, the major question for Liveright was: To what extent was it possible to infect other educators with sufficient enthusiasm and dedication to enable them to act in the role of missionary?

For twelve years, until the Center's dissolution in 1968, Liveright utilized his position to spread
"revolutionary seeds" in the United States and throughout the world in the hope that they might affect individuals, the field of adult and continuing education, and society. In the spring of 1968, the year before his death, West Georgia College honored Liveright's achievements and efforts as an outstanding pioneer in adult education.

The Delbert Clark Award, considered the highest national honor given in the field of adult education—former recipients including Malcolm S. Knowles, 1967; Cyril O. Houle, 1961; Robert J. Blakely, 1959; Howard Y. McClusky, 1956; Jess and Jean Ogden, 1954; and others—was presented to Liveright. The award citation read:

Dr. Liveright has made great contributions to the field of adult education as a teacher, counselor, administrator and writer . . . his intellectual ability, energy, patience, and humor have made him the counselor to counselors, consultant to consultants, and leader to leaders in adult education . . . he has been an outstanding figure in the adult education movement for more than a quarter of a century, and he has kept patient, calm, yet persistent pressure upon the movement in order to enhance its overall philosophy and intellectual fiber . . . projects and publications developed under his leadership will serve the profession in the years to come, just as they have steadied it in the years passed . . . he has contributed much to education not only in the United States but in India and around the world . . . he has been a "dreamer" and a "doer" . . . and his has not been a narrow concept of adult education, but rather a total concern for the individual and his place in society.

Graciously he accepted; however, like the true missionary, Liveright capitalized on the opportunity to
express his deep concern over a "lack of progress toward a philosophy and sense of direction." Specifically, he addressed four broad problems that he believed hindered the field of adult education in the United States at that time:

1. The lack of a unifying philosophy
2. The irrelevance of adult education programming
3. The under-utilization of existing resources—both financial and technical
4. The absence of a sound, identifiable and accessible base for adult education

As a succinct statement of Liveright's overriding concerns during the latter third of his life, these "problem areas" provide a magnificent key to understanding the mature educator's philosophies, and perhaps ultimately provide the best backdrop against which his final achievements may be set. In response to the difficulties outlined, Liveright set forward a "plan of action." It may be well then to consider the "later years" in the light of this plan and its looked-for fulfillment.

There had long been a tendency to divide the ends of education, even adult and continuing education, into the liberal and the vocational. Liveright was keenly aware of this two-part distinction but he was also aware that
courses and subject matter could not always be so neatly divided on this basis. While he had come to study, address, and advocate liberal education among adult educators, he too had come to accept, as had many adult educators in North America at this time, that the term "adult education" was a broad term including educational programs offered by all kinds of providers, in an endless array of subject areas for adults. Liveright (May, 1967) divided adult education programming and goals into four broad areas:

1. Education for man as worker; education for vocational, occupational, and professional competence;
2. Education for man as a family member; education for family and personal competence;
3. Education for man as a political being; education for civic and social competence, and
4. Education for man as an individual; education for self-realization.

These values were reflected in the programming of the day: basic tools of learning for the illiterate; vocational training for the breadwinner; citizenship for aliens; effective community action for each citizen; a better home for families; and a keener appreciation of the great resources of the culture. Liveright realized
that each was respectable and essential for complete development, i.e., necessary education for a "whole man." He was suggesting that "man as a whole" requires many types of education which are equally important to and coordinated with professional education. Attempting to create a commitment to such comprehensive planning would prove to be the greater part of his work and challenge in higher adult education.

For some ten years, as a staff member of the Center, Liveright attempted to clarify some central direction and philosophy which would respect the many forces and interests in the Unites States and throughout the world. He called conferences and meetings on the subject; he commissioned papers by authorities in the field; he spent years examining and revising thoughts and definitions.

For example, during his visits to India (For a more comprehensive listing of Liveright's international travel and efforts, see Appendix B) he was regularly confronted with proponents of an "either-or" philosophy. These proponents argued that there could be no place for liberal education of the Indian population until fundamental literacy problems were dealt with around the country. No doubt influenced by such thinking, in May, 1967, when addressing the National Council for Adult Education in Wellington, Liveright conceded, "It is
essential, therefore, when thinking about adult education, to realize that all aspects are important and not to believe that only one kind is 'true' adult education."

When he was invited to address the Hamilton Scientific Association in January, 1968, concerning international aspects of education, he began to question publicly his own traditional and long-held beliefs:

Some ten years ago—before visits to Africa, Israel, Yugoslavia, India, Southeast Asia, and the Pacific—most of the hallowed concepts and philosophies undergirding our system of education in North America made sense and there seemed to be little need to examine or question these beliefs . . . I can assure you . . . that I will never again attempt to develop an international blue-print for education.

On the other hand, he had always been, and remained, even following his "visits" around the world, especially critical of the American "outmoded horse-and-buggy educational system." In fact, as will be traced, he regularly proposed restructuring the American "blue-print for education." Liveright believed that what America needed was a totally new concept of educational thinking and programming—a continuing education concept that would be an integral part of the future. He was calling for a new kind of education for adults—a liberal education for adults. However, for the most part, Liveright and the Center veered away from any set or
doctrinaire interpretation of what adult education should be; their understanding of what they meant by adult education, particularly liberal education for adults, was continually enlarging. Liveright believed that a definitive interpretation might lead to rigidity and a lack of experimentation. No single, simple definition seemed to work; no simple statement described the variety of objectives or methodologies which fell under the definitions of liberal education. During his search for a definition, he once concluded, "I am beginning to believe that the search for a definition of liberal education may in itself provide the best and most varied form of liberal education for adults" (May, 1967).

Broadly speaking, the Center defined liberal education as an education oriented toward "man as man" as opposed to "man as worker" or "man as money-maker. Liveright (1969) claimed that on such a philosophical base rested two different educational approaches or structures. On one, the traditional liberal arts college attempts to translate the philosophy into one kind of programming. Students on these campuses are aided toward the mastery and comprehension of a liberal education through exposure to a whole range of basic knowledge, e.g., knowledge of the physical and biological world, knowledge of oneself and others, knowledge of man's
achievements and culture, and knowledge of religious and philosophical heritage. The implication is that such knowledge fosters a life of continued learning. But Liveright appears to pose still another question: If the traditional liberal arts school believes so strongly that liberal knowledge is and can be a continuing influence, then does it not have some obligation to its alumni or general adult citizenship?

Perhaps a partial answer is found in Liveright's second view. Here he takes the meaning of liberal education to be, not bodies of knowledge, but a process, a process of liberation; liberation not simply from ignorance, but a "[f]reedom from the bondage of an overly-narrow prespective on life, [and a] strength to maintain individual autonomy against social pressures for conformity . . ." (1969, p. 5). In adulthood, the emphasis in education must shift, since mature and experienced people are more concerned with and more competent to handle deeper and less precise subjects. The intended effect is to make the student more understanding and tolerant, in brief, to generalize knowledge, liberalize viewpoints, and set him or her free to pursue genuine education. He contended that because of the immaturity of the inexperienced "undergraduate," the emphasis in their education must remain on basic
skills and the more exact forms of learning. However, because of experience, emotional overtones, patterns of thought, time perspectives, and motivations, adults are more concerned and competent to grapple with deeper subjects. Liberal education for adults teaches "how to get along with themselves, how to understand the meaning of life, how to answer the 'whats' rather than the 'hows'" (p. 5). Liveright insisted that there comes a point in almost each person when he or she moves from asking the "how" questions to a quest for answers to "why we are." While this specific "teachable moment" occurs at different ages, Liveright proposed that it seems to be clearly associated with the time when an individual moves from vocational interests to questioning "what are we trying to achieve"; somewhere in middle-life between the ages of thirty and forty-five. (It is interesting to note that at about the time Liveright began to publicly consider this point of readiness, Alan Knox was conducting a CSLEA sponsored study of audiences involved in liberal education for adults.)

The idea, in sum, was that issues are more real to adults because, in the ordinary course of living, they had actually been confronted by more of them. Possible solutions are therefore better evaluated by adults because they, in the ordinary course of life, have a
better comprehension of their implications. Liveright, ever the liberal educator, continued to maintain that educators must help mature people improve their basic skills of communication and analysis, but always insisted that adults seek wisdom, not facts—-one of the fundamental tenets laid down by the founders of the liberal tradition.

