

C. GILBERT WRENN

Professor of Education, Arizona State University, author of The Counselor in a Changing World, and editor of a series of books on guidance and counseling for Houghton Mifflin Company.

CULTURAL AND TIME CHANGES IN OUR CONCEPTS OF COUNSELING

Excerpts from a speech at the 1967 Conference of the Canadian Guidance and Counselling Association.

I am pleased to be at this first triennial conference. I have a good feeling that I'm in on something very healthy and vigorous in its early stages of growth. I inadvertently broke in on a board meeting the other day and they were kind enough to ask me to stay. I listened for a while to the careful way in which your Board is attempting to direct the development of this new organization. It was very hopeful—I was impressed. This is the end of a very well-planned, comprehensive conference. I've been to hundreds of such conferences in the United States, and this would match any of them, I think, in the balance of the program.

THE EVOLUTION OF COUNSELING

Now let me talk to you for a while about the evolution of counseling. I am asked many times, "What is this thing called counseling?" And, "How did it come about in America?" And I hit upon a couple of ideas that give a kind of basis for what it is and how it came to be. After that, I'd like to talk about some of the changes in our culture that are affecting counseling, and then finally talk about changes in counseling itself.

I think you can start very simply by saying that "life is learning," while the school is an organized function of society to make the learning process more efficient and more socially real. In the school the teacher and the counselor have particular roles in assisting the student to develop, to learn, to become a person. They both have specialties. To teach well is a specialty; to counsel well is a specialty.

The counselor belongs on two teams. He belongs on *the educational team* of the school—he is a member of the staff and is responsible for the school as a total institution. He is also on *the pupil personnel team*—a specialist who contributes directly to students and directly to teachers. The pupil personnel team is composed of the counselor, the school psychologist, the school social worker, the school health officer, and perhaps the school attendance officer. These are all people who work to make a school effective and useful in the development of the youngster. Counseling is probably the most pervasive of these various specialties. The counselor is responsible for all pupils across the board. He does not deal only with certain particular individuals, as does the school psychologist, nor does he deal with a particular aspect of the pupil, like the relationship between home and school, as does the social worker. He deals with the total range of students in terms of trying to help them relate school experiences to life development. In a way he is trying to help the student make sense out of his school experience in the present and for the future. This is a major job—it is a job which is concerned much more with development than it is with remediation.

Time was, in the history of our country, when the counselor was seen as the person who took care of problem students. The principal saw him as his right-hand aide—when some kid got in trouble, the principal would summon the counselor. This is no longer the pattern, at least in the United States. The principal will now summon the vice principal, who takes care of the vices of students! The counselor is responsible for individual development and growth. It has taken quite a while, but in our country we have effected an almost complete separation of the counselor from discipline. Counselors no longer have disciplinary responsibility. If they do, they are thereby ruined for their major responsibility, which is to be able to have students talk to them with complete confidence and trust.

We have seen counseling growing out of an undifferentiated general function into what is now a highly specialized function. All of this is an American phenomenon. (By "American" I mean of course both the United States and Canada, because we have so much in common.) We can't say this is good for everyone everywhere—I don't know. If other countries have some cultural conditions in common with us, then perhaps counseling will help their youth as it has helped ours. But we can only say how counseling has developed in America, and it has developed because of certain cultural emphases.

CULTURAL EMPHASES IN AMERICA

One such cultural emphasis is highly American, although, of course, it exists in other countries as well. This is an emphasis on *individual achievement*. We have a concept of equal opportunity, not equal ability. I think of all countries we have been very clear on that—equal opportunity does not mean equal ability. A man ought to have a chance to try, and even to fail if he wishes to, because failure is a very good learning experience at times.

We have an emphasis on *mobility* in our country. People are moving not only geographically but socially. A person can move up and down in terms of social order, and can move all over the country in terms of geographical mobility. This calls for much judgment and much selection, and for a kind of flexibility—flexibility which people must have, and which counseling tries to give them—flexibility and assurance of judgment about themselves.

