

## Paul Hanna and International Development Education

The years after World War II marked a change of venue more than a change of direction for Paul Hanna's career. His fundamental goals remained constant, whereas his theater of operations expanded. In the postwar era he became less involved in domestic education concerns and organizations and more involved in education for economic, social, and political development overseas. Hanna's approach to development education was far-reaching. It encompassed the development in students of habits and attitudes of democratic participation on a national and international basis, as well as the specific skills needed to create modern economies and social systems. Many reasons account for that expansion of his interests.

First, Hanna realized the potential for development education during and immediately after the war. Devising ways in which Stanford University could contribute to the war effort encouraged him to view education as an agent of the state. He recognized that study of the school's role in political, social, and economic development held great potential both in terms of its immediate application on

behalf of American foreign policy and, in the abstract, as a subject of scholarship.

Second, Hanna's experience in the *Building America* controversy prompted him to seek new ways to implement his ideas of democratic education, ways somewhat removed from the ideological litmus tests of the McCarthy era. Hanna's loyalties to democratic processes and institutions were never seriously attacked, but they were questioned. He deemed it unwise to answer his detractors, so he ignored them, but he must have bristled to know that his ideas were misunderstood. Moreover, he noted the real and grievous damage inflicted by similar attacks on national colleagues like George Counts, men whom he considered just as patriotic as himself (Hanna 1974, 72). He likely turned to overseas work as one means by which to avoid the minefield of domestic American politics.

Third, moving into international education studies logically extended Hanna's interest in democratic education and supported his notion of the expanding communities model for a scope and sequence in social studies. In a sense, his concentric circles had to encompass "international communities of men" in order to be comprehensive. Just as the expanding communities model grew out of Hanna's concern to prepare students for life in a democratic society, so his work in international development education clearly aimed to spread American-style democracy across the globe. Hanna anticipated that the postwar world would be one in which the United States would play a greater role in international leadership than ever before.

Hanna was also a proponent of constitutional democracy. His summary of decades of study in forces of political and social change was that, "Everybody knows what the goals are. The goals are to improve the democratic open pluralistic society, and to do it by constitutional or accepted methods" (ibid.).

## BEGINNINGS

Hanna's interest in the world beyond the United States dates at least to his days at Hamline University. Hamline had a number of international students in residence, and Hanna befriended Dison Po, a Chinese student. Po's English diction was poor, and Jean Shuman, Hanna's future wife, tutored him. The three became fast friends, and the Hannas later visited Po when he was governor of Taiwan (Hanna 1974). Hanna recalled no particular experiences at Teachers College that sparked his interest in international affairs, but living in cosmopolitan New York City certainly stimulated his interest in the larger world.

The integration of Paul Hanna's interest in education with his interest in the wider world came at the beginning of World War II. At a dinner party in 1940, Robert G. Caldwell first recruited him to serve as an observer for the Coordinator for Inter-American Affairs (CIAA). The coordinator's office technically was part of the Council on National Defense, but because of the inroads that the Axis nations had made in Central and South America, President Roosevelt brought the agency under his own direct control. As its head, he appointed an ambitious young New Yorker, Nelson Rockefeller. One of Rockefeller's first acts was to dispatch fact-finding missions, including Hanna's, to South America in 1940–1941 (Reich 1996, 186).

Hanna took a sabbatical leave from Stanford for the 1940–1941 school term and planned a trip to locations in Central and South America. In early October, Hanna, his wife Jean, and their children, John and Emily, set out for the highlands of Bolivia. They traveled to coastal Peru and coastal and central Ecuador, visiting small villages and archaeological sites. Their three-month journey ended with stops in Panama and Guatemala. Hanna followed this trip

with a three-week visit to Guatemala in late 1941 and early 1942 (John Hanna 1998).

Hanna's trips to Central and South America resulted in a report to the educational section of the Office of the Coordinator for Inter-American Affairs. In it, Hanna revealed a sensitivity to the ravages of European colonialism affecting those nations he had visited. He remarked about the tremendous natural resources of the region and the innate intelligence of the people, but pointed to the underutilization of both. He found that the exploitation of natural resources was largely in the hands of foreign firms: "Wherever the natural resources are being developed, one is likely to find foreign capital and management in control. The people of these Republics themselves are generally not aware that the resources exist, nor would they be able to develop them if they had definite knowledge of their worth" (Hanna 1942?, 2).

Hanna believed that education was the key to economic development in the region. Using Peru as his example, he listed significant problems, pointing out that only a small portion of the population received a formal education. Even that small group was "exposed to a curriculum that would not be considered by modern educators to contain even the minimum essentials needed by these people individually or as a social group. The curriculum for the most part is patterned after European models of the nineteenth century." He decried the lack of locally produced curriculum materials, observing that "The textbooks generally are direct translations from German, Spanish, French and English texts . . ." (ibid., 3). They seldom mentioned problems of local or national concern or significance.

Hanna noted little tradition of professional teaching or scholarship in those countries. He observed, "The teachers are poorly trained, and education as a profession hardly exists. The teachers, particularly on the secondary and collegiate levels, earn their living in some other trade or profession and teach merely as an avocation"

(*ibid.*). Likewise, native scholars contributed little in areas of research. Hanna noted, “Wherever I went I inquired concerning the status of research. I found little of it. Where I did find it, research was usually being conducted, or at least directed, by research workers from foreign countries” (*ibid.*). From these observations, Hanna concluded that progress in the region would have to await “the coming of universal education and native scientific workers” (*ibid.*, 4).

Hanna then focused on how the United States could assist the republics of Central and South America in their development. He suggested a two-pronged approach. First, the United States must win the sympathies of the intelligentsia in the target nations. Here, Hanna displayed an understanding of the social structure of Latin American nations. He advocated working with these people instead of the economic and social elites, because “they are far more active in public affairs than in the United States, and their influence spreads through these countries like the mycelium of a mushroom; the journalists, engineers, medicos, poets, writers, et cetera, at least in much of the continent, touch the people far more generally than in the United States” (Hanna 1942?, 5).

Moreover, the educational opportunities in the United States already appealed to South American intellectuals. Hanna noted that “many of the most learned groups consistently look to the United States for the most advanced and best thought” (*ibid.*). He warned that while the United States had done little to cultivate these relationships, “the totalitarian European nations have been importing Latin Americans to study in their universities, student pilots to learn flying and fighting in their air corps, and so forth” (*ibid.*, 5–6).

The second prong of Hanna’s approach was to extend free public education to the masses. From the masses, he argued, “we may expect the great civil, educational, social, scientific and artistic leaders to emerge” (*ibid.*, 6). He went on to argue that education

for democratic citizenship must be an indispensable part of national curriculum goals.

Hanna's report further outlined a number of projects to help realize U.S. goals in the region. He thought that the United States should assist the Latin American republics in matters of teacher education, curriculum development, organization of teachers' associations, and development of curriculum materials and professional education libraries (Hanna 1942?, 10–23). Much of this work could be financed by private foundations in the United States. He also proposed exchange programs for students, scholars, artists, and athletic teams to promote mutual understanding (*ibid.*, 32). He recommended that the United States aid the libraries of these nations, and even provide literature for them, including the *one hundred best books*, and special editions of *Building America* (*ibid.*, 44–46). He concluded by recommending that the United States provide social and economic planning assistance in the region (*ibid.*, 50).