Clarifying further, he claimed that liberal education for undergraduates is concerned with socialization, i.e., teaching young people how to "get along" in society. On the other hand:

... liberal education for adults is an education which attempts to free men and women from their intellectual and emotional bondage, which is based upon and develops a curriculum which is attuned to the basic differences between adults and undergraduates and which attempts to bring about . . . behavioral changes . . . Most important, it is a process which provides adults with those skills and abilities which permit them to carry on and continue the educational and freeing process on their own. (1969, p. 6)

According to Liveright, there was a new student body, composed of adults, compelling educators to take cognizance of their existence and adjust to it. He called for an acceptance of "continuity in education."

Of course, during this time educators at all levels were giving at least lip-service to this concept of "continuity"; "lifelong learning" and "education from cradle to grave" became accepted terminology. But
Liveright's idea of continuity demanded an impact on the goals of higher education, on curricula, on teaching methods, and on the very organization of institutions of higher education.

In his endeavor to liberalize adult education, Liveright had pragmatic tendencies; he and the Center remained highly flexible. Goals, and programming ideas to meet these goals, were very much dependent upon immediate situations. Sociological and economic forces were creating more leisure, the trend toward specialization demanded more general education, and the need for a more intelligent citizenry to participate in the increasingly, complex decisions were demanding attention. For example, Liveright recognized a national concern; according to him the average American adult was needing a clearer understanding of worldly circumstances and America's part in them. Changes in the United States were too swift and demanding to rely on the education of children alone. He believed in the importance of continuing education for a democratic and fully involved society; he believed that adult educators should assume a bold leadership in giving direction.

It was Liveright's fear of hard realities and his wish for a personal utopia that made his belief in the necessity of adult education stronger than ever before in
his career. It was his conviction that people become appreciative of liberal education and what and how liberal education for adults could contribute to the solutions of important and urgent problems; a liberating education for adults would give them deeper insights into the meaning of life and human progress and values. No doubt, there were those who must have thought this to be too ambitious and comprehensive an undertaking, but it reflects Liveright's vision, patience, and determination. His contention was that adults during this period in American history had a unique, unparalleled, and extremely rich opportunity to realize their full potential, their hidden potential, and become the most liberally educated group of adults in the history of man.

To put his thinking into operation, Liveright (October, 1959) suggested that educators look upon continuing education in three distinct and yet related stages:

1. Education for Socialization: a period of preparation for life, for work, for family and community responsibilities which takes place through primary and secondary schools and through undergraduate education.

2. Education for Specialization: a period when citizens will either continue their education at a higher and more specialized level in graduate or professional
schools or will secure this training on the job or through voluntary associations.

3. Education for Individualization: a period during which emphasis is placed on the broad liberal education of adults, a period during which universities take a major responsibility, and a period that university adult educators will find the most exciting and challenging.

In considering his three-part approach it becomes apparent that his plan rests on the belief that learning itself is what is important rather than what is learned. Liveright was calling for the high schools and colleges and universities to begin thinking of education not only as a preparation for employment but also as a way of life; education that would have as its goal freeing the individual to reach toward his or her potential of growth and toward the effective use of his or her resources. To be effective, the three-part system required a two-fold program. On the one hand, it prepared students for jobs, professions, and mature life; on the other hand, it prepared them for continuing education in what was then becoming known as a "learning society."

He called upon educators to instill in their students ("or at least not to interfere with") a sense of wonder, curiosity, and a thirst for knowledge and
understanding. He asked that schools provide their students with the required skills for independent and continuous study. Most important to his appeal was an underlying philosophy and the necessary ingredients for a sound, individualized program of lifelong liberal education. The essential ingredients included:

First: An attitude, a state of mind, and a national posture which prizes and values the liberally educated man which supports a "learning society."

Second: A society in which there is sufficient leisure time available, so adults have time to carry on a life of learning, and so they have an opportunity to complete their education as they mature and grow older.

Third: Some general agreement as to what constitutes the knowledge, understandings, appreciations, interests, attitudes and skills which characterize a liberally educated man so we can understand better what objectives we are trying to achieve in a program of continuing liberal education.

Fourth: Some methods whereby adults can measure themselves against this ideal, never-to-be-achieved, but always-to-be-sought-after paragon of a liberally educated man—so individuals may compare their present education to what is desired, so they may identify areas in which they are especially weak and lacking, and so they can
measure their progress toward this desired goal.

Fifth: Provision for counseling and tutorial assistance, so adults may have help in finding out where and how they can secure the education which will help them to move toward the ideal goal of becoming a liberally educated man.

Sixth: Availability of a wide variety of different kinds of learning experiences, both group and individual, which make it possible for the adult to carry on a program of continuing liberal education at his own pace and in terms of his own capacities (Liveright, 1963).

The interrelation of these ingredients provide the liberating experiences of Liveright's domestic blueprint for education. With America entering the technological age, such an experience would be especially significant in its attempt to develop in each student the intellectual powers requisite to prepare him or her for inevitable confrontations with major issues of individual and society—war and peace, justice and injustice, equality and inequality.

But, where would such programming best be carried out? While speaking at Wittenberg University, Liveright (1960) gave some convincing reasons why the "smaller" liberal arts colleges and universities were especially prepared to carry such programming forward. He argued
that large universities were research-oriented, placing the responsibility of teaching, teaching men and women to be "human," far down their list of priorities. Small liberal arts schools, he reasoned, tend to place less emphasis on pure research and more on teaching.

While Liveright's educational objectives, philosophy and sense of direction, may have required a little more refinement, most people would agree that schools must impress upon their students the idea that education is a lifelong pursuit. His sense of direction and philosophy might even stir indifferent educators and students to the values of study of a broad liberal nature aside from their vocational allegiances. The answers to such issues around balancing program-planning with a central theme of individual learning will ultimately be governed by all educators, of youths and of adults, as they attempt to identify continuing education as a necessity of life.

This period in American development, of scientific and technological explosion, was causing all concerned to recognize that learning was and must be a continuous, lifelong pursuit. The idea of lifelong learning was not necessarily radical, but it did allow Liveright to apply his thinking to problems of the moment and to the future. His thinking suggested that there was a reservoir of ideas among adults--men and women, disadvantaged and
fortunate--going underutilized and often unrecognized. In Liveright's eyes, a nationwide program of lifelong learning, a nationwide awareness of liberal education for adults would unleash these vast and hidden resources. Liberal education for adults represented to Liveright the most important and challenging task confronting adult educators in North America.

But just as he would admit during his acceptance of the Delbert Clark Award, it was not to be. Adult educators thought in too small and limited terms. They had no vision and by far underestimated the thirst and desire that adults have to learn throughout their lives. Only when adult educators were clear about their philosophy and sense of direction, only when all educators were clear as to the kind of society they were trying to build, would they be able to design an educational system to serve their goals. Throughout his later years, it was to be Liveright's thesis that the necessary ingredients for a nationwide program of continuing liberal education were already at hand. As "gadfly" his role was to create an awareness to these existing ingredients--to create a new kind of climate for continuing education.

It is readily visible that he was idealistic; but his idealism and sense of direction, his "dreamy Walter
Mitty" message, was central to his mission. He only asked that his vision be judged by one criterion, whether it has worked elsewhere. He believed that his ideas were always quite realistic and practical, and he took little credit for most of his recommendations. Quickly he pointed to existing models and prototypes as examples to his thinking. What he described in detail to individual after individual and to group after group was neither a dream nor a luxury but rather a necessity in a free and democratic society. Liveright's missionary responsibility was to bring word of what could and had worked.

Idealistically, Liveright (September, 1964) stated:

... we stand today on the threshold of a new "learning society" in which adults will accept continuing education as a way of life and as a happy alternative to work and in which the thinkers, the musicians, the scientists and the artists will become just as great folk heroes as athletes, businessmen, and Generals.

Whether educators and the general citizenry would cross the "threshold" into a learning society depended on a number of factors. At West Georgia College he concluded his appeal for a unifying philosophy by saying:

... I believe that we need a new Magna Carta for continuing education: a clear-cut resounding, dramatic statement and central direction which can fire the imagination of the operating professionals and which will attract new and young workers into the vineyard. ... Somehow we must attract the modern Deweys, Lindemans, Mansbridges and Cardinal
Newmans, to the task of defining the purposes and goals of a truly sound program of continuing education . . . (Liveright, December, 1968, p. 297)

Liveright's assessment of adult and continuing education at the Delbert Clark Award ceremony dealt with another question: throughout his later years he returned regularly to the issue of the relevance of programming for adults.