We have a concept in our country that *each person is important*, a concept of self-respect. We believe that each person has personal responsibility for himself. We think it important that the pupil have some part—a major part—in the decisions made about him, and in choice he has responsibility. Choices are not made for him. This is less true in many other countries of the world, as you well know. In England they still call high-school students "children." And when you joke with them about it, they say, "Of course, we don't really mean that." But they do really mean it! They call them children, and they make decisions for them. But this is passing, and the children are rebelling as they become young people. Nevertheless there is a tendency to feel that older ones should make decisions for younger ones. This is less true on our continent, and is one reason we have counseling: to help kids learn how to make good decisions—wise decisions—and to assume responsibility for the outcome of the decisions.

So this is the background of counseling. This is how it came to be, growing out of our culture.

THE STATUS OF COUNSELING

Let me, before I move into the changes in culture, give you some 1965 figures on counselors in the United States. Secondary-school counselors totaled 42,000. They had increased in number by 10% each year since 1960. Full-time counselors numbered 23,500, which was an increase over 1960 of 140%. Part-time counselors, on the other hand, numbered 18,500 in 1965, and had decreased by 10%. So we have had a marked increase in terms of full-time as opposed to part-time counselors. We have moved very rapidly towards the assumption that counseling is a full-time professional job.

The counselor-student ratio has dropped since 1958, when it was 1 to 960. In 1964, the latest figure I have, the ratio was 1 to 507. This is still a long way from a recommended ratio of 1 to 300. Only two states in the United States have yet achieved that. I'm not sure that this recommended ratio is very meaningful, because effective counseling also depends on supporting resources like school social workers, psychologists, and other community workers. If you have all kinds of supporting resources, and the teachers are concerned with individual development, and are flexible in their own approach, you can have a higher ratio of students to counselor and still have effective counseling. If you have very little in the school which is supportive of the things the counselor is trying to do, then your ratio of 1 to 300 is still too high.

THE NATURE AND SPEED OF CULTURAL CHANGE

Now let's look at the changing cultural factors that will affect us in the future. Some of these are not very pleasant—they are changes in our culture which you must accept as reality whether you like them or not. One never does away with reality by wishful thinking. Every generation has had changes, of course—it is the way development comes about. I think sometimes you can call it progress, but progress assumes something that change does not necessarily assume.

The important thing about our present world is that it is changing rapidly—very rapidly. It's an astonishing thing that's happening to us in terms of both social change and technological change. There's no way to predict the speed of many kinds of change. Who could have predicted the kinds of violence we have from youth in our country—the kind of violence that attaches itself to racial discrimination and to the civil rights movement?

The speed and magnitude of the changes are at times appalling. Someone has done some guessing about the increase in factual knowledge and has taken as a benchmark the number of facts thought to be known at the time of Christ and then estimated that the number doubled by the year 1750. It took 1750 years to double the amount that was known. This information doubled again by the year 1900. It doubled again by the year 1950, and it doubled again by the year 1960. It doubtless doubled again by 1965. The speed of change and the amount of information available to us is overwhelming. This, of course, calls for computerizing our data, or else we will get lost in a jungle of facts.

THE FAMILY

Let me mention just four areas of change which I think affect counseling particularly. One has to do with the nature of the family. The family is something we don't like to think is changing. I have been talking for some years to counselors all over the country saying, "You cannot base your understanding

of the child you are dealing with upon your own family or upon what families were like when you were a child. The world of *your* family no longer exists! You must study families as of 1967, not 1945."

The family is changing primarily because of the changing place of women in the social world and the vocational world. It is changing also because of urbanization—the fact that we are living together in larger centers, and the children can be "out from under" much more—out from under the observation or the help of any adult. The cohesiveness of the family has greatly deteriorated, and ladies and gentlemen you'll not bring that back by saying it shouldn't be. It *is*, regardless of what you wish about it.

Some of you who do not think that mothers should be working will not change this by saying it shouldn't be. This is a reality which is a hard reality. In the United States 45% of all women between the ages of 18 and 64 are now working outside the home at some time in their lives. Of the United States labor force of some 78 million now, 39% are women, many of them mothers. In 1920, the average woman worker was single and 28 years old; in 1960, the average woman worker was married and 40 years old.