None of Hanna's recommendations were new ideas, and some programs had already been launched to accomplish them. Still, by adding his support to them, Hanna helped shift the emphasis of U.S. programs in Latin America toward education. His report provided the CIAA with an informed analysis by which to consider how education might further the long-range goals of American foreign policy in the region. The missions to Latin America provided Hanna with his first opportunity to study the effects of education on the development of political ideologies and economic attitudes in specific settings outside the United States. On the basis of that work, Hanna consulted with the U.S. military in 1947 on the educational aspects of building a new Central American canal through Nicaragua.

## HANNA AND POSTWAR GERMANY

In the years immediately following the war, Paul Hanna had an opportunity to export American educational ideals to Germany. The Supreme Headquarters of the Allied Expeditionary Force (SHAEF) faced the monumental task of reconstruction in Germany. One of the most daunting challenges was the development of a school system freed from Nazi influences. SHAEF's Education and Religious Affairs (ERA) section was assigned this task (Tent 1982, 16). ERA began by eliminating teachers and school officials with known Nazi sympathies from German schools, and by purging textbooks of the same bias (*ibid.*, 52). Officials hoped that enough books from the pre-Nazi Weimar era might be located to serve the schools on an emergency basis. These books were scarce, and those that were available proved to be too nationalistic and bellicose for the American school reformers' purposes. Nonetheless, emergency copies were published by SHAEF with a disclaimer concerning their content (*ibid.*, 111).

With that immediate need addressed, the War Department turned to a more deliberative study of the educational issues involved in the rehabilitation of Germany. The result was the first U.S. Education Mission to Germany, composed of education scholars and officials, religious educators, and a Textile Workers' Union official (*ibid.*, 115). The team, led by George Zook of the American Council on Education, spent more than a month in the summer of 1946 studying the state of German education in the U.S. zone of occupation. The result, sometimes called the Zook Report, was a thoughtful presentation of what ought to be done in German schools and society to inculcate the habits of democratic living. It eloquently described the need to teach democracy and to teach democratically:

The school emerges as the common center of mutuality, where ideally all children meet as fellow-children before any have been

narrowed by class or creedal bias. But even to approach this ideal we must have not merely the essentially negative safeguards of creed, race, and class toleration, but have also exemplified in the school the positive *method* of living which a democratic citizenship enshrines and climaxes. The goal of democracy is the democratic man (*Report of the U.S. Education Mission to Germany* 1946, 14).

A well-marked copy of the 1946 *Report of the U.S. Education Mission to Germany* in the Hanna Collection reveals that Hanna closely studied the work of those pioneers in the study of German reeducation. Many passages sound like Hanna's own writing from the 1920s and 1930s. The conclusion to one section entitled "The Development of Democracy" describes the school's pivotal role in preparing democratic citizens:

This is the way in which democracy as a form of government finds its spirit through a way of life. The school is central to this enterprise. Its influence can slowly create a family in which mutuality rather than dominance help the child to equanimity as the inner fruit of formal equality . . . the school can fill the hand that feeds it, until sound minds in a sound society may yet justify the negative pains of purification and fulfill the positive faith America had and has in the potencies of democratization (*Report*, 16).

In the margin beside these words, Hanna wrote "excellent."

On the heels of the first education mission, the Education and Religious Affairs section organized tours of the U.S. Zone by visiting experts. Hanna was one of these U.S. visitors. He served on a team of educational leaders in Germany to advise the Office of Military Government-U.S. (OMGUS) on educational matters (Klous 1946). Among the matters on which the War Department sought Hanna's advice were "(1) the training of teachers for teachers' colleges and teacher education work; (2) the general curriculum pattern for practice teaching in the broadest sense; (3) the content of such courses as child psychology; and (4) principles of education, social studies, and comparative education" (*ibid.*).

Visitors typically attended orientation sessions in Washington, D.C., then flew to Berlin for more extensive briefings before taking up their field assignments (Tent 1982, 261). A souvenir menu from the Allied Control Authority dining salon revealed that Paul and Jean Hanna were in Berlin by March 22, 1947. They were in the largest group of the thirty-five American educational experts brought to the U.S. Zone that year, and their presence was not entirely appreciated. Some on the OMGUS staff were leery of visitors with little expertise in European education and no knowledge of the German language posing as specialists on the German school situation. Walter Bergman, the ERA chief in Bavaria, was a particularly outspoken critic. He complained that they stayed only a short while, taxed ERA resources, and attempted to “transplant the whole American scheme of education to Germany” (Bergman 1947). He reported that “A few of the experts, who had never traveled in Germany or seen German schools, seemed more interested in gathering information and experience than in trying to be of immediate service in Germany” (ibid.).

Bergman singled out Hanna as an example of his problems with the experts. He claimed that “Dr. Hanna, though a very able and well-known man, did almost nothing for Bavaria. He did not understand German nor the German educational system. His plan was considered to be a stereotyped ‘scope and sequence’ plan that did not face realistically the present German situation” (ibid.).

If the OMGUS staff did not find Hanna’s input useful, others did. Once back in the United States, he wholeheartedly supported the reeducation work in Germany. In a report on his visit, he wrote,

My observations in Germany lead me with the irristible [sic] logic to accept the burden of putting our efforts resolutely behind the United States Office of Military Government and our State Department. The task will require money, materials, and personnel. And above all, it will require persistance [sic] to stay at so arduous a task. But persist we must, until we can see the fruits of our labor

in free men living under governments deriving their power from the voluntary consent of the governed. Persist we must until we can see institutions, firmly rooted, that guarantee the Bill of Human Rights to all. To do less, will bring upon us World War III (Hanna 1947b).

Hanna did not support the efforts at educational reconstruction in the occupied countries with stirring words alone. He attended the Second National Conference on the Occupied Countries in 1950 as Stanford University's representative. That conference was a joint effort of the American Council on Education, the State Department, and the U.S. Army to evaluate the progress and prospects of education in the former Axis nations. More significantly, Hanna told students in later years that he worked on a team to evaluate both the framework and the ideology of German textbooks in the postwar period, and that he "spent considerable time in 1945, '46, and '47 in Germany" (Foster 1998b). Although scant evidence exists of any extensive work by Hanna on textbooks for the reeducation effort, social science instruction in postwar Germany and Japan alike reflected many of Hanna's ideas. The postwar German schools taught recent history and the social sciences, but also analyses of contemporary society, including classroom discussions of controversial subjects (Hayse 1997). Hanna advocated a similar approach through the *Building America* series.

Likewise, postwar education reforms in Japan reflected Hanna's influence, even if indirectly. In 1949, the Japanese Ministry of Education and Culture introduced new courses of study as part of a national education reform in Japan. Ronald Stone Anderson reported that "Probably the most controversial break with the past curriculum was the elimination of the separate courses in morals, geography, and history, and their replacement by an integrated course called social studies . . . It was to educate for effective citizenship" (Anderson 1959, 102). Although Hanna did not invent the concept of integrated social studies, by 1949 he was among its

primary advocates, and his textbooks spread integrated studies far and wide.

The influence of Hanna's social studies textbooks was more clearly seen in the curriculum model devised to present social studies in the occupied countries. Elementary school teachers in Japan were to present ". . . units built around the immediate environment of the child—home, school, and community. At the lower secondary level the area of study was expanded to include the life of the Nation and foreign countries. Here the course—general social studies—was to utilize the problem approach and the problems were to be based on studies of the needs of young people in Japan" (ibid.). The social problems approach within an expanding communities framework was pure Hanna.