During the first half of the twentieth century change had been among the most pervading characteristics. When Liveright appraised the scene his assessment was that programming was not keeping abreast of the changing times, nor was it preparing itself for future demands; knowledge, understanding, and skills required in an ever-changing world must be acquired by adults at that moment through adult education.

Summarizing the Southern Regional Educational Board Conference on Urbanism in July, 1963, Liveright attempted to suggest the background against which higher education must operate and some of the major dilemmas confronting higher adult educators at the time. Perhaps most interestingly, he told the conference that:

... in the United States--and increasingly in the world--we have more freedom than we know what to do with. As a result of this great increase in freedom we have problems and difficulties. We have more choices to make for ourselves than ever before in history and because of the complexity of these choices we are probably less equipped for this
freedom. As a result . . . we are uneasy and unhappy.

. . . we are suffering from a variety of enormous, dangerous, and usually unconscious, lags in our society . . . cultural, psychological, institutional and political lags . . . In all these areas, thinking, planning and action has fallen way behind advances and developments in the physical and scientific world.

Throughout his life, Liveright maintained that the potentialities of adult education, both short-term and long-term, could not be fully achieved until continuing education was accepted as an integral part of America's dynamic society. Of course it followed that every adult would never realize his or her own potential until relevant programming was incorporated into the traditional educational institutions and into every continuing educational opportunity throughout the United States.

In Cleveland, at the AUEC annual convention in November 1961, Liveright enthusiastically reminded the attending adult and continuing educators:

Unless we in the evening colleges are able to perform a unique and special service to individuals and to the community, which cannot be performed by the day college, and at the same time maintain a high level of quality and concern with university level education we will increasingly find ourselves engulfed and integrated by the day faculty and will lose our evening college identities.

Addressing the faculty of the Boston Center for Adult Education concerning what was happening and what
should be happening in the field of education for adults, Liveright (September, 1964) said that as

... lifelong learning becomes more important ... its students will become more demanding. They will look for educational programs which really challenge them and for courses which have been especially planned and developed for adults. They will not be satisfied with courses which are merely warmed-over day-time classes offered at night. They will, if they are looking for degrees, want to be given some credit toward their degree for education that they have gotten outside of the classroom, and they will expect adult educators to fit their educational programs into the life cycles and patterns of adult life. They will demand more comprehensive and continuing, informal, non-credit educational programs which offer them more than a nice array of educational smorgasbord with no opportunity to move on in depth and scope. They will also demand some kind of educational counseling which will aid them to workout long-term programs of continuing education, based, to an increasing extent, on independent study. In this connection, they will also need a new kind of educator: a counselor-tutor who will be able to act as a continuing educational consultant to them in their lifelong program of independent study ... they will want to know what the components of liberal education are and they will need some kind of self-evaluation procedures whereby they can measure their own knowledge and understanding against the ultimate goals of liberal education.

Underlying these thoughts is Liveright's concept that quality can be achieved not by identity with the traditional day programs, nor simply by replicating them, but rather by cooperating with the day faculty in developing programs which are of equal or greater quality and especially attuned to the needs, motivations, and readiness of adults. He felt it incumbent upon adult
educators to clear away any of the obstacles that might be preventing individuals and groups from developing relevant programming with the speed and efficiency that the times were urgently demanding.

Accordingly, Liveright was not going to rely on the education of youth nor the unimaginative and weak approaches of irrelevant adult education programming. It was to become his obligation to explore the possibilities of revamping existing programs in an effort to restore some of the qualities—the qualities of curiosity, imagination, creativity, and confidence—and principles of lifelong learning.

Speaking at a White House Conference on Education in July, 1965, Liveright respectfully pointed to a number of institutions of higher education, namely, Oakland University in Michigan, the University of South Florida in Tampa, Goddard in Vermont, the University of Minnesota, and Radcliff College, that were

... beginning to accept the fact that a major goal of higher education is one of instilling in its students a thirst for knowledge, and abiding curiosity, and "itch" for continuing education, and skills for independent study. . . . [They] are consciously making plans to reorient their curricular and teaching methods so that they will open up areas of inquiry and stimulate a desire for continuing study rather than trying to achieve closure and completion.

Despite his appeal in Washington, D.C., and in
April, 1966, at the Metro Seminars in Boston, where it would seem certain that those attending would agree that the interest in lifelong learning and the skills to carry it out must be developed before adulthood, he maintained "that most college education is provided in such a manner that the participants feel that 'they have had it' once they get their degrees and graduate." His basic proposition was that the total system of American higher education was outmoded; the system was no longer appropriate for the needs and problems of the mid-twentieth century and especially as it relates to higher adult education. In an attempt to substantiate his theme he submitted a number of propositions to a NUEA workshop in August, 1959, among which included:

1. The speed and pervasiveness of change and the need to keep the citizens of a democracy aware of the scientific, international and personal changes requires a new educational concept.

2. It is the adults who will make the vital decisions which will determine the very conditions under which we exist. It is they who must, today, develop a sense of public responsibility, and the university has a major role to perform in developing this sense of responsibility.

3. Universities have a responsibility not only for providing data and facts and for meeting the "felt needs" of the community but also for cultivating needs in adults as well as in youth.

4. ... more and more people are now ready and prepared for a continuing education along a variety of lines--including especially liberal education.

5. The present scrutiny of education ... suggests that outside forces will require a reexamination of the educational system whether we
6. The experience of other countries suggests that we are resting on our oars and that we are not keeping up with new concepts of continuing education.

7. We have more understanding of the fact that adults can learn and more data about how, and in what ways they learn best.

8. The increase in leisure time and in longevity provides new and continually increasing audiences and opportunities for carrying on continuing education.

9. New means and methods for mass communication and new technological developments which provide challenging opportunities for broadening education are just beginning to be used and will, undoubtedly, call for major revisions in our programs in the future.

10. All of these new and emergent factors calling for a reexamination of our educational system must be seen against the background of the fact that the best opportunity for liberal education occurs later in life.

Such thinking was fairly widely recognized among educators, especially adult educators, during this period; nonetheless, it was revolutionary. What Liveright advocated was a thrust toward reorganizing all of education—not simply anchoring additional and more relevant programs onto traditional schooling. The lifelong learning concept—Liveright's "continuity of learning"—called for a re-definition of the very purpose of schooling; the new purpose being to produce a new generation of self-directed learners. Liveright was convinced that it would take a radical re-thinking of values and a new and creative way of looking at life for lifelong learning and adult and continuing education to
become meaningful. Liveright's unqualified commitment to a continuity of learning, and the role that liberal education contributes to that commitment, impelled him to try to become a kind of intellectual beacon for the adult education community at large, a beacon calling out for a changed attitude among adult educators. He called for adult educators to realize that they were responsible for "the most important kind of education in an increasingly complex world" (March, 1962). He called for an understanding, an understanding that adult educators "are in a favored and unique position to experiment and demonstrate the new and imaginative."

Ironically, the greatest opposition to Liveright's thinking would probably come from the practitioner, the practitioner content with "short, cafeteria-like, unplanned, non-sequential, undemanding courses" geared to the "lowest common denominator." Liveright was frustrated by the practitioner:

1. [Who substituted] entertainment and recreation for education, adhering to the doctrine of "felt needs" thereby abdicating the responsibility of the teacher for creating new, challenging and demanding programs to the "group."

2. [Who underestimated] the capacities of the audience, the ability of adults to learn, the motivation and desire to learn.

3. [Whose] laziness and lack of motivation [made them] unwilling or unable to experiment with new formats, techniques, media and methods . . . resulting in the use of outdated and inadequate techniques and methods which may satisfy
undergraduate captive audiences, but which are not adequate for adult non-captive audiences who need and should be provided with something better. (March, 1962)

A practitioner himself, and obviously somewhat sympathetic to the adult education "movement," Liveright too must have recognized a feeling of frustration on the part of the practitioner—the pervasive feeling of inadequacy, of second-class citizenship, which often times forces the practitioner to look for security in conformity. On the other hand, Liveright was adamant about the role of the adult educator, more than that of any other educator, in planning programs which have a direct and basic relevance to the problems of life. He was challenging the profession to develop a new self-respect and dedication for its roles of innovator and experimenter and practitioner.

