
Otto Glöckel (1874-1935) lives on as both a positive and a negative totem in contemporary Austrian educational politics. For Socialist school officials and other advocates of the school reforms that are currently under discussion, he is their frequently cited progenitor, the progressive pedagogue and politician whose ideas and intentions—still largely valid and still in some essentials unfulfilled—made “Red Vienna” in the 1920s a place of pilgrimage for hundreds of other progressive pedagogues from Europe, Asia, and the Americas. When his name means something to most other Austrians, which is less often, it stands instead for an energetically anticlerical Austro-Marxist who advocated some good ideas (mostly long since accepted) but whose other reforms, still alive and dangerous in the aspirations of ideological successors in influential positions, would lead to educational and social disaster. The consequences, in this view, would include an education as poor as that of the United States, where a high school diploma is no assurance of even simple literacy, the eclipse of religion and the family, and a socially and individually destructive kind of leveling and stereotyping (*Vermassung*) in which ignorance and the ignorant masses reign and talent, background, and enterprise are unrewarded.

For the outside layman, at least some of Glöckel's still unimplemented reforms seem so obviously desirable, both socially and individually and from all ideological positions represented in today's Austria, that effective opposition for more than 60 years appears to be a symbol of peculiarly perverse cultural conservatism. This is particularly true of measures that would postpone from

age 10 to age 14 an educational selection process that virtually precludes later changes in educational specialization, career type, and social status. No one has been willing to dispute the common sense and empirically demonstrable contention that age ten is too young to know with any certainty how intelligent or talented a person will be or the precise direction that his or her talents and inclinations may take, but changes in the system that would delay the moment of decision—by extending general, uniform schooling from the first four to the first eight years and by making it easier to shift from one type to another at any time after the fourth grade—are as controversial in 1978 as they were in the 1890s, when Glöckel and others first proposed that it should be done.¹

Glöckel himself also and predictably maintained that resistance to this and other aspects of his reform program was a matter of stubborn conservatism. For him, however, there was nothing perverse or “cultural” about it. From a Marxist point of view, which was for Glöckel a confirmation of his own early experiences as pupil and teacher, defense of the existing school system—indeed, as we shall see, some of Glöckel's opponents actually wished to turn the clock back to an even earlier system—was a logical and self-serving position for classes that had an interest in preserving their own and the Catholic Church's political and social hegemony in defiance of a changing world; “educational privilege” (*Bildungsprivileg*) is essential to the maintenance of other privileges because education equals power.² Fellow-Socialists among Glöckel's present-day followers tend to agree that this was

and is still the case. In the next breath, however, they are willing to agree that many and perhaps most of their own party's working- and middle-class voters are also in the ranks of the opposition to comprehensive schooling for 10- to 14-year-olds and some other features of the reform program. Unless this is taken as a sign that these voters are not "class conscious," which cannot be argued by anyone who knows them or recent Austrian history, it is surely a sign that the equation is more complex (i.e., that more class interests and clericalism versus anticlericalism are in play).

The story of the life and times of Otto Glöckel and his reforms is a study of a complex set of relationships between collective and individual political and cultural values and the educational system in a period of dramatic social and political change, stresses on both sets of values, and political polarization along starkly ideological lines. In this context a movement for school reform that was eclectic in its inspiration and aspirations—sometimes apolitically pedagogical and sometimes highly political and ideological—became associated in self- and popular awareness with Austro-Marxist Social Democracy as one of Austria's three political camps, invoking reflexive as well as reasoned opposition by the other two, respectively Roman Catholic clericalist and quondam-liberal German nationalist. Then, for 11 traumatic years, the Socialist camp with which these ideas were identified was eliminated from the political stage under successive dictatorships by the other two. As a further and subsequent complication, while the reformers believed (probably rightly) that their program corresponded and was responsive to the values and expectations of most supporters of their camp and of the majority of the population, the duration of the struggle and intervening events now appear to have led to some changes in those values and expectations. As a result, there is today a latent conflict, generally but not always unrecognized by the reformers, between some aspects of what they and Glöckel had in mind and what the intended beneficiaries of their reforms now think they want.

The Reformers' Inheritance

The school years of the last decades of the Hapsburg Monarchy in the provinces that became the Austrian Republic after 1918 was the school

system created by the *Reichsvolksschulgesetz* (Imperial Public School Law) of 1869, modified in practice and in amendments to that legislation under conservative administrations in later years.³ The 1869 law was in turn the work of the Liberal ministry reluctantly appointed by Emperor Francis Joseph after a series of humiliations and defeats, culminating in the Austro-Prussian War of 1866 and the Austro-Hungarian Compromise of 1867, which had demonstrated the ineffectiveness of post-1849 neo-absolutism and the inadequacies of the Empire's army, economy, and schools. The Liberal ministry's mandate was to modernize in all these fields, initially to prepare the country for a war of revenge against Prussia that would restore the House of Hapsburg as the pre-eminent German power and later merely to preserve it as at least a semblance of a Great Power.

The pattern, which a later generation might call The Sputnik Principle, is familiar: the educational reforms of the late 1860s were undertaken as a result and under the influence of a traumatic experience that had made it apparent that others were more "modern" and thereby efficient and threatening. In this case the sputnik orbited by the Prussians was an unexpected, quick, and decisive military victory that had revealed superior military technology (especially the Prussians' breech-loading "needle gun" that enabled their infantry to reload in a prone position), superior strategy (suggesting better trained staff officers), and more competent soldiery (suggesting more appropriate basic education, including indoctrination in patriotic values). The lessons for Austrian education seemed obvious and an appropriate recipe was at hand—doubly appropriate because it seemed to echo Prussian school reforms introduced, at least on paper,⁴ since the 1840s—in the shape of the school system that these same Austrian German Liberals had urged and abortively promulgated during the revolution of 1848.

As a first step, through legislation adopted in 1868, the Liberal ministry had denounced the Concordat of 1855, separated school and church once again, recreated a Ministry of Education, and replaced ecclesiastical school supervision with a hierarchy of elected school boards. With the ground thus cleared, the Imperial Public

School Law extended compulsory schooling from six to eight years and created eight-year public elementary schools—to be called *Volksschulen* rather than *Trivialschulen*, a change with symbolic importance—as nondenominational and basically secular schools to be attended by pupils of all faiths, an aspect still contested by Glöckel's opponents in the First Republic. It also urged the establishment, with local funding, of far more three-year *Burgerschulen*, a type in existence on a small scale since 1774 as an alternative, more intensive form of compulsory schooling for grades six to eight, with teachers specialized in individual subjects in place of the *Volksschule's* general classroom teachers. In all these schools at the compulsory level the curriculum was revised, introducing more technical and “modern” subject matter (called *Realien*) in addition to the three Rs and religion.

Through these measures the 1869 law created a unitary, general, and public (state) elementary school open to all classes and faiths. It was also a “single ladder” system in the first four grades, after which a few pupils—albeit an important few—completed their compulsory education in other types of schools: in 1912-13, by which time 97.2 percent of all 6- to 14-year-olds in the territory of the later Austrian Republic were enrolled in some form of school, about 5 percent of these were attending *Burgerschulen* and less than 2 percent were in the lower division of a *Gymnasium* or other form of “elite” Middle School; all the rest were attending a *Volksschule*.

The preamble of the law also redefined the purpose of universal compulsory education:

The task of the elementary school is to afford the children a moral-religious education, to develop their intellectual powers, to provide them with the knowledge and skills necessary for further education for life, and to lay the foundation for the development of able men and women and members of the community.

Only in the reference to “moral-religious education” (*sittlich-religiöse Erziehung*) and in making religion a compulsory and “most important” subject in later articles—all, incidentally, carried over in the school laws of 1962 that are in effect in

Austria today—was there a compromise with the Austrian Conservatives and clergy and with the Pope. The latter had already protested the renewed separation of church and school and other related Liberal measures in a Secret Consistory on June 22, 1868, and in terms that Glöckel was to maintain were still the views of the Christian Social Party and many Austrian Catholics in the twentieth century:

A truly atrocious act was passed as a constitutional law by the Austrian government. By this law unconditional freedom of all opinion, of the press, of belief, of conscience and of instruction was established; citizens of each and every creed are permitted to set up institutions for instruction and education; all sorts of religious communities, of whatsoever kind, are now regarded as equal and are recognized by the state... Impelled by our responsibility for the Church, which the Lord has laid upon us, we raise our apostolic voice in this gathering and we condemn the said laws in general and in particular... By virtue of our said authority we declare these laws and their consequences to be wholly null and void, now and forever.⁵

Above the compulsory level the Imperial Public School Law provided for compulsory part-time (usually evening) vocational schools for apprentices, also a regulation still in effect in Austria today, and for a greater variety and number of secondary level technical and professional schools, some of which qualified their graduates for university entrance. All these were clearly and often explicitly responses to the demands for new skills and more professionally trained people generated by a modernizing and industrializing society and expressed by the expanding entrepreneurial and professional classes that were represented by the Liberal Party. The “Middle Schools,” heretofore primarily classical *Gymnasien* shifted back and forth between church and state control with changes in the political tide, underwent a corresponding diversification and for the same reasons. By 1914—still enrolling less than 2 percent of each age cohort and still almost the only route to the university—they included the traditional eight-year *Gymnasien* (more of which were now state rather than church schools), initially six-year and then seven-year *Realschulen*

with more science and less classics (since 1869 qualifying their graduates for entrance into university-level Technical High Schools), two types of eight-year *Realgymnasien* (established in 1908, with modern languages in place of classical Greek and with graduates entitled to enter either the university or a Technical High School), and both *lycées* and *Gymnasien* for girls (most founded around or after 1900 and initially little more than luxury “finishing schools” for daughters of the elite).