Paul Hanna was not one of the major players in the rehabilitation of the German or Japanese school systems in the postwar era. Nonetheless, his pervasive influence in curriculum development in the United States influenced those who did take a direct, long-term role in rebuilding the schools of the former Axis countries. In fact, the pacifism and internationalism that have developed in the Japanese and German people in the postwar era are a fulfillment of what Hanna hoped his curriculum designs might accomplish in the United States.

#### HANNA AND THE PHILIPPINES

Hanna's work in international development education took on a much broader scope in the Philippines. That island nation became the focus of some of his most intensive and sustained efforts, and he worked there off and on for twenty years. He began with an appointment in late 1948 as an elementary education and teacher education specialist with the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization's (UNESCO) educational mission to the Philippines.

The government of the Philippines had requested UNESCO's help in surveying elementary, secondary, and adult education. The resulting mission became the "first of the educational missions which UNESCO is undertaking" (Bodet 1948). The UNESCO consultants' reports were to help the Congress of the Philippines in drafting a new, comprehensive education law for the nation.

Hanna spent much of the spring of 1949 in the Philippines working on the project. The four-member UNESCO team met in Manila on Valentine's Day to plan its work, then spent the next three and a half months meeting with educators and laymen throughout the country, visiting schools and colleges, and gathering information. The team visited nearly two hundred grade schools and more than sixty normal schools and colleges in twenty-seven of the fifty Philippine provinces. Each member of the team was responsible for a specific portion of the survey, and they worked with officials from the government of the Philippines to gather data. At the end of the mission, the team flew to Paris to write its report at the UNESCO House there. Paul and Jean Hanna took advantage of this move to visit Hong Kong, Canton, Bangkok, Calcutta, Delhi, Jaipur, Brussels, and London. The team worked in Paris for two months and issued its final report on July 28 (*Report of the Mission to the Philippines* 1950, 7–8).

The report decried the impact of colonialism on the Philippine education system. It claimed that during Spanish colonial rule, the schools were largely private institutions with access limited to the social elite. Even then, their primary educational emphasis was religious instruction and the instructional language was, of course, Spanish. United States rule brought a change in focus toward political education, with the aim of preparing Filipinos for democratic citizenship. The instructional language was English. The Japanese invasion meant yet another shift in focus—toward integrating Filipinos into Japan's East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere—with Japanese as the language of instruction. Mission members found that "each

of the governing countries used education as an instrument for the development of its own ideals and culture” (*Report* 1950, 14). The ever-changing goals of schooling and the frequently changing instructional languages took their toll on the Filipinos. The mission found that literacy in the provinces ranged from nineteen to eighty-one percent, with a national average of only fifty percent (*ibid.*, 17).

The report cited deficiencies in school facilities and funding, in teacher education programs, and in the availability of curriculum materials. It made recommendations to correct those deficiencies. Among the recommendations, mission members called for a broader curriculum. Many Philippine schools, especially the private schools, offered only an academic curriculum. Although those academically oriented institutions were a small part of the elementary education system, fully half of all secondary students attended private schools in 1947 (*ibid.*, 18). The report conceded that the traditional academic subjects were important, but cited the “need for instilling in the pupils greater appreciation of the best national traditions and ideals, for imbuing them with the basic understanding necessary for the conservation and development of the country’s resources, for developing the special abilities of each child, and for preparing them [sic] to participate more effectively in group and community living in the modern world” (*ibid.*, 18).

To effect this broader curriculum, Hanna—the elementary education consultant on the team—recommended reorganizing the elementary school curriculum around sequentially unifying topics. His model was familiar. He suggested that students in grade one study Home and Family Life; grade two, Living in Our Schools; grade three, Living in Our Town and Province; grade four, Philippines history; and grade five, the island nation’s resources. Grade six was to study The Philippines in the Community of the Eastern Hemisphere; and grade seven, The Philippines in the Community of the Western Hemisphere and in the Emerging World Community.

Apparently, Hanna believed that his expanding communities model was applicable universally.

Hanna also influenced the report's recommendation that community schools be developed further. He envisioned students in such schools becoming "more useful members of society through continuous participation in the study of the needs of the community" (ibid., 36). Working cooperatively, students and community members would identify, study, and work to address the needs of their localities. The community schools could also serve as "a significant instrument through which other community agencies may co-ordinate their efforts to attack the main problems of the community" (ibid.). The schools could serve as community centers for social and cultural functions. Hanna envisioned the school as "the center of the spontaneous and joyous life of the people" (ibid., 37). Hanna believed this type of school was a most valuable instrument of education. Through working together on real-life projects that materially affected their lives, the children and adults in the community mastered skills and subjects more quickly and understood them more deeply than through other pedagogical methods. They learned the applicability of academic information, as well as the importance of active and effective participation in their communities. Hanna hoped that community schools in the Philippines would "act as one of the agencies through which the nation can co-ordinate the human energy necessary to satisfy the material and spiritual needs of the people" (ibid., 38).

Many of the report's recommendations were incorporated in a 1951 report of the Joint Congressional Committee on Education to the Congress of the Philippines. Of special interest was a section of the report entitled, "A School for the Community" (*Improving the Philippine Educational System* 1951, 89–95). The section repeated a number of Hanna's tenets for the community school, listed examples of community-centered activities in which schools might engage, and concluded with several legislative proposals. One called

for the reorganization of the school schedule to provide more student time for community service activities (*ibid.*, 92). Another would delegate to the schools “the responsibility for leadership in community improvement, involving literacy, worthwhile recreation, home beautification, community sanitation, and increased agricultural and industrial production, not only as an end in itself but also as a means for implementing more concretely instruction in the classroom . . .” (*ibid.*, 94).

The UNESCO mission provided Hanna with the opportunity to apply his ideas of curriculum organization and citizenship education on a national scale. In addition, the experience he gained, the contacts he made, and the understanding he gleaned of international education consulting and international contracts prepared him well for future work in the Philippines and elsewhere.

Hanna’s next work in the Philippines began in 1952, when he joined the Special Technical and Economic Mission to the Philippines sponsored by the Mutual Security Agency (MSA). He took a one-year leave of absence from Stanford to serve as the mission’s director of education, a post he filled from March 1952 to June 1953. The educational component of the mission was to “be helpful to the Government and people of this Republic in developing the educational institutions and methods essential to achieve the national goals of economic and social development” (Hanna 1953, 1). Hanna targeted three aspects of Philippine education for reform: vocational education, elementary education, and higher education. His goals included improving basic vocational skills, raising the literacy rate, and developing the technical fields of study in the universities. He also intended to develop a “national curriculum-making laboratory in which modern teaching guides and pupil instructional materials will be created” (*ibid.*, 2). That laboratory was a precursor to his proposal of a national curriculum commission in America.

One thrust in Philippine education at the time was the devel-

opment of curriculum to combat communist ideologies. That effort was certainly a goal of MSA's involvement, and that fact was not lost on Paul Hanna. In a letter to Hanna, J. Russell Andrus, the acting education advisor to MSA, wrote, "May I add a personal word to say how very happy I am that you have expressed a willingness to accept this post and to play an important part in our battle for men's minds in Southeast Asia" (Andrus 1952).

Others shared those goals. For example, Juan V. Borra, a Philippine congressman, wrote in a 1951 report on education,

In the Philippines there are some agitators who exploit the ignorance of the masses and sow seeds of communism and unrest. Democracy cannot wait to be challenged on the battlefield by communism. Democracy must win the hearts and minds of men. No investment can be used to [better] advantage than the schools . . . a new program of education should be formulated to teach democracy as a way of life (*Improving* 1951, 6).

