

Arthur Zajonc has spent many years of his life with these teachings. A founding member of the Hartsbrook Waldorf School and a major force in that school and he is a parent of two children. in the outer world He is a quantum physicist, a PHD from the University of Michigan, he is a Post Doctoral Fellow at the Joint Institute for Laboratory of Astrophysics in Boulder, research scientist at Ecole Normal Superior in Paris and.... Institute for Quantum Optics. He is Now a tenured Professor of Physics at Amherst College. He is an Internationally known expert in quantum optics as well as lecturer all over the world. He is Advisor to the Boston Children's Museum, consultant to the Museum of Science and Industry in Tampa, Florida. Living proof that Waldorf does not lack connection with people of science.

It's a special pleasure to be with you this evening, and tomorrow. About ten years ago our two boys ages 1 and 2, I was already a physicist and already at Amherst college, and there was no Waldorf School. I had gone through PS 36 in Staten Island and grew up in a suburban school system outside of Chicago and entered into the University system and made my way through that with a number of televisions going constantly in my house, playing on about every athletic team that you could possibly play on, trying to get a varsity letter. It was an ordinary, exuberant American life. But in Amherst there was no Waldorf School. And we had two children, so it was a difficult question. I had seen Waldorf schools, I had come to know Waldorf schools. It became a question for me, as I guess it is for many of you, of finding a way of guiding your charges, guiding the child or the children that you care for so deeply into the years of, first nursery, then kindergarten, elementary, and then high school years, and preparing them for the life they're going to lead once they leave college.

* * * * *

Conference October 25-26, 1991 Lexington Waldorf School

GUIDING OUR CHILDREN INTO THE NEXT CENTURY

Guest Speaker: Arthur Zajonc

Lecture: Waldorf Education and our Technological Future:
Educating for a Place in the 21st Century

(2)

And you take that very seriously, as every parent must I think, who loves their children. They take seriously that charge of taking care of their children, providing for their children. There wasn't a Waldorf school in Amherst, there wasn't a Waldorf school nearby. It was something we felt was important for them, and could be important not only for them but maybe for all the children in our area. Even if the school didn't exist for our children - they were a kind of living reminder of the need for the finest kind of education that one could provide - a Waldorf education.

All of you, except for those who are neither parents or teachers, have somehow made an internal decision. Maybe you have a child in kindergarten, and a child in fourth grade, and a child in seventh or eighth grade and there are renewals of that commitment that take place throughout the life of your children as they are educated. And there are times of great questions - first when you visit the school with your two year old in mind, looking around to see what the kindergarten is like, what the teachers are like, what kinds of toys they have, what do they do. The decision that you made to enroll your child, like most that are enrolled in our school, was a decision that was based less on concerns of getting into Amherst college at the end of 12 years, and more on the kind of heartfelt reaction - the people you met, the teachers, other parents perhaps that helped you into the school, the materials you saw, the kind of activities you heard would be present there. Maybe you even enrolled with the intentions of a first grade leaving. Well - it's okay, it's so wonderful those first few years. But then when it comes to first grade we'll take him out and send him to a real school. But then there's something charming about the school - there's something wonderful when our children come back filled with light and stories and play - they really play - an extraordinary thing in our time, to see children who really play. Any number of people have stopped in front of our house when our boys are playing - older people - and said "We haven't seen children play like that for years." Why not. You look up and down the street and there's no one out playing. They're busy watching television.

So they come back to the school, and we say, well this is charming. Let's do this a little longer. It's only the first couple of grades. Then maybe around third or fourth grade - certainly by sixth grade we'll send them to a real school.