Finally, the new law also created four-year normal schools for the training of *Volksschule* teachers. The diplomas of such schools did not entitle graduates to go on to university or other postsecondary schools, a feature later attacked by Glöckel on both ideological and pedagogical grounds because it segregated *Volksschule* teachers socially and professionally as a “lower” category and tended to lock them into a lifetime of public elementary teaching from the time they entered a normal school, usually at the unripe age of 15. However, it was at least an improvement on the previous system, which had required only a six-week to one-year training course for elementary teachers.

Leopold Hasner, the Minister of Education at the time of its adoption and its principal author, divided the opponents of the Imperial Public School Law into three groups, whom he called “the autonomist nationalists, the realists, and the confessionalists.”⁶ The first group represented the non-German nationalities whose resistance to German domination first paralyzed and then helped to destroy the Empire; in a multinational state, they argued, all legislation concerning compulsory education except “the establishment of basic educational principles” should be left to the individual provinces and thus to the individual nations. The second resistance group claimed that Austrian society was not ready for such a law; as one of its representatives exclaimed in Parliament: “. . . the more highly developed the school system, the more criminals!” The third and in later and contemporary Austria most significant group argued that the reforms were not only profoundly anti-Catholic. They also violated the Liberals’ own purportedly liberal principles because, by making primary education compulsory, they deprived individual parents of freedom

to choose, and were a further violation of the sanctity of the family because they took children away from the home and “nationalized” them in state institutions.

Opposition from all three groups continued after the law was adopted and led to a perennial *Schulkampf*—an Austrian version of the *Kulturkampf* of the 1870s in Bismarck’s Germany—that lasted until and after the end of the Monarchy. Within four years of the law’s adoption, moreover, the great economic crisis of 1873, which was comparable in its severity and impact with that of 1929, was to strengthen the opposition’s hand by leading to the fall of the Liberal ministry (replaced in 1879 by Count Eduard von Taaffe and his “Iron Ring” of Slavs, clericals, and conservatives), the disintegration of the Liberal Party, and cuts in the state funds available for public education. Amendments to the Imperial Public School Law adopted in 1883 by a vote of 170 to 167 reflected these changes: the legal maximum number of pupils per teacher in public elementary schools was raised from 80 to 100; school authorities were authorized to grant partial exemption from attendance to parents who requested it for their children or to entire communities whose local governments requested it; female teachers were required to be celibate; and it was stipulated that each school’s principal must be of the same religion as the majority of the school’s pupils, which was almost invariably Catholic in the provinces of the later Austrian Republic. Subsequent efforts to secure further retreats from the 1869 system throughout the Austrian half of the Dual Monarchy foundered because of the Imperial Parliament’s increasing preoccupation with and immobilization by the National Question. At the local level, however, new challenges came after 1890 with the electoral triumphs of Karl Lueger’s clericalist, populist, and initially anticapitalist Christian Social Party in Lower Austria and Vienna and in other provinces.

It was at this point that the Monarchy’s last crisis, the World War, and the disintegration of the Empire intervened, bringing in their wake a small federal republic in which the Social Democrats were the largest party in the Constituent Assembly of 1919-20 and in Vienna from 1918 until the imposition of Christian Social

dictatorship in 1934. With the Social Democrats wherever they were thus in power—in the country as a whole for 18 months and in Vienna for 16 years—came Otto Glöckel and the school reform program of which he was the principal author and most passionate advocate.

The Making of a Socialist and School Reformer

Otto Glöckel, as he himself tells us in his autobiography,⁷ was virtually predestined to be a teacher. He was born on February 8, 1874, in a schoolhouse in Pottendorf, a small Lower Austrian market and cotton milling town 25 miles southeast of Vienna and near the pre-1914 frontier between the Austrian and Hungarian halves of the Hapsburg Empire. His father, a teacher in the Pottendorf *Burgerschule*, came from the other side of that frontier, from Sopron (Ödenburg), the principal town of the predominantly German part of Western Hungary that became the Austrian Burgenland in 1921. Otto's paternal grandfather had been a tinsmith with ambitions above his station for his two sons: both were sent to secondary school and the other became a Roman Catholic priest. The one who became a teacher married and began his career in a village near Sopron but moved to the Austrian part of the Empire, where the schools had just been secularized again by the legislation of 1868-69, to escape from the Hungarian system's continuing subordination to the Church and the Hungarian schoolteacher's consequent subordination to the parish priest. In the Pottendorf *Burgerschule* the Glöckel's modest two-room living quarters, which also served as a meeting place for the district teachers' association, were filled with teachers' manuals and the anticlerical literature of the Liberal Party that had sponsored the reforms of 1869. Their only surviving child grew up in this atmosphere, listening to pedagogical and political debates and to his father's reminiscences of the life of a teacher in Hungary, humiliated by ill-educated priests (not that teachers were then better educated) and by undignified adjunct duties as parish sacristan, standard duties in Hungary (and in Austria before 1869) that required him to toll the church bell, serve at mass, take the collection, and keep the sacristy in order.

As recorded in his autobiography, Otto's favorite childhood game was playing school, with

himself as the teacher. The only other career he seems ever to have contemplated, during a pre-puberty period of intense religiosity, was that of a priest, but a brutal and narrow-minded catechism teacher and closer acquaintance with priests during summer vacations at his uncle's vicarage in Hungary—both, on his own testimony, more influential in this respect than his father's anticlericalism—soon led him to change his mind.

He also enjoyed making speeches of other kinds, at imaginary political meetings, and at the age of 16 made his first real one (to his father's surprise and embarrassment) at a local Liberal Party rally honoring Engelbert Pernerstorfer, one of the founders of the Austrian Social Democratic Party in 1889. Pernerstorfer was impressed, told young Glöckel he was "needed in Vienna" as soon as he had finished his teachers' training studies in Wiener Neustadt, and promised to help him. Glöckel came and the promise was kept.

Vienna in the 1890s was marvelous and terrible, exciting and a place to despair. The rapid expansion of its industries and Imperial bureaucracies, begun in the *Grunderzeit* of the 1860s and temporarily stopped by the economic crisis of 1873, was in full swing again; the population, which had been 476,000 in 1857, would be more than 2 million by 1910. The great Ringstrasse and its monumental buildings—Staatsoper, Art and Natural History museums, new Hofburg, Parliament, Burgtheater, Rathaus, and University—were still new or under construction, and so were the working-class slums of the outer *Bezirke*. The Emperor in the Hofburg was old and his Empire a "ramshackle" multinational anachronism in an age of nation-states, but its capital was a magnet for the intellectual cream as well as the proletarian-peasant dregs of his polyglot dominions (Czechs alone provided 200,000 of its 2 million inhabitants by 1910). The sense of avant-garde youthfulness that pervaded Viennese cultural life was captured in the names given to esthetic movements like *Jung Wien* (Young Vienna) and to fashions in art, music, and architecture like the Secession movement and its close relations, the *Jugendstil* (Youth Style) and art nouveau, which had simultaneous fountainheads in Vienna, Berlin, and Paris but perhaps their greatest impact in Vienna. Conflicting cultures and classes

rubbed shoulders uneasily in the streets of the Hapsburg capital. Although their roots are disparate and earlier, both Zionism and anti-Semitism assumed their modern and at least in the latter case virulent forms here and at this period. Brand new mass political parties, all three of them founded by disillusioned young Liberals from the old party's radical wing, addressed each of the expanding classes in the name of conflicting ideologies and in increasingly strident tones: Viktor Adler's Social Democrats for the half-assimilated but still polyglot urban proletariat; Karl Lueger's populist-clerical and anti-Semitic Christian Socials for the "little people" of the German and Germanized-Czech petite bourgeoisie; and Georg Ritter von Schönerer's Pan-German Nationalists for the other middle classes and anyone else who was simultaneously anti-clerical, antisocialist, and anti-Semitic. The tensions, expectations, and vanities of this culturally heterogeneous social and political turbulence—uniquely characterized by a painful and distinctively Viennese dialectic between nineteenth century European optimism and peculiarly Austrian hopelessness—gave the city's late-Hapsburg intellectual flowering its shape and its genius, producing writers like Schnitzler, Zweig, Rilke, Hofmannsthal, and Kraus to describe them (each in his own way and from different perspectives); original thinkers like Freud, Wittgenstein, and Kelsen to analyze and prescribe for their psychological, linguistic-logical, and legal-constitutional aspects; and Strauss and the *Heurigen* of the Vienna Woods and vineyards to provide distraction and therapy.⁸

In September 1892, armed with the title of "Provisional Junior Teacher" and at age 18 the youngest teacher in the city school system, Glöckel took up residence in this Vienna and reported for work. His first charges were 60 13- and 14-year-olds, two-thirds of them grade-repeaters, in a fourth grade class in a new and desolate working-class slum in the 14th *Bezirk*, not far from the Imperial palace of Schönbrunn. His descriptions of his experiences during his five years there are Dickensian images of early urban capitalism: barefoot pupils with empty stomachs and his own misery when he had to distribute only half as many private charity vouchers as he had pupils for hot lunches of cheap vegetable soup at a

local *Gasthaus* full of unemployed drunks; pupils who saw no future for themselves and who attended school only when foul weather drove them in off the streets; still others or the same who regularly slept through class, making him fear he was a poor teacher until he discovered that they had worked most of the night as bowling-boys or had been up before dawn to deliver milk and bread to shops. All this and his own situation—junior teachers in state primary schools were at the poverty end of an impoverished profession enjoying little social prestige—was bad enough in itself and initially a shock for a young man who had grown up in the relatively benign conditions that characterize rural poverty and who had come to Vienna with romantic illusions about "the city of dreams." But to drive the lesson home, there was also the contrast to his slum school that he encountered in observation and practice teaching at the experimental school attached to the Vienna *Pedagogium*, an institute for the part-time further training of young teachers that had been founded as part of the educational reforms of the 1860s and that Glöckel himself was to refound in the 1920s as a distinguished university-level teacher-training institution and important part of his reforms. Here, instead of barefoot, hungry, work-weary grade-repeaters condemned to the *Lumpenproletariat*, the pupils were the well-clothed, well-fed, self-confident, and well-prepared children of the Viennese bourgeoisie, full of energy and a pleasure to teach because of their eagerness to learn and ability to do so. This, he reflected, was the way all pupils and all schools should be.