Yet his own thinking posed a dilemma for Liveright. By his own definition, the concept of adult education was the notion of liberation—the process of individual growth. How was he to reconcile his belief in an individual's right and ability to choose what would be in his or her best interest and in society's, given free choice, and his thinking that the role of the adult educator was too greatly minimized and too much "catering" to customers? Was programming to depend on
the individual, and his or her aims for education and relevance, or adult educators with their aims providing direction? Fortunately, it seems that reconciliation may not have been impossible. After all, Liveright believed that the common aim of adult education is liberal—in the sense of being liberating. In other words, the real test was not subject matter but rather its effect on the student. For example, if an underprivileged adult was inhibited from liberation by inadequate job training, then he needed vocational training. Learning about art, for example, would be relatively meaningless unless it could alter or balance the ways an individual views other people or events. The point is that learning has minor value unless it encourages the adult to seek and choose more rather than fewer experiences of liberal expression.

Liveright seems to have been shocked by the lack of programming concerned with liberal expression and value conflicts. He called for programming in what he believed to be among the most crucial problems confronting Americans: race relations and international relations. It was clear to Liveright that some vague belief and understanding of democracy was not enough; intelligent citizenship and social responsibility demanded knowledge of the world, its history, its political and economic systems, its arts, its technology, all of which make up
not only liberal education, but culture. If democracy meant anything to Liveright, it seems it meant more than just voting—it meant participation in those things of the mind, i.e., learning. Adult educators had many obligations—foremost among them that they ensure that each man and woman continue his or her learning.

It seems then that the crucial question in this regard is whether higher adult education and the adult educator should function as a "change agent." Liveright (1961) answered this question when he examined "The Role of the University in an Undirected Society":

If a university is not to be isolated from the society in which it exists and if it has some responsibility for influencing the direction of change in society, then it must mobilize the energies required to consider the various alternatives involved in reaching agreement for action. The university has the responsibility for examining the process and for educating adults about how changes occur, about the consequences of various possible changes and about the values involved in these consequences . . .

. . . If we are to meet the challenge of industrial disturbance to society . . . universities cannot afford to limit their activities to scholarly research . . . nor to the education of the young . . .

A great university must, therefore, make a decision as to whether it will participate in the revolution or sit on the sidelines and merely report . . . (p. 37)

Liveright was calling for an educational system which provided for two things. First, a system which
adopts and adapts the idea of university/agricultural extension, i.e., a system whereby higher education accepts responsibility for transmitting all its research findings, in the physical and natural sciences as well as in the social sciences, to the people. And, secondly, a system of continuing education which recognizes that education of the adult is just as much its responsibility as education of the youth. How was this to be?

The Liveright solution was one that concerned itself with values, attitudes, and understandings as opposed to simple skills, facts, and information. Higher adult education should be liberal adult education so that adults will be increasingly equipped with skills of decision-making and public responsibility. In short, the solution called for programs that:

... shake up and discomfort adults, that worry and concern them, that insist that they think for themselves, that start a chain reaction of inquiry and investigation, and that set up a state of positive disequilibrium [rather] than programs that satisfy, pacify, and provide simple answers and set solutions . . . (1969, p. 6-7)

It would incorporate the following essential elements:

First, the undergraduate curriculum and teaching methods must take cognizance of the need for continuing education and must instill a concern for such education into the undergraduate students.

Second, a program of continuing education which takes cognizance of the life-cycle of adults and
which is built to meet their developmental roles must be developed. In other words, we in adult education must make available to adults different kinds of educational programs at different stages of their development and growth.

Third, all of the various educational institutions must cooperate in developing and offering this program of continuing education so that each educational facility can offer a program which it is best suited to offer at the appropriate period in the life-cycle and so that an adult can easily move on from one kind of educational program to another.

Fourth, colleges and universities must develop planned and sequential programs of liberal education for adults which will be of sufficient quality and interest so that they will challenge the interest of their graduates when they reach the teachable moment.

Fifth, liberal education programs for adults must be provided in such a manner and planned in such a way that an adult reentering his educational career can follow up his broad and liberal education at increasingly complex levels and depths so that it becomes, in fact, a lifelong program of learning. (Liveright, October, 1959)

One month earlier, as he addressed the program of commemoration at Wittenberg University, Liveright (October, 1960) included another essential element for a program of higher continuing education:

These programs of continuing education must be supported by a national climate which reinforces the importance of such education. In other words, the image of the man who continues his education, who is an active member of the learning society must become the "Man of Distinction of 1970." (pp. 348-349)

Liveright was an academic, romantic idealist. His utopia would hold up the intellectual, the "egghead," as its model. He claimed that the image of the
"Organization Man" was cracking; the low status of the intellectual was shifting to one of status and power. The image of this new man of distinction (much like Cyril Houle's modern man with the inquiring mind), perhaps in the likeness of Robert Hutchins or Margaret Mead, both of whom Liveright admired enormously, would be an educated man or woman, interested in things of the mind first and material achievements secondly, a Renaissance man, a product of a lifelong, relevant education with emphasis on the generalist, individual, non-conformist, the broadly, liberally educated person.

Thus, Liveright's relevant education for the new "man of distinction" of the 1970s is one that provides the student with:

1. A knowledge and understanding of a variety of areas and fields.

2. An ability to make decisions based on continuing knowledge and historical perspectives.

3. An ability to use machines and tools of specialization.

4. An ability to live with ambiguity.

5. A basic understanding of the scientific method.

6. An insulation against propaganda.

7. A capacity to enjoy leisure and family (1960, May 13).
To meet these concerns and other social needs, no doubt greater unity was required within the ranks of adult educators; Liveright's hope was that leaders and those to follow would meet the exciting challenge. These were some of the possibilities and potentialities of a relevant education based in Liveright's liberal approach.

In short, what Liveright proposed was a defined base of educational opportunity for youth and adults. Without it, he concluded at the Delbert Clark Award ceremony, "we will continue to fail in our search for significance in modern society." He called for a "new breed of adult educator."

We need young, idealistic, dedicated men and women who will look upon adult education as a means to social development and individual fulfillment . . . . I suggest that we need new kinds of graduate programs and training for adult educators. A kind of training and education which provides a better understanding of the urgent urban, racial and international problems which confront us and which must increasingly become the substance of continuing education programs . . . . We must . . . make it possible to attract and enroll Peace Corps returnees, Job Corps graduates, Community Action program officers, industry and army "dropouts" and youth now active in political and social activities. In this way we may be able to energize the present group of pragmatic administrators and operators with an injection of radical and forward looking thinking. (December, 1968, p. 298)

It was not simply that American adult educators lacked programming imagination and enterprise,
underestimated the thirst that adults had for continuing education, and lacked a sense of direction; Liveright's message to the field of adult education was that it did not understand the tremendous resources available and under-utilized others in carrying out the movement toward the kind of learning society so many adult educators were talking about. According to Liveright, the field had the necessary ingredients already in place to carry on the nation-wide program of liberal education that he advocated; and, he reasoned, if adult educators could demonstrate what was possible, even more resources would be made available. His conclusions were direct enough. Adult education had more resources at hand than it knew about and easily more than were being used.

It may have surprised, perhaps even affronted, those attending the national conference of the AEA in 1967 when Liveright addressed legislation for social change. Instead of a fiery excoriation of the federal government's unwillingness to provide funding and its inadequacy at effective change, his thesis was that executive and legislative branches of the federal government, not adult educators, had provided the lead and had made the breakthroughs. He insisted that the federal government had provided more legislation, executive orders, and authorization for adult education
than was being utilized.

To support the position made at the 1967 conference that the "basic ammunition" was already available, he cited several examples, including:

1. Forty million dollars for adult basic education through Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

2. Ten million dollars authorized for higher continuing education through Title I of the Higher Education Act.


4. Over $250 million annually through the Smith-Lever Act providing excellent programs but with no integration toward a national thinking.

5. Potential of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965.


8. Over $360 million available in the 1966 budget of the Manpower Development and Training Act and an additional $288 million for training through the Labor Department.

10. Research and Development, Policy and Experimental Centers through the Elementary and Secondary Education School Act provided funds for joint programming.