In a speech to the College of Education at the University of the Philippines, Hanna cited U.S. President Harry S. Truman's claim that "If communism is to be combated successfully in our country, our democratic regime must offer better opportunities—educational, social, and economic—for all our citizens" (Hanna 1952a, 13). Surely such an altruistic goal could be transplanted to Southeast Asia.

Hanna's philosophy of democratic education seems to have hardened in response to the cold war environment and his own growing conservatism. On the other hand, perhaps it was suited all along to serve political ends, and that fact simply was emphasized during the era of fear and intolerance. His views on the purposes of social studies education were instructive:

My work in the social studies, with the elementary schools, has been of the same strand—that is, I would much rather help youngsters look at all the alternatives, values, institutions, et cetera and come to their own conclusions on the evidence or on the ability to persuade better institutions and values, rather than to go out and

lead a revolution, lead a march, or what not. That is, it is the evolutionary concept, not the revolutionary [emphasis his] concept in which I believe (Hanna 1974).

Hanna's thrust was not simply citizenship education or the social sciences, but vocational education with the aim of economic, social, and political development. In an April address to the Third Biennial Conference of the Philippines Association of Christian Schools and Colleges, he declared that, "The Schools and colleges must foster a sound program in industrial arts and economic education. . . . Every school and college needs to lead every boy and girl through a variety of useful work experiences calculated to teach them the dignity of labor, the nature of materials and processes, and the joy of accomplishment in creating useful goods and services" (Hanna 1952a, 12–13).

The view that Filipino workers were "indolent and in need of heavy doses of vocational and character education" was common among American colonial and business leaders from the earliest days of American occupation (Foley 1984, 35). Early solutions to that perceived problem were pure industrial/vocational education programs. In light of the dominance of communism in the two largest nations in Asia and its appeal among factions in the Philippines, Hanna took a more refined approach. Perpetuating a large laboring class ruled by a small elite class encouraged the type of class resentment that Marxism–Leninism exploited. Hanna believed that simple skills training contributed to that class division, and his version of vocational education was more far-reaching than training in basic agricultural or industrial skills alone. He wanted to create a large middle class, educating the elite and the common people alike in the value of labor (Hanna 1952a, 12). Fortunately, the educational aspirations of Filipino parents for their children also went beyond training designed merely to make them better day laborers or tenant farmers.

To press his point, Hanna asked, "How can an architect possibly

design an efficient factory building unless he has actually worked with his hands at machines? To know efficient arrangement of the flow of materials from bench to machine to assembly line is to have felt it in one's own muscles" (ibid.).

As an example, he described the apprenticeship of young architects under Frank Lloyd Wright:

Most of them have already earned college degrees. But each and every one of them, from aristocratic or humble homes, alike, must work with his hands in the fields, in the barns, in the kitchen, in the laundry, in the shop, in the office, as a part of his training. Mr. Wright believes that an architect cannot plan a good house unless he has worked in the kitchen preparing food, canning, washing, et cetera (ibid.).

In line with the conclusions he reached on his 1949 mission, Hanna viewed the development of community schools in the Philippines as an integral factor in his plans. He was especially concerned about the fact that education in the Philippines "has been attuned to the development of the political man. Little attention has been given to the extractive industries, the manufacturing industries and business" (*The Manila Chronicle*, 24 March 1952 [?]). His extensive writing in the prewar years about work with the community school ideal and social reconstruction through the schools prepared him to help Filipino educators launch community schools. Hanna envisioned the community school as a locale for fundamental education, but also for identifying and solving community problems. He declared that "the community school serves two purposes, the development of the individual and the development of the community" (Bernardino 1958, 24).

Hanna's focus on community schools fed a long-standing Philippine interest in the concept. Before the turn of the century the Philippines' "greatest hero," Jose Rizal, had created a community school at Dapitan on the island of Mindanao (ibid., 36). Rizal and others among the Filipino elite shared with American progressive

educators the belief that individuals and society as a whole were improvable, if not perfectible, through increased educational opportunities. That emphasis on schooling as a means of social development led to the unfortunate result of educational overproduction. As educational opportunities increased, the number of available positions in industrial plants and in professional education programs did not keep pace with the increasingly educated work force. The problem became even worse when politicians discovered that school construction was a useful means of rewarding their supporters (Manalang 1977, 227).

Many Philippine public schools took on community school functions early in the twentieth century. American colonial governors hoped to turn the local schools into major rural service institutions. In 1914, government schools were officially given the charge to conduct “civico-educational lectures designed to bring the influence of the school to the community” (Bernardino 1958, 36). Interest in these lectures waned after a time, but they were revived in 1933 under the governorship of Theodore Roosevelt Jr. After World War II, the economic and social dislocation caused by the war and by Japanese occupation once again revived the idea of community schools. It was thought that the problems in Philippine education and society were of such broad scope that community schools were the most appropriate institutions to address them. No less a personage than Philippine President Manuel A. Roxas said, “The time is long past due when the schools should serve as a decisive force to reconstruct society” (Roxas, 58). In 1947, the public schools were charged, not simply with child education, but with “the fundamental education of out-of-school youth and adult[s] . . .” (*Improving* 1951, 43).

Paul Hanna’s promotion of community schools contributed to the growth of the idea in the Philippines (*ibid.*, 23). Philippine educators wrote books and monographs addressing the community school idea and national conferences on community schools were held (Manalang, 227). An oversight apparatus was created within

the government's education bureaucracy, and a doctoral program in community school studies was launched at the University of the Philippines. Courses in the development of community schools were taught at the Philippine Normal College, and the Philippine government contracted with UNESCO to create a Community School Training Center. That center, "although it made little impact in the field" (Foley 1984, 46), attracted educators from around the world to its model sites and programs. Hanna proclaimed that the Philippine community school movement was an innovation that the "free world will hail as one of the more significant social innovations of this epoch" (Tupas and Bernardino 1955, iv).

Paul Hanna resigned as education director of the MSA Mission to the Philippines in the spring of 1953, but he remained active in Philippine education. The International Cooperation Administration, later the Agency for International Development (AID), prepared to contract with institutions in the United States to meet some of the perceived needs in the Philippines. As he had during the war years, Hanna saw an opportunity to help Stanford University while he helped the Philippines. In 1953, he negotiated the first in a series of contracts between Stanford and various entities in the Philippines. In a seven-year agreement, Stanford was to help the University of the Philippines develop its teaching and research in business administration, education, and engineering. Stanford provided specialists in business finance, management, and marketing; in secondary education, teacher education, and educational administration; and in all phases of engineering and its underlying sciences. Stanford also committed to help the Philippine university reorganize and recatalogue its library, as well as procure books and other teaching materials. Twenty faculty members from the University of the Philippines undertook advanced study at Stanford and other American institutions. Nine American specialists were sent to the Philippines, and Hanna served as contract coordinator. The value of the contract was \$1 million provided by AID, with additional

funding from the Philippine government (International Cooperation Agency 1957, 306).

A second contract between the Philippine Department of Education and Stanford University was signed in March of 1956, with Hanna serving again as contract coordinator. Under a four-year agreement, American specialists assisted the Philippine Department of Education in developing preparation programs for vocational education teachers. Stanford provided teams of instructors and teacher educators, in fields such as agronomy, crafts, farm mechanics, and animal husbandry, to five different vocational schools throughout the Philippines (*ibid.*).