So you are welcomed into the first grade and there's the teacher who's going to be with them all those many many years, and you're worried about that. Will they get along? And somehow that manages to work out. You've got a French teacher, a eurythmy teacher, a Spanish teacher and all manner of subjects that crowd in. In those first weeks and months of the children coming back from those classes - they come back filled with the most wonderful and also sometimes disconcerting kinds of stories. "Mother, Father, what's the biggest number in the world?" They come back from your first grade with that - "What's the hugest number?" Is

it zillions, is it millions, is it quadrillion? You all know the secret answer - the secret Waldorf answer - "What's the biggest number in the world? It's ONE." The biggest number is one. The universe is one and it includes everything else. It's huge and it contains all other numbers and they can be gotten by dividing. Whether it's a pie, or an apple or anything, it can be as it were, separated and dismembered and just investigated until it reveals all the other numbers within it - this huge capatious welcoming number one. You were hoping they were maybe going to get into scientific notation - a really big number - the number of electrons in the world or something. 'One' sounds like Pythagorus. But it's charming, and you realise that it's only first grade, so it's alright.

The way they take so long with the letters, you know, it's even more worrisome. They spend a whole week on B. But then I don't know if it happened to you, but it happened to us after that week on B. One night my wife was putting August to bed, the candle was lit and as she was leaning down to give him a goodnight kiss, he looked up at her with the most intense look and said, "Mother, did you know there wqas a B in your face." "No, I didn't know" He reached up and he said, don't you see it? It's right here - there's a B in your face". She came down and told me the story. What a wonderful thing to walk around the world and see the alphabet. To see it as it were breathed out to you, speak to you. Not that it's a set of ciphers that somehow got into books - or that happens on the computer printer over there, but it's actually something that precipitates out of the whole world, out of trees, and mountains, and mouths, fish, every conceivable thing out there. It's like a heiroglyphic world. It's one thing we learned, you know, last week, and now we're beginning to explore that world and it's beginning to speak to us in a language which we're beginning to learn. It's a living language that's actually drawn out of life - by people, places and things. It is something special. And it is only first grade so we still have a few years.

Then you have a boy who's age 11, and another who's age 13. And it's a wonderful time. They're taller than you; they're clearly going to be taller than you, and they're looking towards their driver's licenses, and all those things that inevitably come, and the world has opened up in a way that it's never been open before. Some of you have 7th or 8th graders - anything is possible. They can bicycle anywhere, they can undertake almost any activity that seems to unfold before them; tney want to know things. They want to know everything, more and more and more. The teachers are constantly falling short; they're not really performing - because there's such a amount to be known and only so many hours in the day for learning. Again, there are embarassing moments. I remember one such that happened in class. My son right now is at a little class (orchestra? group?) down in Springfield with any number of children, none of whom are Waldorf children. He's been taking violin lessons in school. He goes down on Friday evenings. He was talking with fellow from one of the public schools. And of course they compare. "Gee, what are you studying? What are you

learning?" "We don't learn anything - nothing." My wife was driving and she said, "Now, August, that's not quite the truth. "No, it's true." Then the other boy said, "Well what do you do?" "Well, we study French and German; we study music. And then there are these things called main lessons." (Of course that's a secret word - it has no meaning. He discovered the word history and he thought that would probably do. They were in a Medieval history block.) "We study history about the Middle Ages." "The Middle Ages?" That was amazing - wonderful! He started talking about the French and German, and about the music and about the ensemble and chorus and all of the things which in fact they are doing - what are they doing in math and what literature are they reading,

and then pretty soon he realized that this young man with whom he was travelling appreciated that it was not true when he said he wasn't learning anything. In fact he was learning an enormous amount. But in such a way that it was almost like an environment in which he lived. It was almost like fish swimming in the water - they don't really notice what they are doing. There aren't any standardized tests for it to say, "You're now at 4th grade level in reading and 6th grade level in mathematics". You just perform, and you keep performing, you keep swimming, and you think, "When am I going to hit the obstacle, when am I going to hit the wall?" But you just keep going and you don't feel often the accomplishment that you've actually achieved after those several years in school. It's a challenge I think, especially in Waldorf Schools, to open that world up in those later years - 7th and 8th grades - to really allow the child to experience the full breadth and richness of the world. Teachers - a challenge which you'll write down on the buttons of your socks to meet those demands...meet the children as they set wings as it were to fly off into the world.