11. Forty-two million dollars for research under Cooperative Research Funds in the Office of Education.


13. Additional funds through Housing and Urban Development, conservation programs, civil rights education, and more.

The questions were obvious: despite the federal government spending approximately one and one-half billion dollars for adult and continuing education, and the non-federal entrepreneurs, e.g., business and industry, churches, etc., spending much more, how many adult educators were really aware of these and other resources? In how many communities were these programs really being utilized effectively? Were there communities where an attempt was being made to bring to bear all available resources? What were adult educators doing to ensure that imaginative and relevant programs continued to develop? And, what were adult educators doing to provide the continuing support and evidence at
the legislative levels to insure that increased resources were provided? He called to the AEA to:

Stop fooling around on a disorganized basis and assume leadership in influencing national policies, legislation, programs, and implementation of existing policy and to insure the achievement of the broad goals of the field . . . and let us use some of the mechanisms already established to do so. (November, 1967)

On the other hand, Liveright recognized that despite the availability of resources, the overall priority of the federal government was shifting--channeling funds away from the Great Society and to the Great War, Vietnam. He called for adult educators to ask: Do we have a position concerning the allocation of resources? Have we stated the case for the war on ignorance and poverty at home? Since any lack of funding in the future would be, to a great extent, a result of expenditures arising from the war in Vietnam, could adult educators afford not to take a position? No doubt drawing on his extensive experience with manpower training and development during World War II, Liveright suggested that in the light of war needs, it seemed only reasonable to expect additional funding for vocational education rather than civil rights, civic education for the humanities and arts, and for urban or community education. But his was not a proposal to change attitudes concerning military funding as much as it was an appeal; an appeal to adult educators to develop
a position on how the total adult and continuing dollar should be spent. It was an appeal for developing and assuming leadership for available and future resources.

The concern for continued funding and utilization of existing resources was well-founded, for at least two significant factors had made themselves felt. First, the death of the Fund for Adult Education (FAE) indicated to Liveright that there was no longer a great and powerful ally operating in the field. Secondly, Liveright had personally experienced the elimination of this "rich, if frequently unpredictable uncle." While the FAE had never guaranteed indefinite funding to CSLEA, certainly Liveright and the Center's staff had developed a fond sense of security from the Fund's generous and continued support over the years.

Despite what to Liveright appeared to be an era in which continuing education was facing legitimate needs and increased demands, financial resources were dwindling, being underutilized, or were simply not anticipated. He remained skeptical that a fragmented, undirected field, one with an irrelevant plan for programming would not stimulate new and additional foundations to invest in higher adult education.

Although Liveright expressed pointed concern over the field's then limited utilization of technological
resources, he could only have imagined the vast opportunities that would, within a few years, be made available to adult educators. His observations may seem limited by contemporary standards. Nonetheless, technological advances presented exceptional challenges to the adult educator during Liveright's later years. Liveright attempted to capture and engage the spirit of the time but reminded those in the field on a number of occasions and specifically the educators attending his Delbert Clark Award ceremony:

As far as media are concerned, we have not even begun to use the fantastic new developments and the enormous potentialities in communications and the mass media which could take the place of the old-time Chautauqua and the lyceum as major channels of adult education today.

The technological resources for massive and imaginative programs of continuing education are here. (December, 1968, p.296)

Liveright's concern was that the educational methodologies of the adult educator were rapidly becoming obsolete and that the adult educator of the technological age must abandon any skepticism. In the face of the much-publicized explosion of knowledge and in the pervasiveness of change in all professions and technologies, Liveright maintained that adult educators must create innovative programming utilizing a variety of media. The "man of distinction" required a totally new
kind of knowledge center which would have access to new kinds of learning materials and opportunities including films, recordings, history-tapes, books, and television programming. The new knowledge center would make use of the new technology on the one hand and on the other, preserve and give new life to liberal education and to the community of adult students and scholars. So it appears that Liveright was not only calling for the utilization of financial and technological resources, he too called for a special genus of university extension accepting responsibility for testing these ideas and technologies.

Having studied and contributed to national and international events since the 1930s, Liveright had come to realize how essential it was that educators, and those outside of education, establish and sustain an environment in which adult and continuing education be viewed as an imperative and not simply an adjunct to existing programs; he recognized that the concept of lifelong learning must be a reality. However, before lifelong learning could be realized, adult educators would have to resolve any number of problems in the field if it were to fulfill its proper function. Integrating lifelong learning into the traditional educational structure posed several questions. Liveright believed
that the organization of adult and continuing education, and the management and leadership of learning, ought to be as thoughtful, as constructive, and as progressive as learning itself in answering these questions.

Francis Keppel, Commissioner of Education from 1962 to 1965, and an organizer of AEA, who was becoming increasingly involved in clarifying adult education's role and furthering lifelong learning both nationally and locally, asked that Liveright undertake a study of the scope and nature of adult education in the United States. Thurman J. White (1968), then Dean of Continuing Education at the University Oklahoma commented:

The invitation of the U.S. Commissioner of Education to A.A. Liveright was perhaps the most unique of all opportunities available to an American adult educator in the 1960's. It was an invitation to look at adult education programs in American society, set focus on unmet needs, and recommend appropriate action by the Federal Government . . . If you care about the future of American society; if you care about responsible educational planning; if you care about rational courses of action by governmental agencies; if you care about harmonious confluence of adult education effort, then you will care about the fact of the invitation . . . (p. vii)

In connection with the study, and in hopes that it would lead to some recommendations for a national policy and program in the field of adult and continuing education, Liveright attempted to determine what kinds of programs were being conducted by various agencies as well as by private institutions and organizations. He was
regularly in touch with a large number of professionals in the field in an effort to secure their ideas about adult education and the gaps and problems existing. He was also eager to secure the ideas and reactions from another group—"opinion-makers and creative thinkers"—who did not necessarily consider themselves adult educators but who were, however, concerned with continuing education for adults. For example, in a letter to Anna Rosenberg-Hoffman, he asked:

If we are to move toward any sound policy and one to develop important and imaginative programs in the future it is essential to get advice from persons like you as well as from those who devote their full-time to adult education . . .

Why is it that our thinkers and opinion-makers have not become more involved in continuing education and have not identified themselves more closely with the field? Is it that we in the field have not taken the initiative to call on you for help? (Liveright, personal communication, 1965)

Anna Rosenberg-Hoffman, a consultant to the federal government, had been Assistant Secretary of Defense appointed by President Truman in 1950 and a Regional Director in the War Manpower Commission appointed by Paul McNutt in Buffalo shortly after Liveright had left. Similarly, he inquired as to the opinions of others outside the traditional realm of adult and continuing education. For example: Eric Fromm; Margaret Mead; Peter Drucker; James Conant; Robert Oppenheimer; Ralph
Lowell; Martin Luther King; Louis Mumford; David Rockefeller; and others. Additionally, Liveright interviewed members of an Intra-Department Committee on Adult Education in the Office of Education, members of the Adult Education Branch of the Office of Education, the Commissioner of Education, and a list of adult educators including: Eugene Johnson; Cyril Houle; Benjamin Bloom; Herbert Thelan; Fred Harrington; John Gardener; Eli Ginzberg; Robert Blakely; and many others.

Liveright's 1968 A Study of Adult Education in the United States presents an overview of the field, considers the social and economic trends that were affecting adult education, examines the role of the federal government and specifically that of the Office of Education, what non-governmental agencies were doing in adult education, and finally makes a number of recommendations for changes in the future direction of adult and continuing education. The recommendations can be divided into four broad areas:

1. Mapping and defining the field: a need to define terms, i.e., what is meant by "adult" and "continuing education" and by the subsidiary terms; a need to set up some mechanisms for getting current information about participation, activities, experimental programs and research in the field; a need to move toward
the establishment of guidelines and objectives for a nation-wide program of continuing education consistent with the social and individual needs in society.

2. Professionalization: a need for assistance and support from the Office of Education in terms of grants and funds for additional research, for fellowships, for Research and Development Centers, and for nation-wide training and education programs for practitioners; however, Liveright suggested that the task of professionalization should grow out of the field itself.

3. Organization and development: a need for bringing together representatives of all adult education agencies and sponsors in a discourse more effective and with greater recognition.