I'm not assured at all that the mother working outside the home is bad for the children. I have sought counsel from family sociologists and have found that there is no research evidence to prove that the mother working out of the home for a few hours each day is bad for the development of the children. It is much better, according to some sociologists, that the mother have two hours of a *good* relationship with children than ten hours of a poor relationship. And they think that there are many mothers who are better off psychologically, working for part of the day, because of an increased sense of their own personal worth. At any event, this is the story.

We have 1965 figures indicating the proportion of women working at different educational levels: 31% of the women in the United States who have no more than a grade-8 education are working outside the home; 45% of high-school graduates are doing so; and 54% of college graduates. Now it stands to reason that as more and more women go on to college, and to high school, there will be more and more women working, if these proportions hold. The latest figures I've been able to secure show that fewer girls attend college than boys, but the two figures are getting closer together. This means one or two or possibly four years of college for many more girls. And with increased education we apparently have increased participation in jobs outside the home.

What is suggested here is that the counseling of girls is of great importance. It's fully as important as the counseling of boys. As a matter of fact it's even more difficult to counsel girls, because they have two careers ahead of them, and the prettier and brighter the girl, the more likely she is to have two careers—marriage and a job outside the home.

URBANIZATION

Now a second material change concerns increasing urbanization—a clustering together in our cities. This is perhaps less true in Canada than in the United States, but I'd like to suggest that this is a world-wide phenomenon. There are more traffic problems and there is living closer together in quarters which do not have full privacy, which have no outside yard, no place to dig in

the dirt. And of course there are problems of smog in our larger cities—air pollution is a matter of great concern. So the problems of urbanization are real ones.

Then too the increase in world population concerns us: the figures show catastrophic rates of population increase, and of increases in the amount of food needed. Many people tell me that the most significant problem of the future, the greatest dynamite in the world of the future, is the population problem—not war, not nuclear bombs.

With urban populations increasing at *twice the rate* of the total world population, the problems involved with large groups of people in cities include the psychological problem of loss of identity—in a city in which you are one in a thousand in a school, or a thousand in a street, or a few hundred in an apartment building. The loss of identity problem is a serious one.

CHANGES IN THE VOCATIONAL WORLD

The thing that is most distressing, or perhaps the most significant, is the mobility of occupational structure, and the extent to which occupations are disappearing and appearing at a very rapid rate. This rate will accelerate, and some estimates have been made which are startling. They're projections—I can't guarantee their accuracy. Such a projection is that made by two economists recently: the next generation, meaning 20-25 years from now, will see 40% of our labor force in occupations that do not now exist. How are counselors going to counsel kids for a world in which we have this much mobility of occupations? The answer, of course, is to counsel them for flexibility.

A related trend is that you have more and more education required—education for living as well as for making a living. We may in the next few decades take up to twenty-four years before we release a person upon the vocational world to make his own way. The astonishing thing is that you must go back to school again and again in your life. You must help your students to see that *any completion level of school is no longer completion of anything*. It is a step in a progression of educational experiences. And they'll return to school, believe me, many times, either for learning how to take care of themselves, or to take care of their leisure time, or to take care of their cultural interests, or to change their vocations, or to take on new vocations. They'll go back to school over and over again, and no longer will you have graduation meaning anything but a commencement.

In the face of this concept of specialization and more education, keep in mind that *the bulk of our students do not go on to college* and do not enter occupations which require a high degree of specialization. I think the latest figures are that 45% of high-school graduates in the United States go on to college or to some other form of post-high-school education. And once there, the attrition rate is very heavy. Some will go for one year, and we can make that one year perhaps a productive year. We can make two years quite productive: the demand for junior-college graduates is very high. Generally speaking, however, you still have the bulk of your population in jobs which are not very highly skilled.