These experiences completed Glöckel's own education and his drift toward the new Social Democratic Party, which he joined in 1894 at age 20. That same year he also became a member of a political association of junior teachers called "The Young Ones" (*Die Jungen*), which had grown out of a self-help movement organized in 1892 by a small group that included Karl Seitz, a life-long friend who was to be first Head of State of the Austrian Republic in 1919-20, Mayor of Vienna from 1923 to 1934, and a leading figure of Austrian Socialism until his death in 1950. The *Jungen* were soon directly engaged in politics and in opposition to Karl Lueger and his Christian Social Party, who won an absolute majority in the

1895 elections to the Vienna City Council. The following year, partly in response to the threat to the secular state school that seemed to be posed by this Christian Social victory, the *Jungen* and like-minded groups of Liberal and other "progressive" teachers founded a Central Organization of Viennese Teachers, which won its own first victory in elections for teachers' representatives on the Vienna District School Board in 1897. Lueger had at last been installed as Mayor of Vienna by the repeated re-election of the man he called "the rabble-rouser" because he feared the populism of the Christian Socials until he discovered that theirs was really a happy combination of loyal social conservatism and mass appeal. As soon as he was in office the new Mayor responded to the challenge from the Central Organization by summarily dismissing five junior teachers whom he considered ringleaders of the movement. One of them was Otto Glöckel. He was never again to be a classroom teacher, but the notoriety in Social Democratic circles that came his way as a result of his dismissal provided the basis for another and lifetime career as party politician and school reformer. By 1907, when he was elected to the Imperial Parliament from a German district in Bohemia in the first Austrian elections held under universal manhood suffrage, he had become the principal draftsman and spokesman for the party's ideas about education.

The School Program of the *Jungen*

The first comprehensive statement of the philosophy and demands that Glöckel helped to formulate, and that were to be incorporated in subsequent Social Democratic Party platforms and in the Austrian and Viennese school reforms of the 1920s, was a manifesto entitled "The School Program of the *Jungen*." Adopted at a congress of the movement in April 1898, it begins with a critical analysis of the existing system that included aspects of a more general social criticism:

Society founds and maintains universities, academies, clinics and observatories. Laboratories, meteorological stations, libraries and museums owe their existence to society. Through society learned people are offered opportunities and means to carry out research into nature and man in the farthest parts of the world. Everyone,

even the most modest member of society, is thus obliged to contribute his labor or his means to the work of researchers. What modern science and art boast of as their accomplishments can therefore only have been created through the collective effort of all of humanity.

It follows that the totality of human knowledge belongs to all of humanity. The "School Program of the *Jungen*" therefore demanded that the education system recognize this fact, that through free and universal education every human being must be assured the right to that portion of this common intellectual property that his abilities and inclinations prompt him to acquire. In return society has the right to demand that every normally endowed individual acquire at least the minimum of education necessary to enable him to contribute to the common welfare. But this was not now the case: "Despite these facts, the knowledge that is the product of the collective labor of mankind is not available to everyone." The poor are denied access to it, but they are not the only ones who suffer:

Even the lucky children of the rich, who command the necessary means, cannot fully and naturally develop their talents because teaching staff frequently do not have the appropriate education and never have the necessary free time, to bring up their pupils to be openminded human beings [vorurteilslose Menschen, a frequently reiterated central concept and goal of the Austrian school reform movement from that time on]. Instead the prevailing regime and the dominant creed constrain them to indoctrinate youth with certain moral, religious, and political viewpoints. These differ to some degree, to be sure, in different countries, in accordance with prevailing political, national and religious circumstances, but in general they conform to the interests of the ruling propertied classes. [Moreover], the fact that science is placed in the service of the ruling classes and that under our educational system a higher education is possible only for the rich, while the great masses of the poor are condemned to be uneducated, intensifies class contrasts through contrasting education. The class conflicts to which our society is doomed cannot be evaded; but if we wish to moderate them so far as possible, the

school must offer an equal education to rich and poor, an education determined solely by the individual's personal capacities, and this education must have no ideological or political bias.

On the basis of this analysis—incidentally characteristic of Austro-Marxism's usually non-revolutionary style—the manifesto made a series of specific demands:

A. To insure every person the acquisition of knowledge appropriate to his abilities:

1. The creation and maintenance by the state of the necessary kindergartens and crèches as well as the necessary elementary, vocational, continuing education, and high schools and universities, in such fashion that they are open to both sexes.

2. Prohibition of child labor.

3. Free instruction and instructional materials in all teaching institutions.

4. Completely free maintenance for pupils in financially straitened circumstances.

5. Complete separation of school and church.

6. General School legislation by a parliament based on universal, equal and direct franchise.

7. As the supreme school authority an Imperial school board, in which teachers and physicians will be represented through professional colleagues elected by themselves, but with the majority elected by and from the population through a universal, equal, direct and secret ballot. Analogously organized provincial, district, and local school boards as lower level authorities.

8. Limit of 30 pupils in each class.

9. Liquidation of one-room schools.

10. Solid teacher training.

B. To insure to the state a population with the necessary minimum education:

11. At least eight years of compulsory instruction in the necessary secular subjects—and only in

these, which should include ethics and morals.

C. to insure the independence of the school and the teachers from all classes, creeds, and parties:

12. Equal and dignified income (salary and pension) for teachers by the state, while guaranteeing the right of communities and provinces to invest additional funds for the promotion of education.

13. Disciplinary procedures for teaching personnel on the basis of a law which corresponds to modern legal principles.

14. Election of school inspectors and principals by the teaching personnel of the inspection district or the school.

15. First engagement of teachers according to the order in which they have applied and later increases in income on the basis of seniority.

16. Public notification of desired qualifications.

17. Complete freedom of pedagogical method.⁹

The principal authors of the School Program of the *Jungen* were Karl Seitz and Otto Glöckel. Twenty-one years later Seitz was the Head of State of the Austrian Republic (as President of the Constituent National Assembly from March 1919 to December 1920) and Glöckel was in charge of the country's school system as State Under-Secretary for Education. The Social Democratic Party had won a plurality in the new Republic's first general election (on February 16, 1919) and was the senior partner in a coalition government of six Social Democrats, five Christian Socials, and four independents, with a Social Democrat, Karl Renner, as State Chancellor. The country was in desperate straits in the aftermath of war, defeat, and the disintegration of the Empire, and even the survival of the state was in doubt—the widespread desire for union with Germany, supported by the Social Democrats as eagerly as by the Pan-Germans, had been vetoed by the country's conquerors assembled in Paris, Vienna was starving despite American emergency relief, and Communist republics had been proclaimed beyond two of Austria's still uncertain frontiers, in Bavaria and Hungary. It was nevertheless a politi-

cally appropriate moment for Austria's Social Democrats to begin implementing the program of school reforms that they had been advocating since the 1890s. Glöckel, who had launched the campaign (and his own candidacy to lead it) with a censorship-defying speech before a mass audience in wartime and still Imperial Vienna in January 1917, restated the goals of the reform in reports presented to the Constituent Assembly at quarterly intervals beginning in April 1919, and in an article entitled "School Reform and Popular Education in the Republic," which was published in late 1919 in *12.November*, a new Socialist journal named for the founding date of the Republic.¹⁰

Some points had been refined since the School Program of the *Jungen*, and in his 1917 speech and 1919 proposals Glöckel had found a specific device for the elimination of "educational privilege" and a giant step toward what would later be called "equality of opportunity" (*Chancengleichheit*). Glöckel's term for this device was the *Einheitsschule*, translated as "Universal Single-Ladder School" by Ernst Papanek,¹¹ but conceptually the same as today's highly controversial *Gesamtschule*, which is commonly translated as "comprehensive school." A junior high school for all 10- to 14-year-olds, its purpose was to eliminate the segregation of that group in three types of schools—the lower-level of the *Gymnasien* and other Middle Schools of the upper classes, the *Burgerschulen* of the urban middle classes, and the upper-level *Volksschulen* for the rest—which Glöckel and the Social Democrats considered the root of most of Austria's social evils.