4. Program innovation and experimentation: a need for the most imaginative persons in the field to meet, to work together for a period of time and develop programs, ideas, and formats in much the same manner as was being done by the Educational Facilities Laboratory and the Educational Services Institute.

Perhaps the most important and interesting among Liveright's findings and recommendations is best demonstrated by considering his conclusions summarized in a memorandum to CSLEA staff:

... I am convinced that, despite increasing funds
for adult education authorized by Congress and in spite of the recently authorized National Policy Council for Extension and Continuing Education, there still exists a great need for persons outside the Government to assume major leadership in planning for the future of the field. Before completing the study I was inclined to believe that the new legislation and inter-departmental provisions would obviate the need for such major private initiative and that the federal government was far ahead of the private sector in planning and innovation.

I was feeling strongly that although there is a great opportunity to develop sound and effective national programs of continuing education in the United States, such opportunity will not be realized unless some badly needed and dramatic action to plan for and mobilize existing and developing adult education resources is taken outside of the government.

... On the other hand we have a great variety of existing and potential activities in continuing education and on the other we have enormous social and personal needs for a comprehensive program but nowhere are we experimenting with a truly comprehensive and rounded program of the kind that is required.

... There now exists no agency or organization either at the national or at the local level which is in a position to weld together the existing programs and facilities in a truly comprehensive program of community continuing education—and there is no such agency or organization provided for either in new federal legislation nor in current private foundation grants ...

... Such imaginative national planning and local demonstration is not likely to take place unless a potent, well-financed, prestigious and imaginative organization is established and is given both public and private sanction to act as a catalyst in the field. (Liveright, personal communication, 1967)

Nowhere, neither in government nor outside it, was there a central location for securing information
concerning available resources in the field of adult and continuing education; there was no focal point to develop policy planning and research and development. Nowhere was there an over-all synthesizing, coordinating, and guiding agency enlisting the confidence and energy of all concerned that had an overview of the whole field with its sights set high and guided by a direction and philosophy with deep insight, practical idealism and motivated by the interest and dedication of the entire community. In other words, Liveright was calling for greater unity within the ranks of education; it was time to stop wrangling over jurisdictions and definitions.

To accomplish such comprehensive problem-solving, Liveright was suggesting the formation of a national center for experimentation, a center to work with the variety of developing activities in the field of public and private education, to develop a dialogue and discussion about crucial issues and dilemmas in an attempt to define the basic needs and directions in the field, to experiment with new technologies and mass media. Liveright was calling for new institutional forms — specifically an institutional form which would provide a central information storage and retrieval center, serve as a focus for all adult and continuing education in a community, act as a central counseling and referral
center which would help to fashion and build programming for lifelong learning, and be a nerve-center of liberal learning in the inner-city and in suburban areas. It was a call for organizational relationships to effectuate a comprehensive program of integrated and relevant learning. He called for an organized leadership to assume responsibility for planting revolutionary seeds to influence national policy, legislation, programming, and implementation of existing policy and legislation to ensure the achievement of broad goals. Liveright's thinking, undoubtedly inspired by extension prototypes and probably spurred on by Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965, envisioned higher adult education, or at least his new institutional form, being pushed more into utilizing total resources to solve new urban and metropolitan problems. In this connection the adult and continuing education branches of higher education would provide a kind of bridge between the colleges and universities and the community whereby it would be possible to bring to bear research skills and resources on the problems and concerns faced by modern communities. Relevant programming would be the result of higher education interpreting to adults the new developments around issues and dilemmas stemming from research findings.
So it seems that Liveright's fourth area of concern as detailed at the Delbert Clark Award speech is in many ways a direct outgrowth of his Study of Adult Education in the United States. At the award ceremony, he spoke of

... the lack of appropriate institutions in our society which are concerned with adult and continuing education as top-priority and central task. With very few exceptions adult education is a secondary or highly peripheral concern of those institutions which now offer such programs.

... As a result, an adult in any community who wants to find out what opportunities exist for his continuing education has no central place to go for information and is lucky if he can somehow stumble across those few continuing education programs which happen to be available in his particular city or town. (December, 1968, p. 297)

Another seemingly natural and direct outgrowth of Liveright's Study was a proposal made to the Office of Education entitled "Study of New Institutional Arrangements and Organizational Patterns for Continuing Education." The purpose of this project, according to Liveright (1967), was based on the findings of his in-house study for the U.S. Office of Education that revealed

... the fact that present programs of adult education are lop-sided both with respect to participation (primarily middle-class) and to the kinds of programs available (with great lack of concentration on programs of civic and social competence). The study also shows that although there are vast numbers of programs and considerable sums of money available, nowhere are there programs
and funds being effectively marshalled or utilized in a planned or comprehensive manner.

He added that:

Based on these findings we are convinced that there is a need for some new kinds of institutional arrangements at both the national and local level to overcome the present fragmentation, to make maximum use of new educational technology, to stimulate more creative and imaginative experimentation and to make plans to deal with the present lop-sidedness of the field. More specifically we believe that there is a need to develop some kind of national planning, information and resources institute or laboratory as well as new kinds of organizations or institutional arrangements at the local level which will mobilize existing resources and develop new programs required to offer comprehensive programs of continuing education to adults in all walks of life.

The need for the study was timely; a number of significant factors seem to have contributed to the Office of Education approving Liveright's investigation of new institutional forms. First, and perhaps most interesting, is the fact that during the 1960's adult and continuing education had recruited a new supporter; on a number of occasions President Johnson had called for a new kind of urban extension program which could provide to metropolitan areas that which agricultural extension service had been providing in rural areas for the last century. As already mentioned, the approval of Title I of the Higher Education Act, for the first time, was making money available for continuing education beyond the traditional vocational and agricultural extension
activities. Furthermore, awareness of the need for developing new institutional arrangements was clearly evidenced by Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare John W. Gardner commented that "Our institutional arrangements for lifelong education are ridiculously inadequate" (1966). Although a few institutions were truly dedicated to the task of community service and continuing education--namely the Land Grant Colleges and Universities--as had been clearly indicated by Liveright, almost no institution of higher education looked upon continuing education as a major, top-priority, compelling responsibility.

Following months of delays and consideration the Office of Education approved the new institutional forms project. Unfortunately, due to Liveright's illness in the fall of 1968, he was forced to withdraw from the study. Under the direction of Alexander Charters, then Vice President for Continuing Education at Syracuse University, Robert J. Blakely assumed the major role of investigator on the project in 1969 and was assisted by a number of people--most notable among whom was Ivan Lappin. Inspired by Liveright, the real question remained: whether adult education would rely on "old nostrums, out-dated methods and approaches, tired institutional arrangements and mere rearrangements of
out-worn programs," (April, 1966) or provide an innovative future for lifelong learning.

The product of Blakely and Lappin's investigation, *Knowledge is Power to Control Power* was dedicated to the memory of A. A. Liveright in October, 1969. "We at Syracuse University cherish the memory of Dr. Liveright, whose intense interest in new institutional arrangements and organizational patterns for continuing education stimulated the investigation" (p. v).

As clearly outlined by Whipple (1967), Liveright directed CSLEA during a period when it was most involved with colleges and universities, programatic innovation and an attempt to infuse the field of adult and continuing education with the concepts and philosophy of liberal education. But Liveright was forced to curtail activities and programming to seek new sources of funding; thus he spent much of his time seeking support and eventually accepting additional responsibilities and special commissions, e.g., his *Study of Adult Education in the United States*.

Additionally, in 1960, Liveright and a number of other prominent adult educators from around the world met and organized the International Congress of University Adult Education; the purpose was to unite higher adult educators from all over the world on issues in continuing
education. The Congress sponsored several international meetings and conferences, encouraged the comparative study of international adult education, and published a newsletter and *The International Congress of University Adult Education Journal*. Liveright served on the ICUAE Executive Committee as Secretary until his death.

Budget restrictions finally forced the Center to affiliate with Boston University; with the affiliation came additional and new responsibilities for Liveright, including university teaching. For about one and one-half years he taught graduate courses in planning and administration of higher adult education at Boston University. Upon the termination of CSLEA, Liveright accepted the position of Professor of Adult Education at Syracuse University but shortly thereafter was forced to discontinue due to illness.

**Conclusion**

Liveright's later years were spent, to a large extent, in exploratory activities; these involved the development of and experimentation with new ideas in liberal education for adults. In attempting to formulate a sharper definition of the problems of higher adult education, and in establishing the necessary relationships with the institutions, agencies, and
individuals in the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, he carried out a missionary-like effort to tap the potential of the field.