In spite of all the specialization and technological development that we must have in order to have leadership, the bulk of the work is still done by those who are not specialized. What the counselor is faced with, of course, is

the fact that he will deal with the many who will not go into the higher skilled vocations—who will go into the service and clerical and non-technical vocations. And yet he will deal also with that important minority who are going to college. And he will be dealing with the pressure of parents who say, "Get my boy into college." In our country this is the great cry—the tragic cry. Tragic because I think the attempt to deal with this pressure means that there are many *other* boys and girls being neglected.

I think that as counselors we must decide to spend our time—invest it if you will—where it makes the most valuable returns, and it may be with the majority rather than with the minority, because after all the majority will have the vote. The majority will determine our social reforms of the future. The extent to which we give attention to the majority will determine to some extent the future of our civilization.

VALUE CHANGES

Here again these are not always "comfortable" changes. Many of us would like to suggest that maybe they shouldn't *be*, but they *are*. I once stated somewhere that truth is not a fixed absolute—truth is forever emerging—new truth, empirical truth. Empirical truth emerges, replacing old truth, and therefore the value concept of truth is that of something that is not static, but is flexible, mobile, modifiable. We ought to be teaching all facts today as facts-for-now, but not necessarily for tomorrow. Many of our curricula have suggested that a given body of facts be given to our students to learn, and once they got this learned—*boy they've got it made*. This is going to be there for the rest of their lives. But it may be that the facts will change in the next five or ten years, and then they're caught with a lot of lumber in the lumber yards of their brains that they ought to clear out. But it's all stacked away neatly there, protected by fire alarms, and who can get it out? We ought to be teaching people to say that what we're learning now is *what we know now*. It is present truth, but tomorrow's truth may be different truth, and we must be alert to learning new truth.

There is a value change in the matter of our *dependence on science*, our deification, almost, of science. I am a scientist, I think, in the field of psychology and human behavior. I believe in systematic methodological investigation of human behavior. I think science has done much for us, in the way of helping us be more careful thinkers—not generalizing from specific instances, not saying, "I once knew a man who did it this way, and therefore all men are like this." We've done a great deal towards understanding that you must have a random sampling of a population. Unless this is done carefully, you cannot generalize for the whole population from your sample. This is what we have been learning from science. (Teachers, by the way, ought to learn this quite carefully, so that they don't generalize from the few kids that they have, and assume that all kids are like these.)

This is part of the story, the good part. The other part is that we have begun to think in terms of science not as a method but as a value: if it isn't scientific, it must not be very important. And this rules out all dreaming, all imagination, all poetry, all arts, all humanity, all theology. And to assume that these things are not also real—even though you can't put them on the board in terms of numbers—is a value change that I'm distressed about. There

are two sides to the coin: science that tells us to be careful in our thinking, but science should *not* tell us that only that which is scientific is truth, or useful, or valuable, or meaningful.

We have had a value change in terms of the *importance of independence*. The assumption has always been that everybody should grow up to be independent. Now we think that probably independence is not as important as *interdependence*, or maybe an understanding of dependence. We are all dependent upon many many others. To learn the value of dependence, we need to admit this dependence without loss of self respect, and to be able to say that, "Without you I could not exist, and you are therefore as important as I am." The concept of independence is that I am I, I am important, I can get along by myself. But no one can get along by himself—no one. In this complex, automated, urbinated, highly knowledgeable, complex society of ours—no one.

There is a value change in terms of the *meaning of work*. Work used to be a virtue regardless of the nature of the work. It was valuable just because it was work. The kids today say, "Nuts to that—'tain't so. I can get ahead without very much work." And they don't necessarily mean that they're going to lean on somebody else. They say, "I can get ahead on four hours a day of work, not eight hours." They say, "I can work so many weeks out of the year." They can also say, "Much of this stuff that you call work is not very interesting or important to me as a person." And much work *is* degrading—it's almost an insult to the integrity of a person—the kind of work that has to be done.