Hanna employed vocational instructors from secondary schools to carry out much of the work. Those instructors conducted seminars and workshops for Filipino instructors and administrators, and they developed improved courses of study for the vocational schools. That second contract was worth more than \$1 million to Stanford.

The contracts were extended into the 1960s, but not without some disruptions. In 1957, Edward Arnold, the deputy director of AID, abruptly suspended the Stanford contracts. Arnold had come across information that led him to believe Paul Hanna might be a security risk. It turned out that a newspaperman in Washington, D.C., shared the name of Paul Hanna, and his political views were somewhat leftist. This was not the first time the two men's identities had been confused. In fact, Hanna regularly had visas and security clearances held up by Federal Bureau of Investigation reports that confused him with the leftist writer. In the political atmosphere of the cold war even such chance associations raised suspicions. Paul Hanna of Stanford wrote a pointed memo to AID in which he pledged that "we on campus would do anything reasonable and honorable to help fight the cold war against communism even though we had to endure rearguard obstruction" (Hanna 1957c). The matter was quickly cleared up and the contracts reinstated.

Paul Hanna's association with the Philippines continued into the 1980s. He served as a consultant on numerous projects, traveled

there to address various groups, and continued to educate Philippine students at Stanford. Ultimately, the island nation saw the most comprehensive application of his ideas on education for development. Hanna's centerpiece for that effort was the community school, and the model developed in the Philippines became a pattern for UNESCO's efforts to modernize former colonies worldwide (International Cooperation Agency 1962, 10).

Despite its popularity and proliferation, the community school did not accomplish for the Philippines all that Hanna had hoped. One of the first scholars to study Hanna's vocational education and community school work in the Philippines was Douglas Foley, then a Stanford Ph.D. student. Foley served in the Philippines as a Peace Corps volunteer in 1962–1963, and he mastered two native Philippine languages. There he met Robert Textor, an anthropologist teaching in the Stanford International Development Education Center (SIDECE), who persuaded Foley to enroll in the program. Foley was educated at SIDECE from 1965 to 1970 and returned to the Philippines to conduct his anthropological fieldwork (Foley 1997).

Foley noted that, despite a heritage of service to the community and strong supporters in various government agencies, the community school movement in the Philippines had declined from its heyday in the 1950s. He attributed that decline to a number of factors (Foley 1984, 35). First, the Philippine education system was highly centralized and bureaucratized. The inertia inherent in that form of organization makes curriculum innovation nearly impossible. By definition, community schools follow unique, idiosyncratic curricula largely developed on site, and the Philippines' central educational bureaucracy simply could not accommodate that type of institution. Prishla Manalang agreed with Foley that a central bureaucracy imposing its authority on community schools defies the local control inherent in the community school concept (Manalang 1977, 227).

A second reason for the decline in Philippine community schools

was the inability of teacher education institutions in that country to graduate enough teachers to provide for the proliferation of the community school. The type of preparation required for teachers in community schools was radically different from more traditional pedagogical training. Community school teachers must develop skills in community organizing and coordination of services with other agencies, as well as in adult and child education. The traditional teacher education programs were not geared to produce the needed teachers, and the few specialized programs that did—including UNESCO's Training Center—could not produce enough teachers to staff more than a few pilot sites (Foley 1984, 35).

Third, the community school was a new concept in some areas. Introducing new forms of practice in traditional communities was not an easy task, and some communities simply rejected the idea.

Fourth, coordinating activities and services among different social service agencies proved difficult. As the Philippine government modernized, agencies to aid in rural development proliferated. It was the community school's duty to coordinate all available services, but that was not always possible. Sometimes the goals of the various agencies conflicted, making cooperation difficult. Sometimes, interpersonal animosities intervened. In the end, many agencies found it easier to operate independently of the community school (ibid.). Manalang added that community school teachers who were charged with the coordination of the various services in the school did not receive rewards in proportion to their efforts (Manalang, 227).

Fifth, historical trends intervened. The multiplication of domestic and foreign rural aid organizations supplanted the community school's role as the social service center in many areas. The demand of parents for an academic rather than a vocational education for their children altered the community school curriculum. That trend toward a more academically oriented curriculum was bolstered by the resurgence of content-centered curricula in the late 1950s. Foley claimed that "Learning the vocabulary of modern

mathematics and the laboratory approaches of discovery science has replaced sanitary toilet campaigns and literacy classes” (Foley 1984, 48).

Finally, international aid organizations shifted the funding of their educational interventions from elementary to higher education. Much of the foreign funding for community school development simply dried up. All of these forces contributed to the decline of the community school movement in the Philippines by the mid-1950s. Only the promotional activities of Paul Hanna and other American educators kept it alive after that time (*ibid.*, 46; Manalang, 227).

A deeper problem was the effect of creating a model for development along purely western lines in the Philippines and elsewhere. UNESCO used the community schools in that country as models for other developing nations, but they failed to exert the social, political, and economic influence in the Philippines that Hanna had hoped, as subsequent events have demonstrated (Foley 1997). The Philippines has consistently lagged behind many of its Asian neighbors in economic growth and prosperity. In addition, the nation has been plagued with political unrest and scandals that have betrayed Hanna’s dream of building a democratic society there. In his later years, Hanna seemed to acknowledge that failure. In a 1968 press release describing the reasons for SIDEC’s creation, Hanna wrote, “We were making horrendous mistakes . . . by exporting the content of education that had worked for 150 years in the U.S., but had not tried to tailor educational structure and content suited to the needs of the countries we were trying to help” (Hanna 1968a).

#### IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Hanna’s work in the Philippines positioned him to take leadership roles in a number of other Asian development projects. In fact, by

the mid-1950s he was recognized as a leading expert in development education. R. Freeman Butts reported that he and Hanna saw themselves at the pinnacle of that field. He recalled, “We used to joke that Paul at Stanford was reeducating the new nations of Pacific East Asia and I at Teachers College was trying to do the same for Africa and South Asia. Between us, the world” (Butts 1999). Hanna worked with the Asia Society, the East–West Center, and the Asia Foundation, which cosponsored much of his work in the Philippines. In 1955, Hanna’s prominence in the field earned him nomination to the directorship of UNESCO’s Department of Education (Adiseshiah 1955). Hanna’s vision for the Mekong River Project is perhaps most revealing of how he came to see the role of education in national and international development.

The United Nations’ Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East (ECAFE) first proposed a hydroelectric and flood control project on the Mekong River in 1957. The UN’s goal was the economic development of the region. Hanna saw development of the Lower Mekong River Basin, along the lines of the Tennessee Valley Authority, as essential to the peace and prosperity of Cambodia, Laos, South Vietnam, and Thailand. More than just an economic boon for the individual nations, he thought that the project could be a case study in international cooperation to support his contention that multinational communities were the next stage in sociopolitical development (Hanna 1969, 254). He was concerned that although much effort had been poured into the political and technical aspects of planning such a massive project, there was a “lack of focused attention on the need for investment in human resource development through education” (ibid.).

As in the Philippines, Hanna advocated more than simply developing skills and technical expertise. Instead, he was concerned with people’s ways of thinking. He asked, “What will motivate the illiterate masses in these nations to believe that by creating a larger-than-national community they can improve their lot? What will

motivate them to develop at one and the same time attitudes of cooperation and loyalty to their mother nation and a sense of membership in a larger community of the Lower Mekong?" (ibid.).