On this point and in general the principal argument that Glöckel advanced—apparently overlooking the fact that many of his proposals for curriculum, textbook, classroom, and methodological reforms were or could be made to appear apolitical, nonideological, and "purely" pedagogical—concerned the purportedly class-biased and antidemocratic nature of the existing system. "In all times," he wrote for *12.November*, "those who rule have understood how to secure their rule by keeping the broad masses of the people as uncultured as possible, creating for themselves an educational privilege." What education the masses receive is designed to socialize them as

obedient subordinates; thus, for example, the emphasis on "the glorious Ruling House" in the elementary textbooks of old Austria (which Glöckel's Reform Division was already in the process of revising) and the deliberate mimicking of the military ethos in school architecture, classroom interiors, and schedules of rules governing pupil behavior and pupil-teacher relations. In addition, "the whole existing organization of the schools was based on the idea that proletarian youth should be separated from the children of the propertied classes as soon as possible." Such a separation at age ten he called "the bulwark of Absolutism." To this his answer was the *Einheitsschule* for the first 8 grades, to age 14, with a uniform but broadened and "modernized" curriculum which should include things like stenography as an elective, compulsory physical education for girls as well as boys, and training in manual arts for all. After that some would go on to a higher-level secondary school that would prepare them for university entrance, others to a variety of technical and professional training schools that would prepare them for places in society's middle ranks, and the rest to briefer vocational training schools, including part-time schools for apprentices.

It should be noted that this plan does not reveal opposition to "elite" schools per se, even in the form of the notorious *Gymnasium*, as long as entrance is based on talent rather than class origin. On the contrary, one of Glöckel's first innovations, which was to survive with ideologically revealing modifications through the Austro-Fascist and Nazi regimes and the Second Republic, was to create more of them, but with a difference. These, opened in October 1919 and called *Bundeserziehungsanstalten* (Federal Educational Institutions), were established with some piquancy in three former military academies and, for girls, in two former finishing schools for daughters of the aristocracy and of officers. (Glöckel also intended to establish another one in—of all places!—the Theresianum, which was and is the ultimate snob school of the country, its Eton-plus, but in this he was frustrated.) The *Bundeserziehungsanstalten* were free, full-scholarship boarding schools, with a curriculum emphasizing modern languages and science and admission based on a highly competitive exami-

nation and on need defined as either financial or because of geographic remoteness from an equivalent school; the pupils were thus predominantly of working and lower middle class or rural origin. Although Glöckel eschewed the term *Begabenschulen* (Schools for the Gifted), used for similar schools in Germany which were his model, this is precisely what they were meant to be. Under the Nazi regime after 1938, ironically, they and their elite function were maintained, but to different ends: they were taken over by the SS!²

In this and many other aspects of their program the educational ideology of Austria's Social Democrats was in essence a logical continuation and extension of the educational philosophy and aspirations of Austro-German Liberalism that had been formulated at the time of the Revolution of 1848, anathematized under Absolutism in the 1850s, promulgated as law in 1868-69, and partly reversed after 1876. All three of Austria's modern political parties after 1880 were the children of Liberalism, founded by former Liberals. Each inherited or reacted to various aspects of the liberal program in different mixes, but in educational reform—as Max Adler, the ideologue of Austro-Marxism's left wing, commented at the time¹³—Austria's Marxist party was Liberalism's truest spiritual heir and executor.

A New School for a New Society and Values: Glöckel's Philosophy and Goals

Glöckel's own most mature and concise description of the goals of his reforms and the philosophy of education and society on which they were based is found in a short book, entitled *Drill-schule Lernschule Arbeitsschule*, which he published in 1928. For eight years his reforms had stagnated or been reversed almost everywhere beyond the boundaries of the City and Province of Vienna. The Federal Government and those of all the other federal provinces were in the hands of the "bourgeois" parties—Christian Social, Pan German, and Peasant League (the *Landbund*, a second clericalist party later to be absorbed by its senior partner) in a variety of coalitions. All were under the alternately direct and behind-the-scenes domination of Monsignor Ignaz Seipel, the leader of the Christian Socials, a frequent Federal Chancellor, and an intensely conservative prelate who had transmogrified the Social Democratic

Party and its leader, Otto Bauer, into a Marxist anti-Christ, with himself as a viceroy of God's Kingdom on Earth and anti-Christ's last and best opponent in "the navel of the world" that had once been the Hapsburgs' Holy Roman Empire. In Vienna, however, with its considerable autonomy and solid Social Democratic majority (which grew from 54.1 percent in the elections of 1919 to 59 percent in those of 1934), and with Mayor Seitz as ex officio President and Glöckel as Acting Second President of a powerful City School Board, the school reform lived, prospered, and drew educators from around the world to observe its virtues. In education as in other areas, Austrian socialism, frustrated in the rest of the country, was creating a Viennese model in microcosm for what Bauer—as apocalyptic and megalomaniac as Seipel—foresaw as the future of Austria and mankind.

In this context Glöckel described and published his own vision-becoming-reality of what he called the "work school," which was to be the social-democratic successor to the "drill school" of clericalist Absolutism and the "learning school" of capitalist Liberalism. His interpretation constituted an extended version and particular application—less "ideological" than those of fellow Austro-Marxists like Max Adler and Otto Bauer¹⁴—of the definition of the social and political function of the European school since the Enlightenment offered by Douglas Skopp in his study of the elementary school in midnineteenth-century Germany:¹⁵

In this regard, educational experiences provide the training grounds for society, and at the same time, a prism of society itself...In some traditional cultural situations—for example, one dominated by an authoritarian, religiously orthodox value structure—the teacher may represent the king, the pupils his subjects; school lessons are social tasks, and the threat of corporal punishment or the reward of good "grades" are a veiled substitution for a primitive economy and judicial structure. In an egalitarian, rationalistic social milieu—for example, a participatory democracy—schooling may seek to break down class distinctions between teacher and pupil; individual differences of the pupils may be accentuated with little concern that the group's cohe-

sion or submissiveness will be eroded; the rewards and/or punishments pass from the realm of reinforcing discipline to the area of reinforcing individual accomplishments and enterprise.

After an introductory section singing the praises of the Vienna school reform and castigating the Christian Socials, who were accused of undoing the reform “wherever they hold the school under their dictation,” Glöckel declares the purpose of his essay in a restatement of views he had been expressing for a decade:

Here it will be shown how the school has always depended on political and economic power relationships, how the school as a socializing institution is at any time used to reinforce existing power relationships...It will be suggested that every school-reforming development must of natural necessity develop out of the economic, cultural, and political development of a state [Italics in the original].... To be sure, the tempo of school transformation varies, for it depends on knowing about and adapting new materials, on the willingness of public bodies to make sacrifices, and especially on a strong political party that commits itself totally to innovation.

In present-day Austria that party is of course the Social Democratic Party, and Glöckel notes that it is “no coincidence” that the Austrian social-democratic workers’ movement, which Viktor Adler united to form the party in 1889, had had its origins in workers’ *educational* associations founded as a concomitant of rapid industrialization in the midnineteenth century. However, power relations were not then ripe for the changes that the workers’ movement was demanding, and so the Austrian school system had to pass through two other stages that conformed to relations as they were.

The first of these stages, which Glöckel calls “the drill school,” was the school of the Concordat of 1855, “the school that our fathers attended.” It was under the Church and existed for the Church and for order as defined by an alliance of Crown and clergy. It offered what that order required, namely the “four Rs” or a little reading, writing, and arithmetic—and a lot of religion. These were “whipped into” the pupils by teachers whose real

function was that of drill sergeants and who were therefore required, if they were civilians and not clergy, to have no more than six weeks to one year of teacher-training. In Glöckel’s view it was a modified version of this type of school that the Christian Socials of his own time would like to restore.

But the drill school was overtaken and rendered obsolete by industrialization and its different requirements. The result was the “new school” that was created by the Imperial Public School Law of 1869, “the learning school.” This was indeed the school system that the times and changing power relationships demanded, and Glöckel counted off the social classes and their corresponding school types:

- Government was still government primarily by aristocracy, but to govern efficiently in a more complex world young aristocrats needed to know more than their fathers; for this there was the Theresianum, the elite school of elite schools in which the untitled were extraordinarily uncommon.

- The Army needed modern, technically trained officers, and so special officers’ academies were created.

- Modern government and modern industry needed better trained and ever more middle-rank officials, preferably drawn from the ranks of the upper and middle bourgeoisie; so more and different kinds of Middle Schools were created, in principle open to all who demonstrated the requisite talent but in practice and through deliberately high tuition and other charges largely restricted to middle class children. (As proof Glöckel notes that even in 1925 and in Vienna there was one Middle School pupil for every 2.7 children in that age group living in middle class districts of the city but only one for every 22, some of them also middle class, in predominantly working-class districts.)

- Those in charge of this society also wanted highly skilled workers and small businessmen; so they also created the *Burgerschule*, “for its time a good school that offered a higher education—but not too much of it,” a limit proved by regulations

that made it impossible to transfer from a *Burgerschule* to an upper-division Middle School.