So the concept of work is changing. It's no longer work, work, work—it's "what kind of work?" and "for what purpose?" The majority of our people work in what Havighurst has called the "societal maintenance occupations." Only one third of the people work in occupations that are self involved, in which they put something of themselves into the job, and therefore have a feeling of significance because their work is a part of them. Much other work is highly necessary—it is work in which they maintain society, but none of themselves goes into it. These people must get their satisfactions in life outside of their paid jobs.

I think we counselors and teachers are probably seriously in error when we assume that because *our* work is important to *us*, a job will determine the kind of person our counselee will become. That is no longer so. "The implementation of the self concept through your vocation"—it's a nice large phrase, isn't it?—that you become what you want to be through your vocation, is now true for only a minority of people. For most of the kids that you counsel, this will not be the case.

I've developed a new ethic of work—I've got it down now into a fairly succinct statement, I think: "the objective of work is to do something that has personal meaning for you, or that is seen by you as a contribution to society, whether you're paid for it or not." Work has to have personal significance to you to be ethical. And work which may be really meaningful to you may not be paid work at all.

Another value change has to do with the relation of young people to their adults and to their peers. Young people do not tend to model themselves after us as much as they did a generation or two ago—not by a great deal. They are increasingly dependent upon their peers for their values and for

their identity and for their models, not upon us adults. Here again we may not be very happy about this, but it is nevertheless true. And there's good reason for it. It may be that the young people today—the "mods" of today—as screwy as they look to us, may be closer to reality than we adults are. They may be closer to 1967 conditions than I could possibly be. In this case to whom are the mods going to look for models, for identity, for values? Not to me, but to their peers. This we must recognize is a changing value.

SOME PARADOXES

And now I'd like to bring out a few paradoxes that we find in the changing world of today. *The first paradox is that at the same time that we hope for more self responsibility, we know that the government is going to increase its concern with and its impact on individuals in our community.* This will happen for all kinds of reasons whether you like it or not, ladies and gentlemen. For unless we control large numbers of the electorate (which we probably don't, for we are small in number, and our control as educators is not great) we're probably not going to change the trend of our governments in having more impact upon the life of the individual in the community—educationally, socially, medically. But what happens to one's feeling of self responsibility and self reliance in the process? How can we guard against that danger?

The second paradox arises from the fact that we live in an industrialized society. We have things, things, things—gadgets galore—conveniences for shaving, for making up your face, for washing the dishes, and so on. We're full of gadgets and they go out of date rapidly. We have an economic pressure to make them so they get rapidly out of date and new ones will be purchased. So we fill up our houses and our garages with things, things, things. *The paradox concerns whether we are going to possess things or whether things are going to possess us.* Are we going to become so obsessed with things that we think of success and usefulness in life in terms of the number of things we have in our affluent, industrialized society?

Third paradox: For success in my vocation I must spend lots of time at my vocation—I must work at it hard, I must study it, I must immerse myself in my vocation to get ahead. But how about the possibility that in doing this I lose *me*? If I become coincidental with my vocation, I have lost my identity: my vocation has captured me. I am not a person—I am a teacher, I am a counselor, I am a banker. In our society we have had a lot of this sort of thing—we identify a person by the kind of work he does. But I think that more and more as we move toward specialized training we are getting to the point where the paradox is: *can I be successful in my vocation and still maintain my personal autonomy as an individual?*

The fourth paradox: my religion and change. Why can't my concepts of the way I worship and my concept of God change with the rest of my culture? Why should I feel guilty about new ideas that may come to me about the nature of God or the way I worship or serve God? Should I retain the way I've always done it, the way it's been done for hundreds of years? In this debate do I run the danger of having some part of my life which stays fixed and unchangeable, sort of walled off and put over here somewhere, while all the rest of me is going ahead? Is this reasonable? *This is the paradox: Why should my religion be changeless while all of my life and being changes?*

Another paradox: how much should I have conviction, and about what?

If truth is changing, if conditions are changing, my convictions ought to be at least ephemeral. They ought to be commitments for today. I believe with Allport that it's very important that if the truth is tentative, and this is a kind of principle, then a parallel principle is, I must be committed, wholly committed, to the truth as I know it. I must bet my life upon this truth, even though I know it is tentative truth. And it takes a good deal more courage for me to bet my life on truth which I know may change than it does to assume that this truth I'm betting my life on will never change. I mean empirical truth, professional truth, social truth.