Liveright was concerned with an aspect of adult and continuing education that was of greatest importance to him. His fear was that the potential energy of adult educators would prove ineffective unless it were focused on a common sense of direction. Until adult educators committed themselves to addressing the inadequacies of higher adult education the picture of the field would remain "lop-sided." His need to build a common direction and purpose presented the most profound challenge of his lifetime. Unfortunately, he was eventually forced to conclude that one of the greatest roadblocks to the realization of his goal was an apathy and lack of understanding among those who might most benefit.

At a time when, throughout the entire educational system, educators were giving more attention to individual needs and to the development of individual abilities and talents, Liveright was attempting also to make individuals, and adult and continuing education, more compellingly aware of their responsibilities to society. A brief example serves to illustrate his point: no matter how stimulating the atmosphere of the education for the specialist, adult educators constantly run the
risk of inhibiting an adult from reaching his full, and often undiscovered, potential. According to Liveright, it was the responsibility of all adult education to offset any preoccupation with specialization; it was adult education's responsibility to provide the liberating experiences of education.

It was not his method to regularly grapple with harsh realities when initiating his ideas. While he did, for example, stimulate innovation in program design, his contribution appears to have been that of promotion and consultation where needed. Rarely did he deal with the problem of how to secure and develop a stronger faculty in programs hampered by limited staffing and funding; and only on occasion did he contend with aspects of generating revenue in continuing education. It was as if he thought it premature to attempt to solve the specifics of curricula or organization, the questions of admissions or the levels of instruction—items that are often the concern of adult education administration and faculty—without first establishing the ideal these would reflect. Instead, the answers to such questions would naturally follow the development of an imaginative and bold plan.

He was a visionary of liberal education for adults. Because of his perception of social issues and his
understanding of adult education philosophy, theory, and practice, he questioned the status quo. His idealistic approach was occasionally balanced with a practical style in proportions that advanced his cause. His cause was to restore to the adult some of the qualities, qualities of curiosity, imagination, and self-confidence, that he or she had possessed as a child but had lost in the process of schooling. His role in this cause was to attempt to clear away any obstacles that were preventing adult and continuing educators from contributing to the solutions of many of the urgent problems facing twentieth century Americans, the kinds of problems that demanded educated adults and could not be met by relying on the education of youth.

Predicated on the thesis that people have an inherent "thirst" for knowledge and that higher adult education is the source for social change and liberation, and convinced of the need for a missionary enterprise, Liveright came to be something of a catalyst to the status quo. As a result of his preoccupation with lifelong learning, and specifically with a liberating education for adults, and because of his ongoing relationships with adult educators, associations of higher education, and "thinkers" outside the field, Liveright brought a sense of responsibility with his
idealism, a viable philosophy of liberal education which might motivate adult educators to practice idealism. Idealism to Liveright was a useless abstraction if he did not seize every opportunity to practice and speak it.

Throughout Liveright's later years and in the twenty years since his death, many adult educators have made valiant beginnings and some have made substantial achievements in establishing a continuity of learning. While Liveright did not singularly change the fundamental perceptions of the American educational process (after all, only isolated instances of "progress" in the direction of Liveright's ideal can be identified in the United States), this does not diminish the truth in his unfulfilled hope; to point thus to an unfinished task does not in any way minimize the significance of a great new fact of our times: genuine education is a continuing process.

There is no doubt that adult education, with or without Liveright, has carried forth a lifelong learning "attitude" and yet, when we consider Liveright's later years in regards to modern adult education, he must be identified as an early pioneer, and a true descendant of earlier pioneers--the Lindemans, the Cartwrights, the Houles. The persistence of his idealism has helped make possible the success that today's adult educator has had
in realizing that education is a lifelong, liberating pursuit; Liveright has helped fellow educators look ahead and anticipate the ways in which higher education can prepare itself for future trials.

As a liberal adult educator, Liveright helped clarify, sharpen, and update the field's own understanding of the lifelong learning mandate for higher continuing education. It was his imperative to communicate a missionary mandate by precept and example, by preparing new leaders with the principles and practice of an "emerging profession." An awareness for the liberal education of adults was enhanced.

On the other hand, who can say precisely how far adult educators have come as a result of Liveright's exciting idealism? Was, as a result of Liveright's liberal orientation, higher adult education somewhat balanced, or as measured against actual accomplishments and shortcomings did the picture remain, as drawn by Liveright, "lop-sided"? He himself conceded a number of times that the kind of overall liberal education programming he proposed would not happen overnight. Nevertheless, in setting forth his personal Utopia, he hoped to stimulate many other people to dream and possibly build toward their own. He was a man motivated intelligently by idealism, by the idealistic tenet:
knowledge is better than ignorance, and still better if liberating.

The argument might be suggested that A. A. Liveright never changed. Simply put, his conviction remained throughout his life, that individuals, thus society, is better, only if all people have the opportunity to continue learning. It was a conviction to find meaning, purpose, and direction in human potential that marked the very nature of this American adult educator.

Despite any present-day emphasis on liberal education for adults, and despite Liveright's own enthusiasm for liberal education, his conclusion still seems particularly relevant:

... the challenge still lies ahead of us. A beginning has been made. Those who were convinced of the importance of liberal education for adults have probably become even more convinced and they realize that they have allies in their cause. Some who were not convinced before have become exponents of liberal education, and they will join the band of the missionaries. A number still remain to be convinced. It is our hope that the increasing success of the old and new converts in meeting the challenge of liberal adult education will persuade the unconvinced in the future, that liberal education presents not only a difficult challenge, but also a satisfying and stimulating activity which will bring them increasing community acceptance and acclaim. ("The Challenge," nd)


Liveright, A. A. (1959, October 1). Liberal adult education for today and tomorrow. Paper presented
at the annual meeting of the Missouri Adult Education Association.


Bureau of Research.


White, T. J. (1968). Preface. In A. A. Liveright,
A study of adult education in the United States.
Boston: Center for the Study of Adult Education for Adults.
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PERSONAL AND FAMILY BACKGROUND

Alexander Albert "Sandy" Liveright was born on November 13, 1907 in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. He received his primary education at the Oak Lane Country Day School in Philadelphia, a small private progressive school. His secondary education was completed at Central High, a large public school in Philadelphia.

For two years, following high school graduation, he attended Haverford College, a private institution in Pennsylvania, and for two years thereafter studied English at the University of Wisconsin in Madison where he received his AB in 1929.

Upon graduation from the University of Wisconsin he entered the publishing field as a reader with his uncle Horace Brisbin Liveright's publishing company, Boni and Liveright. About the same time that he came to Boni and Liveright, Horace Liveright became especially interested in the theatre, producing a number of plays. A. A. Liveright soon became manager of two theatrical companies. (One company was a road show and the other, supposedly destined for Broadway, "died just outside of
Deciding that something more stable was necessary, he enrolled at Columbia to study guidance and counseling at the master's level, leaving without taking a degree. In 1956 he completed his PhD in adult education from the University of Chicago.

He married Dorothy June Moos, who would regularly travel with her husband on his professional trips throughout the United States and around the world. They had two children, Michael and Martha.

Dr. Liveright died on September 21, 1969.
INTERNATIONAL ADULT EDUCATION

In *A Study of Adult Education in the United States*, Liveright recommended:

Relevant experiences in other nations should be reviewed. Experiences in Israel in residential basic literacy education, Scandinavian experiences in meeting the educational needs of young adults, part-time college programs and correspondence, education experiences within the Soviet bloc—all may be relevant to adult education needs at home, particularly for the education of the disadvantaged. (1968, p. 125)

Perhaps one of Liveright's most significant contributions to this international end is best illustrated by his involvement in establishing the International Congress of University Adult Education; of course, one valuable benefit was that his participation provided the opportunity for foreign travel:

**December 27, 1961 - January 22, 1962, Africa**

Liveright was among ten North Americans invited to the University of Ghana to attend a Conference on African University Adult Education. For a report on the Conference itself, the reader is referred to:

Liveright, A.A. (1962). *Conference on university
Liveright moved on to Basutoland (via: Lagos, Kano, Johannesburg, and Blomfentein). Liveright's one week visit to Basutoland was summarized in a report to the Carnegie Corporation.