- And finally, “for ‘ordinary’ people,” who also needed a certain basic education to become obedient and useful subjects, a new *Volksschule*, “an extraordinary advance over the Concordat school,” was created in 1869. This was “the school that we attended,” and Glöckel reminded his readers of its grimness and inadequacies despite its admitted virtues of improved curriculum, basic secularization, and universality in the first four years: the teacher was enthroned as a symbol of authority on his podium at a higher level than the pupils, who sat mutely facing him on long benches, subject to quasimilitary discipline (“hands on the desk!” “no talking except when addressed by the teacher!”), receiving instruction—therefore a “learning school”—that was forced on them unimaginationally, in precisely determined daily doses to be memorized and repeated uncritically and with equal lack of imagination. Parents were not involved or even welcome inside the school except when summoned to hear judgment, but the school’s mission and world, unconcerned with the living and cultural conditions of the streets and homes to which the pupils returned, also stopped at the school door. The Church too, was still omnipresent, despite the intent of those who created the system. School life was thus dominated by stern rules, a stern grading system, and (illegally) compulsory attendance at mass, religious processions, confession, and communion.

Then came the war, the collapse of the existing order, revolution, and a democratic republic. The way was open for another phase, one anticipated for centuries by philosophers and pedagogues like Comenius, Rousseau, Fichte, Pestalozzi, and Fröbel (a significantly selective list of mentors whom Glöckel had cited in earlier writings as well). This was the “work school,” so called because here education would be the product of the active and imaginative engagement of pupils building on what they already knew and guided rather than drilled or taught by their teachers. It was a system based on recognition that in a democratic state of equal and equally participant citizens “it is in the state’s interest that youth, the future citizens, should have the most intensive

possible education leading to an independent ability to judge and make choices.” To these ends the school, beginning with the elementary school, must be subjected to both “external” (organizational) and “internal” (methodological and curricular) reforms.

The centerpiece of the “external” reform must be the creation of a comprehensive school (*Einheitsschule* in Glöckel’s terminology) for co-education of sexes and social classes with a common, uniform curriculum up to age 15—the only way to abolish “educational privilege” based on class, to encourage the full development of intelligence and talent wherever it might be found, and to eliminate the personal, social, and economic costs of premature “selecting out” at age 10 under the old system. As originally foreseen and in fact tested in 253 experimental classes since 1919-20, the new system would begin, for the 8 years of legally compulsory schooling, with a 4-year *Volksschule* followed by a 4-year *Allgemeine Mittelschule* (General Middle School), a kind of amalgam of the existing *Burgerschule* and lower division Middle School in which pupils would be divided by ability, on a semester-to-semester basis, into a First and Second Stream. First Stream graduates of a General Middle School would be entitled to go on either to an *Oberschule* (Upper School, corresponding to the four-year upper division of the existing Middle Schools) or to technical or professional schools. Second Stream pupils would proceed to a lower technical school or to the already existing compulsory part-time vocational schools for apprentices.

Achieving all this would also require a reform of teacher training, providing all teachers with a minimum of two years of “university-level” preparation and thus eliminating the ironclad division between the preparation and status of a *Volksschule* teacher (trained in a secondary-school-level pedagogical institute and therefore strong on methodology but weak in general and subject-matter knowledge) and a Middle School one (trained in a Middle School and university and therefore strong in general and subject knowledge but with no pedagogical theory or experience). Other measures, such as the organization of active Parents’ Associations in each school and class, larger and more broadly representative school

boards, and pupil as well as parent participation in school governance above the *Volksschule* level, were designed to break down the barriers between the school and the outer world of home and society.

As for the “internal” reforms, they should be based on three principles, which Glöckel had described as early as 1919 in his reports to Parliament as Undersecretary for Education. These were *Arbeitsunterricht* (sometimes termed *Selbsttätigkeit*: the active rather than passive participation of pupils in the educational process), *Bodenständigkeit* (instruction based on and moving out from the child’s immediate environment and prior experience), and *Gesamtunterricht* (no strict division of subjects and hours but a focusing of all subjects of instruction—from language and mathematics to art and music—on a logical series of “self-evidently relevant” central topics). To these ends even the design of the classroom and the locale of learning—as well as curriculum, textbooks, methods, and teacher training—must be changed. In place of podium and benches in a stark, “military” room there should be informal groups of pupils around tables in a “homelike” atmosphere, and the teacher should stand or sit in the midst of the pupils and at their level. Whenever the topic of instruction makes it appropriate, the class should move outdoors to observe and learn through a *Lehrausgang*—a “learning outing,” already a principal target of scorn for those who thought that the reforms were debasing education but one of Glöckel’s favorite and in fact permanent innovations, enthusiastically accepted today even by Catholic private schools.

In all of this, from philosophical underpinnings to curricular and classroom innovations, Glöckel and his colleagues owed much to what was then, as it is today, in effect “an international ideology of educational reform.”¹⁶ Glöckel’s own list of prestigious historical mentors has already been mentioned. Ernst Papanek, one of several Glöckel associates who were to carry the message of his reforms with them into exile to America or Western Europe after 1934 and 1938 (or through even earlier emigration, as in the case of Papanek’s fellow-psychologist Alfred Adler), has provided us with a more comprehensive and con-

temporary list of those whose ideas or models he found reflected in the Austrian reforms of the 1920s. Papanek’s nominations include Ellen Kay of Sweden, who proclaimed the “Century of the Child” in 1900; Ovid Decroly of Belgium, who advocated a “school workshop” based on “individual self-activity” in place of the traditional classroom; John Dewey of the United States, from whom Papanek says the Austrians accepted the concept of “education as a constant function” and the idea that “acquisition of skills, possession of knowledge, attainment of culture are not ends; they are marks of growth and means to its continuing”; William H. Kilpatrick, also of the United States, and his “education for a changing civilization”; Georg Kerschensteiner of Munich for the concept of the *Arbeitsschule*; the “Jena plan” from the Weimar Republic with its *Wohnstube* (living room) school; Berthold Otto, also of Germany, whose “school of the future” was based on Glöckel-like ideas of *Gesamtunterricht* and *Bodenständigkeit*; the psychological insights and prescriptions of Wilhelm Windt and William Stern (Germany), Jean Piaget and Heinrich Hauselmann (Switzerland), and Stanley Hall (United States); and others.¹⁷ Some of these might more aptly be described as fellow-discoverers rather than influences, since there is some indication that their ideas became known or at least popular in Austria only after Glöckel’s reforms were fully formulated (for example, I have found no reference to Dewey in Glöckel’s own writings or the earlier works of his associates, and the earliest acquisitions of Dewey’s books by the *Pädagogisches Zentralbücherei* in Vienna, a basic repository, date from the end of the 1920s), but the international quality of a reform is confirmed by serendipity as well as by imitation. What was original here, making Vienna a place of pilgrimage for other school reformers in the 1920s, was the Viennese “model” of systematic implementation of a more widely advocated set of “modernizing” and “democratizing” school reforms. And what marred the consistency and completion of that implementation, even before it was halted and largely reversed after the political coup d’état of 1934, was conflict and deadlock between reformers and their reforms on the one hand and the balance of political and social forces and attendant cultural and political values on the other.

The *Schulkampf* in the First Republic

In October 1920, when the Social Democrats went into opposition, Glöckel moved from the Ministry of Education on the Minoritenplatz to the palace next to Parliament on the nearby Ringstrasse that he had virtually commandeered (typical Glöckel!) for the Vienna City School Board that he was now to head and that was upgraded in authority by Vienna's elevation to the status of a federal province in 1921 and a reorganization of the administration of the city-province in 1922. The foundations for country-wide school reform had been laid during his 18 months at the Minoritenplatz. The Ministry itself had been "professionalized" without altering its existing structure or most of its personnel—a politically tactful strategy in an unstable coalition government—by introducing a team of experienced teachers, school administrators, and psychologists (these last primarily but not exclusively from Alfred Adler's school) to work in tandem with existing officials, most of whom had legal rather than educational backgrounds. Of equal or greater importance was a newly created School Reform Division of the Ministry, comprised of 32 dedicated pedagogical theorists. As Papanek notes, the 32 members of the Division were divided into 4 groups: Glöckel's own co-workers and followers, mostly Social Democrats and Liberals; basically apolitical school reformers drawn largely from the Christian Social and Pan-German Nationalist camps; Catholic educators willing to cooperate if the reform did not infringe too much on the prerogatives of the Church; and moderate Nationalists committed to the full separation of Church and school and to the realization of their party's ideas concerning the teaching of German language and literature and physical education.¹⁸ Such a mixture was also an astute move. Not only did it engage all three political camps in the preparation of the reform, making it more likely that the results would be accepted, but professional solidarity and bias tended to triumph over differing ideologies within the Reform Division, at least in the early years.¹⁹

Paralleling these organizational measures came a remarkably rapid-fire series of ministerial decrees and orders affecting every aspect of the school system. The Middle Schools were made co-educational, and women were ordered admitted to

all university faculties (they were previously admitted only to the Philosophical and Medical faculties, and even here with some restrictions). Compulsory pupil participation in religious functions was prohibited. The *Bundeserziehungsanstalten* were created. Regulations adopted in 1883 regarding the religion of school principals, the celibacy of women teachers, and partial exemptions from compulsory education were rescinded. Transfer from *Burgerschulen* to the upper level of the Middle Schools was facilitated, and the system of pupil evaluation was provisionally reformed, introducing written descriptions of pupil progress in place of grades. The organization of Parents' Associations was facilitated and encouraged. Textbook revision for "a democratic republic" was begun, and a new *Volksschule* curriculum—based on Glöckel's three principles, drafted by the School Reform Division, and accepted by all three Austrian Chambers of Teachers—was introduced on a trial basis during the 1920-21 school year, after which it was to become permanent.²⁰