I *could* be committed as well as believing it tentative. John Ciardi (1962) brought this out in the *Saturday Review* several years ago when he talked about the courage of his confusions (p. 9). He said he wished we could teach our young people that it's more important to have the courage of their confusions than it is to have the courage of their convictions, or at least *as* important—to admit that there are some things we don't know—to be courageous enough to admit it. It's all right for me to have convictions about the fact that my car is the best make of car ever built, or the fact that Arizona is the best place in which to live, but should I have convictions about whether it is right to kill people in the name of mercy, or whether it is all right to populate the world and have people starve to death? Is it all right for me to have convictions about the fact that I must make things and throw them away as quickly as possible so as to keep our economy going? Do I have a right to these kinds of convictions? Or should I say that at this point I don't know, and decide that stating my confusion is as important as stating my conviction? Ciardi says, "There will always be more questions than thoughtful men can answer, though the unreflective, to be sure, will always have their fast answers ready." (1962, p. 9) I read somewhere else this statement, "A fool is a person with short answers to long questions."

CHANGES IN COUNSELING

I have a few minutes now to spend on counseling, in terms of the cultural changes I've been analyzing.

1. The first change in counseling, I think, is *the recognition of a difference between elementary-school counseling and high-school counseling*. There is a major difference.

Verne Faust, who is writing a book on elementary counseling in the Houghton Mifflin series that I edit, is an imaginative person, and he believes deeply that in elementary counseling the counselor must give attention to the cognitive development of students. In the process of doing this he must be primarily a helper of the teacher and spend more time with teachers than he does with pupils.

In the past, counselors at the high-school level have more or less divided the world into two parts—my part and your part. The teacher takes care of the intellectual and academic side, and the counselor takes care of the social and vocational. This has provided a schism which is very bad indeed, and very unnecessary. What we're now thinking is that some of our social and emotional problems would be erased if we gave more attention to helping kids

get intellectual growth, intellectual satisfaction, out of academic work, especially in elementary school.

There's a difference in history here, too, you see. At the high-school level the counselor was brought in to help with problems that the teachers didn't have time or knowledge to help students with. Later the counselors felt the need for people like school psychologists and social workers, and these specialists were brought in to assist in the total system. But the counselor was there first. In an elementary school, this is not true. The teacher was already pupil-centered in an elementary school. School psychologists were brought in early to *help teachers* with certain pupils. The counselor is being brought in to help the other specialists who were there ahead of him. He is there particularly to help teachers and parents with normal, developmental classroom problems.

2. In the high schools of our country I think *we need a redefinition of vocational counseling*. I'd like to introduce here, as I mentioned earlier, the old-fashioned concept of the vocation as a *commitment to life*. It's a religious concept: one is "called." In the past the only person who has been "called" is one who is called to religious activity. Maybe we can consider the fact that *life* has called for us to be a kind of person, and consider a vocation in terms of a commitment to *living*. Living effectively is really our calling, and thus an occupation is a part, and only a part. *Maybe vocational counseling should embrace much more than occupations.*

If you really consider vocational choice in its full significance—it's a complex activity in any event—it involves much more than the ability *to do something*. It is much more than a question of "Can he do it?" It's a question of "Will he?" "Does he want to?" "Does it meet his needs?" This is a matter of *adding attitude to aptitude*.

Vocational counseling is very very different from giving a battery of tests, seeing what he can do, what his potentials are, seeing what the requirements of different occupations are, matching one against the other—and now "you've got it made." But there are an awful lot of kids who don't have it made. There are an awful lot of kids *who could, but they don't*. Not willfully, but they don't. They don't because this doesn't fit in with what they think they need out of life. Vocational counseling, after all, is a matter of *first helping a person discover what his needs and capacities are, and second what environments can meet these needs, and third at what level of education he can enter this environmental area*. The level may vary with different persons. We now think of occupations in clusters, and there are many levels. Your final job is to determine at what point your counsellee can enter the area in terms of ability to study, or willingness to study, or financial support to study.