January 23-30, 1962, Paris

UNESCO and International Association of Universities meetings

Topics:

1. Relationship between ICUAE and UNESCO
2. African conference
3. Library and Clearinghouse Project
4. Assistance on journal and publications
5. Australian and Southeast Asia conference
6. Latin America conference
7. African Adult Education Institute
8. Exchange of practitioners and professors
9. World Conference, 1965


Meetings with Thomas Kelley of the Universities Council, Frank Jessup of the Extra-Mural Delegacy at Oxford, and others.
October 2-8, 1963, United Kingdom

Meetings with: W. Burmeister, University of London; E.M. Hutchinson, National Institute of Adult Education, London; Salter Davis, Her Majesty's Chief Inspector in Adult Education; Frank Jessup, University of Oxford; Sidney Raybould, University of Leeds; Ieuan Hughes, University of Hong Kong.

Topics:

1. US/UK Conference of University of Adult Educators
2. UK Extra-Mural Directors to US
3. US Fulbrights to UK
4. US/UK Study Commission on Part-time Degrees

October 8-15, 1963, Paris


December 1-18, 1964, Israel

Liveright, representing the United States National Commission for UNESCO and the only US representative among thirty other delegates from nations in Africa, Asia, the Near East, and Europe, attended the Second
International Seminar on Workers' and Adult Education in Jerusalem. He addressed the conference on the subject "Urban Community Development." His itinerary included a visit to the Mount Carmel International Training Center in Haifa and the Workers' College in Tel Aviv. For Liveright's report of the Seminar, the reader is referred to:


June, 1965, Denmark

The ICUAE held its First World Conference on University Adult Education in Krogerup. For an analysis and discussion of topics at the Conference, the reader is referred to:


February 13 - June 10, 1967

Far East and Pacific Study Tour

Sponsored by the Carnegie Corporation, Liveright visited, lectured, and studied liberal and extension education in various countries:

1. India - Delhi; Jaipur; Udaipur
2. Hong Kong
3. Nepal - Katmandu
4. Thailand - Bangkok

5. Singapore

6. Malaysia - Kuala Lumpur

7. Australia - Perth; Adelaide; Tasmania;
   Melbourne; Canberra; Sydney

8. New Zealand - Wellington; Auckland; Otago
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PUBLICATIONS: A CHRONOLOGICAL LISTING

In the beginning was censorship. Drama, 21, 5, 7-8, 18, 1931.

Censorship in the United States. Drama, 21, 7-8, 14, 1931.


Vocational guidance for Jewish groups. Youth Leader, November, 1939.

How to get a job and hold it. Chicago: B'nai B'rith, 1939.

How to write job letters. Chicago: B'nai B'rith, 1940.

The community and race relations. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 244, 106-116, 1946.


A long look at labor education: Part II. Adult

The place of a center-type agency in liberalizing adult education: A special report. Chicago: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1956.


"... that the individual maintain ..." The N.U.E.A. Spectator, 10-12, 1962.


Impact of the emerging city on higher adult education. Southern Regional Education Board, 43-46, 1964.


Special degree programs. ACE Educational Record, 419-426, 1964.


The uncommon college: The college of continuing education at Metropolis University. ED 018 697. 1966.


The concept of lifelong integrated learning "education permanente" and some implications for university adult education. Brookline, MA: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1968.


Liberal education - defined and illustrated. Convergence, 2, 4-7, 1969.
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ADDRESSES: A CHRONOLOGICAL LISTING


"New Directions in Liberal Adult Education." Conference at Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York; April 20, 1958.

"Liberal Education: Defined and Illustrated." Sectional Meeting, Association of University Evening Colleges, Louisville, Kentucky; November 17, 1958.

"Remarks to Graduates, University High School." Daughter's Commencement Address, Chicago; June 11, 1959.

"Continuing Adult Education: A Challenge to the Liberal Arts." Program of Commemoration, Wittenberg University, Springfield, Ohio; September 17, 1959.

"Extension Utopia: A Program of Higher Adult Education for the Late Twentieth Century." National University Extension Association Mid-West Workshop, Escanaba, Michigan; August, 1959.

"Liberal Adult Education - For Today and Tomorrow." Annual Meeting of the Missouri Adult Education Association; October 1, 1959.


"National Trends in Higher Adult Education." Meeting of the Visiting Committee, Cleveland College, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio; November 10, 1960.

"The First Commencement, or There are Still Frontiers in Oklahoma." First Convocation of Faculty and Students of the Bachelor of Liberal Studies, College of Continuing Education, University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma; March 18, 1961.

"University Adult Education - The Center of Experiment in Education." Annual Conference on Instruction of University College at Syracuse University at Sagamore Conference Center; May 19-21, 1961.

"The Role of the University in an Undirected Society." Canadian Association of Directors of Extension and Summer Sessions Meeting, Montreal, Canada; June 12, 1961.


"Report from the Center." Association of University Evening Colleges Convention, Cleveland, Ohio; November 6, 1961.


"Creativity in Programming." University of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii; March 26, 1962.

"New Directions in University Programming for Adults." Meeting of Visiting Specialists, University of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii; April 3, 1962.

"New Horizons for Liberal Adult Education." Omaha Tele-Lecture Conference, University of Omaha, Omaha, Nebraska; December, 1962.


"Modifications in Credit Systems of Other Universities." Syracuse University Faculty Seminars, Syracuse, New York; June, 1964.

"A University for Adults in a Learning Society." Boston Center for Adult Education, Boston; September 21, 1964.

"Role of the University in Continuing Education." Boston University Board of Trustees, Boston; October 16, 1964.


"Ivory Tower or Involvement: The Continuing Education Challenge to U.S. Universities." Woman's Association, Cleveland College, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio; May 15, 1965.


"Nature and Aim of Adult Education." March 24, 1966(?).


"Continuing Education in the Modern City." Metro Seminars, Boston; April 20, 1966.


"The Urban Condition: The Stakes of the University." The University and the Community: An Urban Affairs Conference Toward Improving Local Community Leadership, Howard University, Washington, D.C.; December 8, 1966.


"Some International Challenges to Educational Beliefs." The Hamilton Association Public Lectures, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario; January 27, 1968.

"Adult Education - For What?" Delbert Clark Award Dinner, West Georgia College, Carrollton, Georgia; May 2, 1968.

"Professional Interaction for Action." Connecticut Home Economics and Dietetic Associations Joint Spring Meeting, University of Connecticut, Storrs, Connecticut; May 4,
1968.

"The Challenge of Liberal Adult Education." nd.

"Focussing Public Attention on Adult Education." nd.

"Toward a Graduate Program in the Comparative Study of Adult Education..." nd.
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ARCHIVES AND MANUSCRIPTS OF CONTINUING EDUCATION
AT SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY

The Archives and Manuscripts of Continuing Education at Syracuse University are a record and collection of many contributions that distinguished adult and continuing educators and organizations in the field have made. The donors include:

1. Adult Education Association
2. Adult Education Research Conference
3. American Foundation for Continuing Education
4. Association of University Evening Colleges
5. Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults
6. Alexander N. Charters
7. Commission of the Professors of Adult Education
8. Fund for Adult Education
9. Galaxy Conference
10. Andrew Hendrickson
11. International Congress of University Adult Education
12. Joseph W. Jacques
13. Alexander A. Liveright
14. National Association of Public School Adult Educators
15. National University Extension Association
16. George A. Parkinson
17. Bernard W. Reed
18. Robert E. Sharer
19. Paul H. Sheats
20. Syracuse University Publications in Continuing Education
21. Clarence H. Thompson
22. Willard Thompson
24. Coolie Verner

The printed materials in the collection consist of publication files, writings, correspondence, records, reports, and speeches; recorded tapes are included. For a complete descriptive list of manuscript holdings, the reader is referred to:

The Kellogg Foundation has recently awarded Syracuse University a multi-million dollar grant to develop an information system that would allow scholars from throughout the United States and around the world to access, via computer, the archives and manuscripts collection.

The "Liveright Papers," for the most part, are from the period 1956-1969, although there are some clippings for 1934-1935, and some War Manpower Commission documents dated 1942 and 1943. Because of Liveright's prominence in the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, the "CSLEA Papers" contain a collection of his correspondence, writings, newspaper clippings, and speeches.
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