This, however, was as far as Glöckel and his associates could go within the framework of the Imperial Public School Law of 1869, which was still in force. In May 1920 the School Reform Division issued a set of "Guiding Principles" for a more complete reform, including the *Einheitschule* for 10- to 14-year-olds, but most of their proposals remained on paper. The Constitution of the new Republic, adopted that summer, provided that basic legislation in certain fields, including education, must be passed by a two-third majority of the Federal Parliament—in effect meaning that Social Democrats and Christian Socials must agree—and that all nine federal provinces must concur before some types of reforms could be instituted. More important at the moment than these provisions, whose main impact came later when they prevented a Christian Social parliamentary plurality from undoing most of Glöckel's reforms and much of the 1869 law as well, the coalition and Austrian society were by then in the process of fissuring along increasingly rigid and eventually bitterly antagonistic ideological lines. Glöckel's School Reform Division continued to operate after his departure and to issue proposals, but it, too, was gradually penetrated by the prevailing atmosphere of increasingly intransigent

antagonism between the Marxist and “bourgeois” camps. In any case, a series of Christian Social Ministers of Education, including some who were personally sympathetic to many purely methodological aspects of the reform program but could not stomach its ideological decorations, were a guarantee that no recommendations that had Social Democratic endorsement would be implemented if it could be avoided. One of the first measures taken by the first of these ministers at the end of 1920, was to decree that the new *Volksschule* curriculum should remain “provisional” and on trial for another five years.

In these circumstances the new Austria’s *Schulkampf*, like the rest of the First Republic’s political life, became a continuous struggle between “Red” Vienna and a “Black”-dominated Federal government, symbolized on the educational front by the Ministry on the Minoritenplatz and the City School Board’s palace on the Ring as opposing citadels separated only by the Heldenplatz and the Volksgarten—the Heroes’ Square with its Imperial monuments and the People’s Garden of the new democracy. The City School Board exploited the limits of the powers granted it by the Constitution and existing laws and by the federal nature of the Republic; this meant almost full control of elementary education and lower secondary compulsory schools (*Pflichtschulen*) and the Vienna Pedagogical Institute (which became internationally famous in this period, counting many of the great names of the early post-Hapsburg Viennese intellectual flowering among its lecturers²¹), partial authority over secondary schools, and no say over the University and post-secondary education generally. The Federal government sought, with fluctuating degrees of earnestness, to limit all of the telic and some of the methodological-pedagogical reforms initiated by the City School Board. As for the dominant force in successive Federal governments, Seipel’s Christian Social Party, its school policies seemed to the other camps to be a faithful if more cautious reflection of the principles that were proclaimed by Austria’s Catholic bishops in a Lenten letter of 1922, which incidentally paid Glöckel the compliment of attempting to capture and redefine two of his pet concepts and slogans:

... *This highest goal of education [to educate the children in accordance with the teachings on faith*

and morals of Jesus Christ] will be fulfilled for Catholic children only if the school has a clearly confessional character, that is, if children of the Catholic creed or the Catholic denomination [des katolischen Glaubensbekenntnisses oder der katolischen Konfession] are instructed and brought up in their own schools, separated as far as possible from children of other faiths. This, however, is only possible when the teaching personnel also belong to the same Catholic faith and are prepared for the teaching profession in their own confessional teacher-training institutions.

Beyond this, the confessional, moral-religious character of the school requires that the teaching of religion should not be confined to a brief instruction period of a few weeks like an ordinary subject, but that the religious spirit should dominate the entire curriculum, which means also the secular subjects—that religion as a dominating idea should inspire and give life to all educational measures, so that everything will be seen to be concentrated and gathered together around the great religious idea, like a sun in the center of the universe.

This would, in addition, be the best way to realize the ideal of the modern Einheitsschule and to give the ideal of Gesamtunterricht a concentric and complete shape.

It would be particularly irreconcilable with the religious-moral character of the confessional school if principles and teachings that are incompatible with Catholic teachings about faith and morals were to be represented in any kind of textbook or by any teacher; for this reason the church as the highest religious-moral authority lays claim to the right of independent supervisory authority over the school in these matters, without thereby superseding and taking precedence over secular or state supervision.

The Christian Social Party Program of 1926 declared its allegiance to the ideal of the confessional school, although it also recognized the untouchability of existing laws by specifically demanding only autonomy and state subventions for private schools.

Another plank in the Program’s educational platform was equally significant: “The Christian

Social Party demands a school system that corresponds in its divisions and stages to the educational requirements of the various occupational classes [*Berufsstände*] and the special characteristics of the various fields they represent. It should also, however, be a unitary system based on religion and nationality [*Volkstum*].” What the first part of this demand apparently signified was given more radical expression in the election platform published in 1930 by the then semi-autonomous right wing of the Christian Social camp, Prince Starhemberg’s *Heimatblock*:

Every year new Middle Schools are built and every county town demands its own Gymnasium, all in order to strip the countryside of its best brains and stuff the overfilled city with an intellectual proletariat.... As in all sectors so in this sector we demand that the state operate in a planned way. The state must first determine the size of its yearly requirement for doctors, lawyers, officials, and engineers, the size of its need for farmers, skilled workers, salespeople, and craftsmen. And on this basis the state should apportion it means (anyone may learn whatever he wants, but at his own expense and not that of the state).²²

In the face of such conflicting programs and values bitterness increased and readiness to compromise decreased on both sides with the passing years. Attacks on Glöckel and the Viennese reforms by Christian Social politicians and newspapers became increasingly strident: the reforms were making pupils into guinea pigs for Marxist experiments; the new schools had no discipline; *Gesamtunterricht* and the abolition of centrally-dictated hourly subject schedules in the *Volksschule* meant unplanned instruction; the three Rs were no longer being taught; “instead of sitting in school, teachers and pupils take strolls!”; sex education, another Glöckel curriculum innovation, was a deliberate undermining of morality and hence society by Marxists bent on revolution (one cartoon, showing teen-age girls holding illegitimate babies and boys in a ward for venereal diseases, was labeled “fruits of the school reform”); religion and God were being driven out of the school by Marxist atheists; and the new curriculum was designed to make Socialists out of all Austrian children. Glöckel’s answers, point for point, were hardly less strident and certainly not less ideological.²³

Complete intransigence was nevertheless impossible on either side and for several reasons. The Constitution, with its two-third rule for the passage of federal legislation affecting education and its division of powers between Federation and provinces, made some degree of cooperation unavoidable if anything was to be done, including funding. There was also the ambivalent position of the Pan-German Party, simultaneously in coalition with the Christian Social Party in Seipel’s anti-Marxist “bourgeois bloc” (*Bürgerblock*) but opposed to the Christian Socials and allied with the Social Democrats whenever the Church’s role in education was in question. The fate of the schools of the Burgenland, where Glöckel’s father had begun his teaching career, provided a case in point. Because the Burgenland had been part of Hungary in 1869, the Imperial Public School Law had never applied there, and so the schools remained subject to pre-1918 Hungarian regulations—i.e., under the Church—when and after the district became part of Austria in 1921. In the following years coalitions of Social Democrats and Pan-Germans in the Burgenland provincial parliament repeatedly called for the extension of the 1869 laws to their province. This, however, required sanction by a two-third majority of the Federal Parliament in Vienna, where an enabling act was repeatedly proposed by the Social Democrats but was never adopted because there the same Pan-German Party, mindful of its junior status in coalition with the Christian Socials, joined the latter in voting against it. The Burgenland thus continued to have a separate, Hungarian school system throughout the life of the First Austrian Republic.²⁴

Of equal importance (and otherwise indicative of Glöckel’s success in winning popular support for his program among parents as well as teachers), the citizenry of Vienna, seat of the Federal government and with nearly one-third of the country’s population, proved their readiness to take to the streets in support of their school system by doing so—reportedly 100,000 strong—in June 1926. The provocation was provided by ministerial decrees, issued by the Christian Social Minister of Education under pressure from others in his party, which violated a recent compromise agreement between the Ministry and the City School Board by altering the elementary school

curriculum and ordering the abandonment of experimental classes in the city's secondary schools. A government crisis ensued and the Minister resigned—his replacement and the City School Board's new negotiating partner, ironically, was Anton Rintelen, who was to be sentenced to life imprisonment by the clericalist dictatorship of the 1930s for his leading role in the abortive Nazi Putsch of 1934. After a month of negotiations the decrees were rescinded, the Vienna curriculum was confirmed, and autonomous control of elementary education by Vienna and other "cities with their own statutes" (most also under Social Democratic control) was reaffirmed.²⁵

The next year, after new elections in which school reform was a major campaign issue, produced a swing to the left in much of the country, a similar process of negotiation at last produced a Constitutional Law on education—adopted, again ironically, in the same month as the burning of the Ministry of Justice by demonstrating workers, an event from which Austria's slide toward a dictatorship of the right is usually dated. Glöckel and his associates, as is clear from their statements in subsequent months, considered the school law of 1927 a compromise but on balance a victory.