3. A third change in counseling is that it is now seen as a broad societal function—you *have counseling in many areas of life*. It can be *industrial counseling, rehabilitation counseling, employment counseling*, and counseling in many other areas. Counseling is now a function, a social function, cutting through many areas of life. This is a trend we have not formerly seen.

4. I've already mentioned the question of full-time and professionally prepared counselors. *No longer is counseling a part-time job*. If the principal sees the counselor in a school as someone who can help him with administrative duties, both he and the counselor ought to understand two things. The counselor is a member of the educational team and ought to do his share of the

housekeeping duties, but it's important that the housekeeping duties should meet two criteria. One, *is this duty getting the most mileage out of the counselor's special abilities and background?* And frankly I think that if many parents knew what counselors are being asked to do, how their child is not getting the help from the counselor that he should get, the principal would be in trouble. And second, counselors and principals ought to ask *whether this housekeeping duty is one that will hurt the counselor's image in the mind of the student or the mind of the teacher.* If he wants to develop an image of a person who is to be trusted, who doesn't betray confidences, who can be talked to about anything, who has no administrative authority, who has no biases for a given subject area, then what he is asked to do is important in terms of contributing to that image or destroying it.

5. Now we see that counseling is based much more on attitude than it is on professional preparation. As a counselor educator I can take a person with an attitude of caring toward children—do you really care what happens to little folks, or big folks, or other people—and I can make this caring more efficient, more effective in the life of the student. I can help this person to become prepared professionally but if he hasn't the attitude of caring, all the preparation in the world won't make him a counselor.

I've been considering trying to give attention to two alliterative words. One of them is *contemporary*—how can we keep people contemporary, and ourselves contemporary? The second is *caring*: how can we find out whether people care enough to be a counselor? This has come after forty-some years of experience trying to help people become counselors. I've finally discovered that if I haven't appraised adequately not only the person's ability to do graduate work, but also his ability to care for somebody else—to go out of himself, to be really concerned, to communicate to another that he really cares—then my helping him in graduate school is time wasted. He can become anything else, and he can do some very useful things, but he'll not be a counselor.

Let me close with part of Kahlil Gibran's essay on Work in *The Prophet*. (1961, pp. 25 ff.) I think counselors might well live with this kind of attitude toward work.

You work that you may keep pace with the earth and with the soul of the earth.

For to be idle is to become a stranger unto the seasons, and to step out of life's procession, that marches in majesty and proud submission towards the infinite

Always you have been told that work is a curse and labour a misfortune.

But I say to you that when you work you fulfil a part of earth's furthest dream, assigned to you when that dream was born,

And in keeping yourself with labour you are in truth loving life,

And to love life through labour, is to be intimate with life's inmost secret

You have been told also that life is darkness, and in your weariness you echo what was said by the weary.

And I say that life is indeed darkness save where there is urge,

And all urge is blind save when there is knowledge,

And all knowledge is vain save when there is work,

And all work is empty save when there is love;

And when you work with love you bind yourself to yourself, and to one another, and to God.

And what is it to work with love?

It is to weave the cloth with threads drawn from your heart, even as if your beloved were to wear that cloth.

It is to build a house with affection, even as if your beloved were to dwell in that house.

It is to sow seed with tenderness and reap the harvest with joy, even as if your beloved were to eat the fruit

Work is love made visible.

And if you cannot work with love but only with distaste, it is better that you should leave your work and sit at the gate of the temple and take alms of those who work with joy.

This then is the "caring" part of counseling, to be coupled with the need to be "contemporary." The combination requires a dedicated person.

REFERENCES

- Ciardi, J. Manner of speaking: The courage of his confusions. *Saturday Review*, 1962, 45 (June 2), 9.
- Faust, V. *History of elementary school counseling: Overview and critique*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin (in press).
- Gibran, K. *The prophet*. New York: Knopf, 1961.