Further, Hanna warned that

the Lower Mekong project is not going to "come off" unless the people are helped to see how such a multi-national and multipurpose attack on the Lower Mekong could improve their lives and unless these people are helped to learn the appropriate attitudes, concepts, and competencies that are the *sine qua non* for the construction of the infrastructure in the first place and for its effective use in economic and social affairs once the network of physical mechanisms are built and in operation (Hanna 1969, 254).

Hanna saw the schools as a natural venue for the development of those concepts and attitudes, but education officials in the area were not planning in that direction. He criticized ECAFE proposals for the project because they included no studies that would "explore the instrumental use of education—formal and informal—in facilitating the river-basin projects or in preparing the masses to take advantage of the expected better economic, social, and political conditions that would flow from the larger-than-national community of the Lower Mekong" (ibid., 256).

The regional organization of education officials—the Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization (SEAMEO)—was not involved, and Hanna thought that disengagement was an enormous oversight. He urged the organization to "move the primary-, secondary-, and adult-education establishments toward helping the common people understand the essential role that the long-range multipurpose Mekong River projects must play in their lives" (ibid., 255).

In a predictable recommendation, Hanna advocated a structure akin to the community school to help ECAFE meet some of its objectives. Beyond that suggestion, he used his position on the Stone

Foundation board to try to arouse awareness of, and to bring some coordination to, education efforts in the region. In March of 1971, Hanna spent two weeks touring the area and meeting with SEAMEO officials. He then prepared a recommendation that the Stone Foundation support the establishment of ties between SEAMEO and the Mekong River Development Committee of ECAFE. SEAMEO would take on the role of planning for human resource development in the region. The Stone Foundation's executive committee ultimately rejected Hanna's proposal, but they agreed to employ a fund-raising consultant to help SEAMEO raise support in the United States (Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Secretariat 1971, 66-67).

His recommendations for Mekong River development displayed the depth of Hanna's thought about international development education late in his career. He had moved far beyond the vocational and citizenship education thrusts of his early work in the Philippines. By 1971, he was able to insist that the schools develop in children and adults the attitudes, concepts, and skills needed for their successful exploitation of economic development opportunities in international partnerships.

#### OTHER INTERNATIONAL WORK

Paul Hanna's work in international development education reached its fullest fruition in Asia, but it was not limited to that continent. His role changed, but his thrust was consistently the use of education as a tool for national and international development. In 1966, Hanna served as chairman of the Binational Yugoslav-American Advisory Commission of the U.S. Department of Education's Board of Foreign Scholarship. The commission met in Belgrade from November 21 to December 2. Its report on scholarly cooperation between the two countries displayed Hanna's influence. The report concluded that

contemporary economic and social developments place great emphasis on education and the central roles that the natural and social sciences and technology play in modern educational systems. It is to our mutual advantage to discover better strategies of utilizing education in applying the most recent advances in sciences, in view of their great potential, to the improvement of social and economic conditions (Hanna 1966).

Hanna's retirement from the Stanford faculty at the end of the 1966–1967 university term freed him to take even more extended trips than he had previously taken. For example, in the fall of 1967 he undertook a tour of four East African nations on behalf of the U.S. State Department's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs. He spent October and November meeting with education officials in Kenya, Malawi, Lesotho, and Ethiopia. Again, the resulting report of his observations provided insights into Hanna's thought on international development education at that mature point in his career. Additionally, it revealed his view of his own role in promoting development education.

Hanna's report began with his observations of conditions in the nations he visited. He found that both the leaders and the people had "great expectations for national development and for modernization that supposedly follow greater investment through education in human resources" (Hanna 1967b, 1). Hanna's use of the modifier *supposedly* indicated a decline in the idealistic faith in education's efficacy for national development that he had displayed earlier in his career. A factor contributing to that decline may have been Hanna's observation in these nations of "little evidence of an understanding of the relevance of the content and of instructional methods of schooling to economic development and to social and political modernization" (*ibid.*). Just as in the Philippines in 1948, he found in Africa a curriculum and related materials that reflected European colonial roots. The content and instructional methods were traditional, geared more toward college entrance and profes-

sional study than to preparation of students for the economic and social conditions of East Africa in 1967. An external examination system selected only an elite few for advanced study, ensuring underemployment and disillusionment for the rest (*ibid.*, 2).

In higher education, no effort was made to guide students into fields necessary for their nation's development, and educational overproduction resulted. Some professional development programs enrolled too many students whereas others were left with too many vacancies. To make matters worse, the sparsely manned professions were often those technical fields most vital to industrial modernization. Hanna believed that the imbalance of supply and demand in the professions and the lack of technically trained individuals "only increases the dangerous gap between exploding aspirations and lagging fulfillment," both within individuals and for society as a whole (*ibid.*).

Hanna laid part of the blame for the imbalance on educators. He wrote that "The relevance of the curriculum to national goals must be the basic consideration . . . curriculum is too important to be left to the schoolmasters" (*ibid.*, 2-3). The traditional academic approaches of colonial times were insufficient for newly independent, developing nations. Schools should be more attuned to specific manpower needs and adjust their curricula accordingly. Such curricula must be developed with input from technicians and planners as well as pedagogues (Hanna 1967b, 4).

Once again, Hanna's concern transcended simple vocational training. Instead, he wanted to change people's attitudes. He observed in those countries a lack of attention to "instruction in the purposes and the mechanisms of the emerging multinational communities of men" (*ibid.*). In Southeast Asia, he had observed that modern economies require such an array of resources that nations must often form international combinations for their effective exploitation. Education systems designed to help nations modernize, especially small nations with limited resources, must attend to the

concepts, attitudes, and skills of international cooperation. Of course, education systems patterned after those formerly imposed by colonial powers would not include that feature. Particularly in Africa, the colonial competition among European powers had been so fierce that cooperation across national lines was anathema, and cooperation in the exploitation of natural resources was the antithesis of European colonialism there. Hanna insisted that the content of the curriculum must change.

Instructional methods likewise received Hanna's criticism. The nations he visited in Africa depended primarily on rote memorization of text passages as a mode of instruction. That approach ignored what Hanna perceived as "the relationship between instructional methods, and modernization and development" (*ibid.*, 3). Instead, Hanna advocated methods employing inquiry, discovery, and experimentation, the very methods he had found most intriguing as a boy and most effective as a young school superintendent. Only methods directed at higher-level thought processes would develop the problem-solving skills needed for economic modernization.

Hanna's interpretation of his mission in Africa revealed much about how he operated on international consulting trips. He took a much broader view of educational consulting and drew a much broader field of actors into his activities than did most consultants. He anticipated meeting with cabinet-level officials in ministries dealing with education, industry, and trade. In addition, he expected to consult with school and university authorities to help them revamp the curriculum and the instructional methods in their schools. Integral to Hanna's mission was his "work with leaders of the private sector who are investing in the growth of the economy and who have general and specific information that must be a part of the preparation of human resources in order to facilitate the development and modernization of the nation" (Hanna 1967b, 5).

Hanna understood as well as any educational leader of his time that the accumulation of capital fuels development in market econ-

omies, and that human capital is a vital resource. Ignoring that factor in developing curriculum for economic and social modernization was futile, but Hanna's conception of addressing private-sector concerns in the curriculum went beyond simplistic ideas of vocational education for industrial and agricultural workers. As he had in the United States during the Great Depression, he perceived the need for schools to help children understand market economics, technological development, international relations, and a myriad of other complex concepts in order to contribute to their nation's, and their region's, development.