Its most important section created a new type of school for the fifth to eighth years of compulsory education, replacing the old three-year *Bürgerschulen* and the experimental General Middle Schools of the Glöckel reforms. It was to be called a *Hauptschule*—a rejection of Glöckel's preferred term *Allgemeine Mittelschule*, which apparently sounded to conservatives too much like the existing "Middle Schools" of *Gymnasium* type, and one of the compromises that he reluctantly accepted for the sake of substance. Open to all 10- to 14-year-olds throughout the country and not only in Vienna, it was in essence the school that Vienna had introduced experimentally—complete with the First and Second Streams that today are condemned by Glöckel's successors because in practice they proved to be as rigid and almost as supportive of class distinctions as the system the *Hauptschule* was designed to remedy.²⁶ In another and more substantial concession by the Social Democrats, the old types of lower secondary schools for the same age group—Gym-

nasium, Realschule, Realgymnasium—would remain, unreformed, as parallel and still "elite" schools. First Stream *Hauptschule* pupils who had received instruction in a foreign language (the primary difference between the required curriculum of the *Hauptschule* and that of a Middle School), and who had earned at least "fair" grades, were in theory to be entitled to move into the next higher class of one of these Middle Schools without an entrance examination, but this seldom happened; the "sorting out" process at age ten that the reformers had hoped to eliminate as a personal, pedagogical, and social evil remained a problem to be sorted out by the Second Republic in the 1970s or after.

In 1929, the drafting of a new constitution provided the occasion for a third and last round of confrontation, negotiation, and compromise over Glöckel's school reforms. This time the dispute arose from Christian Social proposals that would have stripped Vienna of the attributes of a federal province, explicitly reducing the competence of the City School Board from that of an autonomous provincial authority to that of a subordinate county (*Bezirks-*) School Board, in charge only of the *Volksschulen* and even there with limitations. In the ensuing negotiations Federal Chancellor Johann Schober's determination that the new constitution should be adopted legally and the consequent necessity of winning Social Democratic concurrence triumphed once again. Vienna and its City School Board retained their status under the Constitution of December 1929, but in return Glöckel and the Social Democrats accepted a clearer and broadened definition of the Federation's ultimate but still limited authority over the Middle Schools. The Vienna school reform had been rescued once again.

A Biographical-Political Postscript

The adoption of the Constitution of 1929 proved to be the last important instance of cooperation, however grudging, between Austria's political camps in the lifetime of the First Republic, whose own days were now numbered. The impact of the Great Depression, which struck Austria with special severity after the collapse of the Creditanstalt, Vienna's leading bank, in 1931; Engelbert Dollfuss as Austrian Chancellor after May 1932 and Hitler as German Chancellor in

January 1933; the Austrian regime's dependence on Mussolini as a counterweight to the magnetic attraction of Nazi Germany for many Austrians, whose dreams of Anschluss with Greater Germany seemed realistic again; Mussolini's pressures on the Dollfuss government, welcomed by many Christian Socials, to put their Austrian house in order in the face of the German challenge by suppressing the Social Democrats and establishing an authoritarian regime; confrontations in the streets between the private party armies of the Christian Socials and the Social Democrats; the miscalculations of the Social Democrats, including those that led to the dissolution of Parliament on a procedural technicality in March 1933—these were the principal milestones along the remainder of the road that led from the burning of the Ministry of Justice in 1927 to the brief, pathetic civil war of February 1934, the suppression of the Social Democratic Party, and the consolidation of a Christian Social dictatorship with fascist trappings and aspirations to create a "Christian corporative state."

The events of February 1934, which marked the end of the First Republic, began when units of the *Republikanische Schutzbund*, the Socialists' private army, succumbed to provocations and started an ill-planned and hopeless uprising, thereby providing their enemies with a pretext to outlaw the Social Democratic Party, arrest those of its leaders who did not escape abroad, and complete Austria's transformation into a dictatorship. The three-day uprising began on February 12. On the following morning Glöckel, who had been warned that a warrant was being issued but had chosen not to flee, was arrested in his office in the Ringstrasse palace of the City School Board. After being moved twice to the prison hospital for an increasingly serious heart ailment, he was released at the end of the following October, his health broken. He died 9 months later, on July 23, 1935, at the age of 61.

In May 1934, while Glöckel was in prison, the Austrian people "received in the name of Almighty God, from whom all right derives," a new, authoritarian Constitution "for their Christian, German Federal State built on corporativist foundations" (as the preamble described it), and a new Concordat with the Holy See. Article 4 of the Concordat, repealing an

important provision of the school reform legislation of 1868-69, provided that private Catholic schools should receive subventions from the state budget and specified that "through these measures the Catholic school system in Austria shall be supported and therewith the preconditions for their development into public Catholic-confessional schools shall also be fulfilled." One month earlier, the Minister of Education—once again the former Christian Social Governor of Styria and future Nazi Putschist Anton Rintelen—had as one of his first acts repealed Glöckel's April 1919 ministerial decree prohibiting compulsory pupil participation in religious ceremonies.

The undoing of Glöckel's reforms was under way, but some of his associates, veterans of the School Reform Division of 1919 and the Vienna City School Board of the 1920s, would survive to tell the tale and to help reinstitute many of them after 1945, this time under the aegis of a grand coalition of repentant and reconciled former Christian Socials and Social Democrats.²⁷

Lessons and Speculations

To readers familiar with the social history of other European and trans-Atlantic states during the past century it will be clear that the school reforms that Otto Glöckel proposed were not out of joint with or ahead of their time. On the contrary, the reforms that he fought for and the pedagogical and psychological theories and political insights on which they were based all belonged to what contemporary jargon would call "mainstream"—albeit "progressive" and generally left wing—currents of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century European and American thinking about education and its relation to society and politics. Many and perhaps most of his fellow Austrians—Liberals, Nationalists, Catholics, and apoliticals as well as Social Democrats—were ready to agree with his critique of the school system of late Imperial days, as is clear from Austrian literature of the period,²⁸ and should in principle have been receptive to the remedies he proposed. Quite a few in fact were, judging by the popularity the reforms seem to have enjoyed among teachers and parents from all three political camps (although rarely among *Gymnasium* teachers and almost never among university pedagogues) as well as within his own party and among the urban proletariat it purported to represent.

Glöckel's reforms, however, also encountered intense, even passionate, and widespread opposition, *mutatis mutandis* of the same quality that is still aroused today by some of his methodological innovations and by one of his central, still unfulfilled, and at first glance reasonable proposals, the "single ladder" school for 10- to 14-year-olds that would postpone fateful educational and career decisions and social classifications from age 10 to age 15. Glöckel himself, like his successors engaged in today's *Schulkampf* over all-day and comprehensive schools, had an answer to this apparent paradox: propertied and powerful classes grimly defending the "educational privilege" that they consider the principal means to perpetuate their privileged access to other limited desirables like wealth, power, and social prestige in a democratic and industrial society; and while these classes are a minority, they *are* powerful and control most "opinion-making" media. This may be true, but is it sufficient? Does it, for example, explain the large number of ordinary "little people" of Austria who today oppose much of what Glöckel did or tried to do, although they ostensibly stand to gain in social mobility and in other ways from a "single ladder" junior high school, more modern teaching methods, and a more comprehensible and obviously "relevant" curriculum? Are we really to assume they have simply been bamboozled by their betters or drugged by the opiate of the masses?

An additional part of a more complex explanation may be found in differences between the way that pedagogical theory, educational reform, and the political process have tended to be related to one another in Central Europe and corresponding relationships in the United States. "The school is a 'politicum,'" an aphorism variously attributed to Empress Maria Theresa or to one of her ministers, originally referred to the school's initial removal from the purview of the Church (and therefore from the status of an "ecclesiasticum") to that of the state, in the spirit of the Enlightenment, but it has continued to be true in a broader sense and more pervasively than has generally been the case in the United States or (at least recently) in northern and western Europe. Hermann Schnell, who now sits in Otto Glöckel's old office as President of the Vienna City School Board, suggests that this is because American school reform movements have normally lacked "those

sharp features of social criticism that they display in Europe." This he in turn attributes to the earlier development of democratic political forms on the western shore of the Atlantic, which meant that "democracy did not first have to be won in the United States." As a consequence, Schnell argues, "American educational theory has not only supported reform efforts but in fact has generally given rise to them, as is demonstrated by the influence of the Professor of Philosophy John Dewey." In Europe, by contrast, movements for educational reform historically tended to originate outside and in opposition to the "normative educational theory" of the universities, usually as products of left-wing political movements or autonomous "social critics," therefore automatically arousing the opposition of political and cultural establishments and cultural conservatives generally. But even within Europe Schnell makes a further distinction: whereas in northern and western Europe there was a belated but fruitful coming together and fusion of "reform pedagogy" and "normative pedagogy," in the 1920s, such a development was forestalled in Austria and Germany by the rise of fascism, with its ideological opposition to all reform movements associated with democratic goals.²⁹

Schnell's focus here is on the relationship between educational theory and school reform, but his argument has broader implications. It has already been suggested that the identification of Glöckel's reform program with Marxism and the Social Democratic Party, however natural and indeed inevitable, and his own emphasis on his program's basically Marxist ideological underpinnings aroused broader than otherwise necessary opposition to even those reforms that could have been presented in nonideological garb. Dissension within the School Reform Division of the Ministry of Education and the drift away or into opposition by many of its non-Socialist members who had initially cooperated with enthusiasm are indicative. It may also be significant that many of his curricular and methodological reforms, such as the new physical layout of the classroom (and its implicit changes in teacher-pupil relationships), *Bodenständigkeit*, the *Lehrausgang*, and some aspects of *Gesamtunterricht* have since and in a less "ideological" age been adopted as eagerly (or as reluctantly!) by teachers in Catholic private schools as by their colleagues in "Red" public

ones. Recent splits over the question of comprehensive education for 10- to 14-year-olds in the ranks of Catholic teacher organizations—basically ranging from Catholic *Volks-* and *Hauptschule* teachers on one side, to Catholic Gymnasium teachers on the other—are equally suggestive. Glöckel was undoubtedly correct and expressing his own intentions when he pointed out that the goal of all these changes was the creation of a school appropriate to a republican, secular, and democratic (in fact social-democratic) society, but Max Adler, speaking from and for the party's left wing, was equally correct when he pointed out that the reforms were really only an implementation and logical extension of the ideals and school reform program of nineteenth-century Austro-German Liberalism. It is therefore arguable that at least many of the Viennese reforms of the 1920s would have been generally accepted much earlier, with less political trauma and vehement protests only by those bishops and Christian Social politicians who genuinely yearned for a return to the Concordat schools of the 1850s, if they had been presented differently—for example by a John Dewey, using Deweyian pedagogical and psychological arguments, rather than by Otto Glöckel, speaking in the name of Social Democratic equality and justice and identified (undeservedly) with Otto Bauer's combative brand of Austro-Marxism.

