

Stephen Keith Sagarin

We are pleased to bring you this second issue of the *Research Bulletin* in its new format. Reading through the material in this issue we hope you will find research that supports your work and what you already know, and also material that provokes new thinking or that sparks further investigation. In our last issue, for example, a brief piece on spiritual research (“The Four Phases of Research,” *Research Bulletin*, Vol. XI, No. 1, p. 36) defined it in terms that set the concepts of spiritual or “alchemical” research against a concept of conventional research. Here, Aksel Hugo describes spiritual research as a series of extensions of conventional research. From different points of view, we find that both positions are valid and helpful. Martyn Rawson, in this issue, examines carefully several of the questions surrounding what is often called “first grade readiness.” Not all readers will necessarily agree with the course of his argument, but the conversation he opens is necessary and valuable. Fostering a more sophisticated approach to the question of school readiness will help all schools.

We hope, too, that you will notice the threads that connect the work of one researcher to the work of another, or the echoes of one voice in the work of another. Van James and Magda Lissau, independently, refer human experience to “the Seven Arts.” Read together, their very different articles reinforce one another in surprising ways. Similarly, Arthur Auer’s article on teaching reading is bolstered by recent research on creativity, which, in turn, supports James and Lissau. David Mitchell’s review of work on “nature deficit disorder” is closely aligned both with Philip Incao’s review of medical research and with Jon McAlice’s review of Kay Hymowitz’s work on “anticulturalism.” In reading these articles, an image of health arises in which body and mind are one, and in which human experience of the world is fundamentally associated with health or disease.

In order to educate, all teachers must have a view or an image, implicit or explicit, of what it is to be human. We could well say that this image

underlies any attempt or approach to teaching and to thinking about teaching. Previous such images in the history of education have included a notion of children born into original sin—sin that had then to be beaten out of them. Or children, as in Rousseau, born innately good and then tended, as a garden, in order to ward off the corrupting influence of society. Or children growing into community, as in Dewey, requiring socialization. In one way or another, each of the articles in this issue—and the work of the Research Institute in general—addresses or illuminates a portion of the image synthesized for us first or most clearly by Rudolf Steiner. This is true of previous issues, and it will be true of issues in the future.

Reading through the contents that follow, however, brings this point powerfully enough to mind to mention it now. In particular, the image of a human being that appears strongly in different ways in many of the articles and reviews of the present issue is of a creative being. The arts, and creativity in general, are not peripheral enhancements to an education. They are the root of human experience of the world and deserve to be placed at the center of educational theory and practice. Further, as children grow and develop, they move from a physical engagement with the world—architectural and sculptural, according to Lissau—to a more internalized, mature engagement. True education addresses, as Waldorf schools attempt to do, the myriad and subtle transformations and experiences—and the ways in which adults can guide young people through these—that constitute a good education for a human being.