Hanna evaluated the success of his African mission as "two hits, one walk, and one strikeout" (*ibid.*, 6). He attributed those mixed results less to the national officials with whom he met, or to himself, than to the U.S. embassy staffs in East Africa. His estimation of successful and unsuccessful encounters in each nation related directly to the power and prestige of those with whom he met. He clearly believed that it was his mission to act as an advocate for international development education at the highest levels of government.

The two "hits" were in nations where the embassy personnel appreciated the value of Hanna's celebrity status and prepared accordingly. In both countries, meetings were arranged between Hanna and the heads of universities, cabinet ministers, and other high government officials. In both countries, the prestige of Hanna's activities was enhanced by the participation of the U.S. ambassador. Invitations to meetings often issued from the ambassador himself, and in both countries the meetings were held in settings such as the embassy building that were appropriate for high-level consultations. Hanna's report claimed that

in these two nations, it is my evaluation that our seminars with the top policy makers resulted not only in better understanding of the crucial role a revised school and university curricula (content and method) might play in nation and multination building, but, equally important, resulted in the beginnings of formal mech-

anisms through which, hopefully, these policy makers will proceed to assist the Ministry of Education and the university staffs in infusing the curricula with those concepts, values, and skills essential to achieve the goals in economic, social, and political sectors (*ibid.*, 7).

In the nations Hanna rated as less than fully successful, the embassy staffs did not make suitable preparations for a visitor of his stature. In the “walk,” embassy personnel did not want Hanna to meet with government officials before the newly appointed ambassador had. As a result, no high-level meetings were arranged. Instead, Hanna addressed the staff of the American school there, and gave several lectures to student teachers at a university. He did manage to meet with “a few leaders” near the end of his stay, but he left feeling that he had made little “headway in helping the leaders with the central problem of using education as a tool for achieving the goals of the various ministries or of the private sector” (*ibid.*, 6).

In his “strikeout,” the embassy staff scheduled Hanna only to speak to secondary school students. He perceived “no comprehension on the part of the ambassador or his staff of the purpose of my visit.” Even after Hanna explained what he had done in other countries and what he hoped to accomplish there, the ambassador refused to arrange consultations. He told Hanna that “the officials locally were already too much bothered with foreigners telling the host government how to conduct its business” (*ibid.*). Clearly, some diplomats may have failed to grasp all that Hanna had to offer. On the other hand, they likely understood the local culture better than Hanna. His style of top-down dissemination of his ideas had proven ineffective in the Philippines, but he insisted on continuing it. Obviously, Hanna placed the highest value on his own advice and wanted to share it with only the most powerful officials in the African nations he visited.

In all, despite his inability to operate as he intended in all four

nations, Hanna was pleased with the results of his African tour. He was especially gratified at the heightened awareness in the region of the need for international cooperation. His visit coincided fortuitously with planning meetings in Addis Ababa for the development of an East African Common Market. The news media in the region covered that event thoroughly, and as a result Hanna found “the university authorities and the ministries challenged by these questions [of the school’s role in creating conditions conducive to international cooperation] and in each instance they expressed a determination to work for inclusion of curriculum content that would help prepare citizens to participate in the emerging larger-than-nations communities” (Hanna 1967b, 8).

The effects of Hanna’s short visit and limited input on the subsequent development of the four nations are difficult to assess. Kenya has continued its growth as a pro-Western, modernizing economic powerhouse in the region. Ethiopia has tended to move in the opposite direction. Malawi and Lesotho have been handicapped by their small size. Lesotho, especially, has suffered from its position as a nation landlocked within the Republic of South Africa. For all the excitement it generated, the East African Common Market never came to fruition. Hanna’s brief visit likely had little effect on any of those events.

Later in 1967, Hanna attended a high-level conference on international education issues held in Williamsburg, Virginia. His inclusion in that prestigious gathering indicates the high profile he had attained in international education circles. The meeting grew out of a speech by President Lyndon Johnson the previous year calling for a meeting of world leaders to address issues in education across national boundaries. That call was consistent with Hanna’s internationalism. The International Conference on the World Crisis in Education was held October 5–9, 1967. One hundred and seventy educators and education officials attended, representing fifty-two nations. Hanna served as one of the United States’ representatives.

The goals of the conference included “(a) to diagnose the nature, causes, and prospects of the world education crisis, and (b) to make recommendations on a strategy and specific measures for meeting the crisis by both national and international action” (Perkins 1967). The choice of the term *crisis* to describe education worldwide was an interesting one, and the word was subject to interpretation. Dr. James A. Perkins, president of Cornell University and the conference chairman, recognized this ambiguity. In a letter to Hanna, he explained, “Obviously, this crisis takes different forms in different countries and some are already more deeply involved in it than others. But its common characteristic anywhere, and the essence of the problem, is that educational systems have been unable to keep pace in the last decade with their rapidly changing environments” (ibid.). That observation paralleled Hanna’s 1930s-era interpretation of the social dilemma of modern times in the United States and his observations in Latin America, Asia, and Africa.

Hanna used the conference as an opportunity to expand and reinforce his vast network of personal contacts. He served on the conference’s working group studying Research to Improve Education, but much of his time was spent visiting with friends. He wrote personal notes to university and government officials who were attending the conference from a number of nations in Europe, the Americas, Asia, and Africa.

Hanna’s lifelong attention to such social details contributed to the building and maintenance of his vast network of friends and acquaintances around the world. Late in his life, Hanna was chided for his habit of writing *thank you* notes in response to Christmas cards. He replied, “At my age, if I don’t respond, they’ll think I’m dead!” (A. Hanna 1999). Hanna’s attention to social conventions benefited him and his friends. In 1958, Harold Rugg enlisted his former colleague’s help in organizing a trip to the Far East. He wrote Hanna that his last trip to the region had been in 1937, and many of his contacts there had passed away (Rugg 1958). Hanna

wrote several letters of introduction for him (Hanna 1974). In 1965 Hanna wrote letters of introduction for Congressman Richard Hanna, who was preparing for a fact-finding mission, to a number of important officials in the Philippines. Those contacts also benefited Hanna; colleagues from the Philippines and elsewhere sent their students and came themselves to study at Hanna's Stanford International Development Education Center.

THE STANFORD INTERNATIONAL  
DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION CENTER

Paul Hanna built his sphere of influence in international education as much through the creation of a center for development education on the Stanford campus as he did through his work overseas. The idea for a center for the formal preparation of educators in international development education sprang from Hanna's work in Latin America, Europe, and Asia in the 1940s and 1950s. The scholarly activities of data gathering and interpretation he had observed in the more traditional programs of comparative education did not seem to meet the needs of nations looking to education to help them build their social, political, and economic institutions. The focus of Stanford's program under Hanna's leadership was the use of education as an agent of change. Students in the program were to become "scholar-doers" (Foley 1997). At Hanna's instigation, Stanford approved a doctoral degree program in overseas/comparative education in 1954.

In its first few years, the program catered mainly to foreign students, and many of them later became important government and university officials in their home countries. By 1960, students from the United States had begun to enter the program, and many went on to faculty positions at influential universities such as Ohio State, Pennsylvania State, and the University of Quebec. Others

served in UNESCO, USAID, and other international and quasi-governmental organizations and foundations (Foster 1998b).

