



Education

The debate

Adapted from contributions by
Jonathan Kozel and Clive Crook
to *The Atlantic* series on education published in
honor of the magazine's 150th anniversary

FOR WELL OVER a century, wrote Jonathan Kozol in the November 2006 issue of *The Atlantic*, two seemingly irreconcilable notions of the purposes and character of American public education have warred against each other.

At one extreme, he continues, has been the concept of the public school as training ground for the future economic roles our students will assume, with distinctions drawn between students whose “innate” abilities presuppose their future economic and professional ascendance and those who require a more practical curriculum to prepare them for employment. Whether for the future surgeon or the future draftsman, schools are to be governed by a highly disciplined agenda.

At the opposite extreme is education of a relatively classless nature, in which every child is believed to have unknowable potential and, for this reason, is to be provided, to the degree this is feasible, with an equally capacious course of study to prepare that child for the fullest possible participation in a democratic social order. [Does “No Child Left Behind” come to mind?]

FOR WELL OVER half a century, the surveying and mapping profession has struggled with its own notions about the type of education its members need to prepare them for success. Years of apprenticeship have been weighed against years of college for licensure, and then, when a mixture of both was deemed necessary, the question arose how much of the “academics” should be in the mix—two years or four? Clive Crook, senior editor at *The Atlantic*, takes a measured but refreshing stance on the issue. Excerpts from his article are reproduced here for you to judge how relevant the view he espouses is to the current debate within the entire geospatial community on education.