From this perspective the highly controversial nature of the Austrian school reforms of the 1920s derived from the status of the Austrian school as a particular kind of "politicum" in a political culture characterized by superheated ideological confrontation. The reforms were in this sense the victim of a conflict among political values that could have been reduced if not entirely avoided had the reforms been presented in terms of other relevant values.

On the other hand, the continuation of the *Schulkampf* on some of Glöckel's fronts after 1945 in the "de-ideologified" (*entideologisierte*) Second Republic suggests that there are other dimensions as well. In recent conversations at the Vienna City School Board, President Schnell and several of his colleagues again offered a clue. The subject was current opposition to the principle of an integrated comprehensive school for 10- to 14-year-olds by many of the Austrian Socialist Party's own working class supporters as well as by the Austrian People's Party, successor to the Christian Social Party of the First Republic.

"We made a mistake," I was told, "when we placed so much emphasis on 'equality of opportunity' [Chancengleichheit] rather than on age 10 as simply too early for such decisions, which almost everyone would accept." The term not only reeks of an ideology that is still in varying degrees anathema for half of all Austrians. It is apparently also regarded as conflicting with the values and expectations of an even wider sector of the population. Trends in Middle School enrollment and the testimony of school inspectors from the City School Board confirm what this observer suspected from a random sample of friends and neighbors: the ambitious "ordinary" *Hauptschule* Austrian wants *his* children to go to a Gymnasium or other "elite" Middle School (now collectively called *Allgemeinbildende Höhere Schulen* or AHS), not to a predominantly plebeian "single ladder" comprehensive school. In other words he wants the "educational privilege" that Glöckel damned, on condition that he, too, can somehow have a piece of that action, and not the egalitarian concept of "an equal chance." Perhaps his parents of Glöckel's generation might have wanted it too, but they knew that it was not possible for their class in their day. Values may not have changed here, but perception of what is socially possible and hence aspirations have.

The results are producing a new paradox. The pedagogues and politicians who are Glöckel's spiritual successors—including the present Federal Minister of Education, Fred Sinowatz and Leopold Gratz, the Mayor of Vienna, and one of two leading candidates to succeed Bruno Kreisky as Federal Chancellor and head of the Socialist Party—continue to pursue the ideal of an integrated school in which the *Hauptschule* (the school of the reform of 1927) will in effect absorb the *Gymnasien* and other *AHS*. While they are doing it, those whom they would like to benefit are instead and in increasing numbers choosing the *AHS*—enabled to do so, as a further irony, by a political accident, the suspension of *AHS* entrance examinations reluctantly permitted since 1969 as a temporary measure pending an interparty agreement on entrance standards that has never happened. This trend is already gradually producing what amounts to an inversion of the present system: in place of a socially heterogeneous *Hauptschule* for the majority and a socially homogeneous network of *AHS* for a talented or privileged minority, there will be a socially heterogeneous *AHS* for the majority and a

socially homogeneous *Hauptschule* for the underprivileged and the hopelessly untalented. Instead of "selecting out" the cream for the *Gymnasien*, the division at age 10 will "select out" the dregs for the rump *Hauptschulen*. The results will resemble a nearly-universal version of the comprehensive junior high school that was the centerpiece of Glöckel's program. From some perspectives, however, it will be the "wrong" comprehensive school, based on and promoting the "wrong" values, which is presumably why Glöckel's successors are not happy at the prospect and are still doggedly pursuing their own road.

(June 1978)

NOTES

1. For detailed proposals and the current debate, see Dennison I. Rusinow, "Educational Reforms in Austria and Yugoslavia, Part I: Five-Day School, All-Day School, Comprehensive School" [DIR-3-'77], *AUFS Reports*, Southeast Europe Series, Vol. XXII, No. 3, 1977. During the year since the Report was written, the dispute has become sharper and more ideological.
2. The term and argument appear repeatedly in Glöckel's writings cited in note 10 below and later.
3. Cf. Oskar Achs and Albert Krassnigg, *Drillschule-Lernschule-Arbeitsschule: Otto Glöckel und die österreichische Schulreform in der Ersten Republik* (Vienna, 1974), ch. III; Ernst Papanek, *The Austrian School Reform* (New York, 1962), chs. 1-2; Otto Glöckel, *Drillschule Lernschule Arbeitsschule* (Vienna, 1928) and *Selbstbiographie* (Zürich, 1939); Gustav Strakosch-Grassmann, *Geschichte des österreichischen Unterrichtswesens* (Vienna, 1905); and Friedrich Langer (ed.), *Österreichs erneuerte Erziehung: 200 Jahre Unterrichtsverwaltung* (Vienna, 1960).
4. For details and qualifications, see Douglas R. Skopp, *The Mission of the Volksschule: Political Tendencies in German Primary Education 1840 to 1870* (Ph.D. dissertation, Brown University, 1974).
5. As quoted by Papanek, p. 24.
6. Cited by Hermann Schnell, *Die österreichische Schule im Umbruch* (Vienna, 1974), pp. 20ff.
7. *Selbstbiographie* (see note 3), p. 1-70, covers his early life.
8. Cf. the brilliantly argued but controversial interpretation of these cultural phenomena in Allan Janik and Stephen Toulmin, *Wittgenstein's Vienna* (New York, 1973).
9. Cited in Schnell (1974), pp. 23ff.
10. *Das Tor der Zukunft* (the January 1917 speech, published as pamphlet with several censored pages blank); *Ausführungen des Unterstaatssekretärs für Unterricht Otto Glöckel*, dated 22.3.19, 23.7.19, 22.10.19, 12.2.20, and 15.6.20 (published as parliamentary documents); and "Schulreform und Volksbildung in der Republik," in *12. November*, 4/1919. Copies of these and other now rare pamphlets and periodicals can be found in the Pädagogische Zentralbücherei der Stadt Wien, itself a Glöckel creation to whose librarians I am indebted for assistance in locating the sources on which this Report is based.
11. Papanek, p. 5 and passim.
12. Cf. also *1919-1969 Festschrift—50 Jahr österreichische Bundeserziehungsanstalt* (Saalfelden, 1969), for both the history and the post-1945 evolution of the BEA.
13. Max Adler, *Neue Menschen—Gedanken über sozialistische Erziehung* (Berlin, 1924), pp. 51ff and passim.
14. *Ibid.*, and Bauer, *Schulreform und Klassenkampf* (lecture published as pamphlet, Vienna, 1922).
15. *The Mission of the Volksschule* (see note 4), p. 2ff.
16. Cf. Schnell (1974), pp. 47ff, and the *AUFS Report* cited in note 1 above for the 1960s and 1970s version.
17. Papanek, pp. 66-68.
18. *Ibid.*, pp. 57-65, with brief biographies of the main ones.
19. For the work of the Division and the 1920s in general, see Papanek, ch. 4; Hans Fischl, *Schulreform Demokratie und Österreich 1918-1950* (Vienna, n.d.), pp. 36-69, and *Wesen und Werden der Schulreform in Österreich* (Vienna, 1929); and Achs and Krassnigg, pp. 84-146.
20. Achs and Krassnigg, pp. 84-92, lists all of these decrees and orders.
21. Cf. Hermann Schnell, *100 Jahr Pädagogisches Institut der Stadt Wien* (Vienna, 1968).
22. All three quotations cited from Achs and Krassnigg, pp. 133-35.
23. Cf. Glöckel's 52-page enumeration of and response to these charges, *Die österreichische Schulreform: Einige Feststellungen im Kampfe gegen die Schulverderber* (Vienna, 1923).
24. See Glöckel's own account in *Drillschule Lernschule Arbeitsschule*.
25. The details and legal technicalities of this incident and the compromises of 1927 and 1929 (described below), all more complicated than indicated here, are most clearly described in Fischl, *Schulreform...*, pp. 55-69; cf. Papanek, pp. 101-106.
26. See the *AUFS Report* cited in note 1.
27. Fischl, *Schulreform...*, pp. 75-186, is a useful account of both the prewar and 1938-1950 chapters of this story by one of these surviving associates.
28. e.g., the description of his school days by Stefan Zweig in his *Welt von gestern* (quoted by Achs and Krassnigg, pp. 34-39).
29. *Die österreichische Schule im Umbruch*, p. 101.