By 1965, the degree program was housed in a formal unit of the university called the Stanford International Development Education Center (SIDECE). As Hanna's understanding of *development education* deepened, SIDECE's mission broadened. From its early focus as a training ground for technicians in Western modes of development, it grew into an interdisciplinary program to "improve American educators' abilities in helping under-developed countries build their own educational systems that were truly a reflection of needs for development and modernization" (Hanna 1968b). Instead of imposing a western model of modernization, SIDECE's graduates helped nations "build their own educational systems" (*ibid.*). Also, as Hanna's focus grew from national development to include multinational arrangements, he perceived that he was "constantly struggling to get SIDECE turned around so that they don't just talk about education and nationhood, but education and multinationalhood" (Hanna 1974).

The expansion of SIDECE's mission also changed the degree programs. By 1968, students were designing their own programs of study under the guidance of a three-member faculty committee. The diverse student body in that year included doctoral students from Asia, Africa, the Middle East, Europe, Latin America, and Australia, as well as the United States and Canada (Hanna 1968b).

During those years of change, SIDECE took on a more theoretical bent. Hanna's ideal of the "scholar-doer" remained the pattern for SIDECE students, but a subtle shift had begun. In order to establish and maintain its prestige among academic programs, SIDECE had to produce theoretical research and recruit outstanding scholars in the social sciences. Its promotional literature of the late 1960s revealed the shift. A 1967 brochure stated, for example, that SIDECE "seeks theoretical and practical insights by comparative analysis of developmental processes in countries at various levels of advancement" (*The Stanford International Development Center* 1967). Al-

though national development was mentioned, the statement could have issued from any of the more traditional programs in comparative education. The preparation of students to advise on education reform overseas is not mentioned.

In a 1968 press release, the preparation of “scholar–doers” is described as a goal of SIDEAC, but it is put on a par with the production of “research-based literature to aid in educational policy making the world over” (Hanna 1968b). In addition, the focus of SIDEAC research was expanded overseas to include more developed nations, rather than only developing nations. The shift in emphasis attracted a new type of student who was less apt to work overseas with education systems and foreign governments and more attuned to scholarly research in the theoretical aspects of “the role of education in the processes of social-economic-political development” (*The Stanford International Development Center* 1967). The recruitment of faculty and students with academic interests other than education no doubt enriched SIDEAC, but also changed its character. After Hanna’s retirement, SIDEAC became even more academically oriented than service oriented and that change was a source of conflict between Hanna and the Stanford administration (Foster 1998b). Ultimately, Hanna shifted the focus of his scholarly study of education’s interactions with the larger society to the Hoover Institution.

Perhaps to compensate for the increasingly academic character of SIDEAC, Hanna offered a radical proposal to the United States government in 1969. The previous year he had been appointed chairman of the Special Committee to Study Peace Corps/University Relations. The committee met first in Washington, D.C., in mid-November, then in Honolulu to study Peace Corps training programs at the University of Hawaii in mid-December, and then in Palo Alto the following January. The resulting committee report, issued in April of 1969, called for an expansion of the Peace Corps into an International Volunteer Development Corps composed of “volunteers from most free nations of the globe” (Stanford Univer-

sity News Service 1969). The report suggested that “multinational teams of volunteers would work in the rural and urban ghettos of every nation, in the development of world or regional ecological balance, in preservation of pure water or air, in eradicating illiteracy and ignorance, in lessening disease, in enhancing beauty . . .” (ibid.).

Such an organization might prepare the force of bright young people dedicated to modernization in underdeveloped countries that Hanna had hoped would issue from SIDEAC. As a sample project he recommended that the corps be set to work on the Lower Mekong River Development Project, “provided the Vietnam war was over” (ibid.).

Hanna’s proposal revealed a change in his attitude about exporting American ideas and institutions to other parts of the world. Whereas his work in the Philippines was criticized as an unreflective imposition of educational forms that had largely failed in the United States, his recommendation to expand the Peace Corps showed some cultural sensitivity. He wrote, “One immediate effect which would be noted would be to remove the stigma from the U.S. Peace Corps and every other nation using similar youth volunteers as ‘nationalistic and imperialistic’” (ibid.). His concern was more than just politically superficial. The committee suggested that the Development Corps would be an improvement over the Peace Corps by “emphasizing more forcefully the economic development of the host nation within the terms of its own plan [emphasis theirs], rather than the Peace Corps’ own ‘self-realization’ (personal image) of the current program” (ibid.). Politics would still play a part, though, because all volunteers would come from *free nations*.

#### CONCLUSION

Hanna’s second career in international development education seemed to have occurred without plan. After he rejected the excesses of radical social reconstruction for American schools in the 1930s,

he fully embraced the liberal democratic tradition and sought means through which education could instill the requisite knowledges and skills for democratic citizenship. He fixed on two solutions. The first solution was the community school, an innovative way to teach responsible, democratic citizenship through service to the community. The second solution was embodied in his textbook series and in *Building America*. Hanna designed these books to help students understand vital social science concepts and use them to analyze current conditions in their society. The community school ideal suffered in the general backlash against progressive education methods and a reemphasis on a traditional academic curriculum in American schools. The *Building America* series was scuttled by criticism from right-wing political groups. These setbacks, combined with Hanna's wartime opportunities to investigate the instrumental uses of education overseas, encouraged him to shift his focus to the uses of education as a tool of national and international development.

In fact, Hanna had been interested in the wider world from his youth. Consulting work in Europe, Asia, South America, and Africa simply allowed him to indulge this interest and expand his influence. He aided in the proliferation of American democratic ideals throughout the postwar world. His expanding communities model for organization of the social studies curriculum became a familiar fixture in dozens of foreign school systems. Expanding communities became the organizing principle in UNESCO guides on teaching social studies (Churchill 1999; Mehlinger 1981, 379). In many countries, the conscious goal of the social studies curriculum became the promotion of democratic values. In postwar Japan, social studies "was intended to serve as a means—along with other aspects of the curriculum—by which a sense of morality might be developed along democratic lines" (R. Anderson, 102).

Hanna spread his version of development education, as well, through the work of graduates from SIDEAC. Many of these students

went on to hold important posts in foreign governments, international organizations, and universities around the world. Douglas Foley reflected that Hanna's Filipino graduates are "now running universities in the Philippines" (Foley 1997). Hanna saw this work as a natural complement to his curriculum work. He told Martin Gill that he considered his "social studies emphases an outgrowth of that postwar experience, but also my coming back and developing the Stanford International Development Educational [sic] Center. . . . So the social studies master design and SIDECE emphasis were really one and the same" (Hanna 1974).

Hanna's work in international education also refined his curriculum work at home. His expanding communities curriculum came to include international communities of people. He said, "It wasn't until I became involved with my international work . . . [that] I began to see that we had a whole series of concentric circle communities and I was a part of every one of them . . . That came after my experiences in the war and my international experiences after the war (Hanna 1974).

As he gained deeper multicultural understandings, Hanna brought those perspectives to his work at home. The result was a greater internationalism in the American social studies curriculum than had existed before World War II. Dozens of Hanna's students had seen something of the world during their service in the war. They easily adopted his internationalism and helped it spread through their own curriculum work. The influence of their wartime experiences in developing an international consciousness and depth of understanding of the social order in the postwar generation of curriculum workers cannot be overestimated. The impact of these scholars in school systems worldwide deserves further study.

Through seemingly random circumstances, Hanna and his ideas were thrust onto the world stage in the years after World War II. The result was a new, worldwide, UNESCO-promulgated model for use of the schools as tools of national development, a cadre of

highly trained educators to carry it out, the proliferation of Hanna's expanding communities model for the social science curriculum, and an increased level of international awareness in curriculum materials in the United States. Through his work in international development education, Hanna truly became a citizen of the world.