

*Stephen Keith Sagarin*

*A*s I write, we are enjoying April snows and flooded streams here in New England; nothing balmy about it. An inner balminess blows through many of the articles in this issue of the *Bulletin*, however, and that will suffice for now. Reading through the contents this season, it is striking how our writers refresh our engagement with Waldorf education. We present here a spring cleaning, if you will, or at least some directions for how to find one. Enjoy the balm.

Arthur Auer, continuing his series on teaching reading, expands our understanding of Steiner's work, calling our attention to the various modes—too easily smothered by simply drawing pictures for each letter—by which Steiner pictured the teaching of writing and reading. Running and playing in the mud (or clay) do as well as beautiful beeswax crayon drawings to reinvigorate children as they learn the dull conventions by which we adults communicate.

In a report on her work as a speech artist and teacher, Helen Lubin details the ways in which speech supports, informs, and revives our work in Waldorf schools from early years through high school and into teacher education. In particular, she notes objective and subjective elements present in all speech, poles between which individuals mediate experience of the world and communication occurs.

A centerpiece of this issue is a summary report of the Research Institute's *Survey of Waldorf Graduates* by Douglas Gerwin and David Mitchell. The authors' clear presentation of significant data on Waldorf school graduates serves to dust away cobwebs of false belief—for instance, that Waldorf students don't "do" science—and adds color to a picture of who it is we have been teaching all these years.

For years I have been keeping a list of practices and beliefs that I have encountered in Waldorf schools but which I have not found in my own study of Steiner's work. Having written a history of Waldorf schools in the U.S., I am interested in the ways in which institutions grow and

change, sometimes consciously and sometimes unconsciously. My article in this *Bulletin* addresses twenty "myths," beliefs or practices in Waldorf schools that cannot be well-grounded in Steiner's work. Some of these are admirable—consensus decision-making, when well practiced—and others are questionable—math gnomes. My hope is that, in the spirit of spring cleaning, we continue to re-examine our beliefs and practices, saving what's good, repairing what the moths have eaten, and discarding what no longer serves us.

Eugene Schwartz, in an article on high-stakes testing, airs a call for Waldorf schools to figure out our relationship to testing and then to enter the important national debate on this topic. Our children, not just our Waldorf children, deserve such an effort on our part.

Testing can be the opposite of play (well, some of us saw tests as fun when we were young, but we were a perverse minority), and Susan Howard here assesses recent research on play. As we learn more and more about how important play is to the health and development of children, we also see that schools are under greater and greater pressures to reduce time and opportunities for children's play. Waldorf schools recognize the value of play but cannot find support for parent evenings and engagement with local communities.

David Mitchell draws our attention to ways in which two relatively new European Waldorf high schools address adolescent education in the contemporary world, flexibly and intelligently. Interestingly, although one school is in Switzerland and one in Norway, both see practical work as a key to educating teens. Adolescents are demanding, and they provide a catalyst for us to try new forms in efforts to address their healthy growth and development.

In a brief interview, Michael D'Aleo lays out precisely what "Waldorf" science teaching entails and why parents and science-oriented students should seek out, rather than be suspicious of, Waldorf schools. Although Waldorf students may

learn fewer facts than students in other schools, they are more likely to retain them because the facts are presented in a meaningful context. More important, students in Waldorf schools engage again and again in the creative process by which science moves forward and by which we learn to know the world. Here is a form of imagination, trained and precise, that we don't always find in the arts.

In a brief article on math teaching and memory, Lori MacKinder outlines three kinds of memory, in developmental order: movement memory, rhythmic memory, and picture memory. Delays or disruptions in the development of these can be seen, particularly, in difficulties with learning math. Addressing these remedially can assist in aiding students who have difficulty in math. Although this was not her intention, her brief article supports Auer's longer piece on writing and reading. The modes by which we learn are several and varied.

Regarding higher education, we include excerpts from a paper by John Burnett on a transnational Waldorf teacher education program in Europe, finding a direction for teacher education appropriate for a Europe that more and more sees itself as one larger community.

In a brief report on a conference he attended, Michael Mancini draws our attention to the ways in which Waldorf schools already do what other independent school educators increasingly recognize we must do in order to teach well—address such human aptitudes as play, story, meaning, and empathy. We should cheer that Patrick Bassett, astute and respected president of the National Association of Independent Schools (NAIS), says that this is the century for Waldorf education.

An excerpt in this *Bulletin* from Steiner's previously untranslated *Education, Teaching, and Practical Life* shows how we acknowledge the existential riddles of our soul as we become increasingly conscious. One could write that we as a collection of educators and researchers face this same situation, face the riddles of the soul not as individuals, but collectively, socially. As we become increasingly conscious, we face the riddles of our own practice. What do we do consciously, and what do we do as unexamined habit? Part of Steiner's brilliance here lies in his observation that

fear, anxiety, and anger arise when we do not make conscious that which must be so.

With a new season, we should buckle down to work—working smarter; we're already working as hard as we can, right?—so that our work is worthy of a dialogue with colleagues in schools that are not already Waldorf schools. We have a lot to say on teacher education, authority, testing, play, science teaching, reading and writing, and a host of other issues not immediately addressed in the pages that follow—but often addressed in past issues and to be addressed in issues to come.

You may know that High Mowing School was founded as a high school; but did you know that the original impulse for this initiative started in a prep school in Greenwich, Connecticut—the Edgewood School—and that the faculty, presented with a Waldorf school curriculum (called a “school plan” in those days), voted unanimously to adopt it, overnight becoming a proto-Waldorf school in the late 1930s? Beulah Emmet and her guest, Hermann von Baravalle, presented the Waldorf method and curriculum to the teachers before Christmas 1937, and when the school opened in January 1938, after Christmas break, it was on its way to becoming the second Waldorf school in the U.S. (Mrs. Emmet later moved the school—against tough odds, in the middle of World War II—to her farm, High Mowing, in southern New Hampshire.) The possibilities for Waldorf education, and for change, are greater than we sometimes imagine.