However this is still wonderful - maybe you've been captured by the story line - to allow your child to actually go through the whole eight years of the elementary school. Of course you don't have a high school and neither do we, so at a certain point you confront the question, "Is this going to be preparing my child for later life not just for the Waldorf school, or my home, but for their life in the world - the world of the 21st century? Or is this an education which is really a 19th century romantic wonderful thing that is a kind of precious moment, but really has no efficacy for the world that driven by industry and technology? Or perhaps is it offering the way of the future in that 21st century which can actually add an essential ingredient - an essential missing dimension to that 21st century and doing it in every single field - not just in the arts, but in physics, technology, and the sciences, the human services of various kinds, medicine, what have you?" And it's about that that I'd like to speak today. I'd like to speak about that image of the 21st century, about the century which none of us will manage to get into but surely our children and our grandchildren will get into and the place of those children in that life that they're going to be living on the other side of that 21st century. How is it that Waldorf education can place those children in the lives they will lead and the challenges they will meet in the 21st century? What made it important for a group of us in Amherst and in Lexington not only to pay the support of a private school, but to support it with our hearts as well, to foster this kind of education?

I'd like to enter that question of the future and the education that is important for that future not by talking about Waldorf education, but by talking about the a program which has now been launched by the Federal Government and the Department of Education. Education 2000 - an enormously important issue - as the president of the nation has called it, for the future, of this country and its excellence. James Watkins, Secretary of the Department of energy, in an article in which he described some of the priorities of education of our young men and women for the demands of the 21st century, had this to say about what we really need most of all for the future. He says we need technicians, and we need them badly. Those technicians must be able to read well, compute accurately and know masses sof technical material. In order to meet the demands of the technical industries of the next decade we must keep the science techline filled.

I don't know how that rings to you, but it rings a bit like an old cliché. When I was the age of my two boys, I got into an assembly - at PS 36 they had an assembly room just like this one - it had dropped lamps - in fact you used to have them too. And up on the stage was a big TV set. We watched the Mercury blast-off. It was a big moment and we were all crowded around - 200 of us watching the Mercury blast-off. And we were told - Sputnik - this is the big race - the race is on with Russia. I studied Russian in high school to be one of the scientist types that could meet the adversary and so on. And this sounds a little bit the same. the same kind of language. Now the problem is not that the

Russians are shooting space shots into the air but that the Japanese and the Germans and about 15 other nations who are ahead of the US in science and technology and mathematics in their scores on objective tests. That they say correlates with the productivity of American manufacturing; we are fast losing whatever edge we did have in the economic world. But it was really that these technicians are there to fuel the economic growth of America.

We came years ago to this continent and it was nothing but forests and animals and clear streams, and we have subdued that wilderness, we have clear cut that wilderness, we have harvested for our own economic development. We are fast polluting what lands we have, we're pumping the waters out of the desert regions in order to make them fertile. In order to fuel that economic edge we have often treated our children in the same way - like the pipeline, like oil - put it in at one end and it fuels industry at the other. There's another pipeline and its filled with children. In a way it's like a refinery - the public school system, and they refine them so that they can fit into industry - so they can power the economies of America. And when they're done with them, they are combusted so to speak and they're spent. Radioactive ones they put in the earth somewhere and the other ones are just vaporized. Obviously I'm not speaking against science and technology. I love science, and technology too - gadgets. The question is what's the appropriate human relationship to science and technology. The appropriate relationship to our natural resources, whether it's oil in the pipeline or children in our classrooms. What's the appropriate relationship of we to them and they to their future.

So that the pipeline that was feeding the economy was feeding into the defense department by and large, to make sure that those rocket ships went up - those were the growth industries of my generation. All the scientists were funded, until very recently, by the defense department contracts or National Science Foundation contracts which were connected with government priorities.

There's a change that's taken place. In part of that same little article that Watkins produced he says, "There are 70,000 US scientists and engineers hired by the Department of Energy. And where are the jobs in the Department of Energy that can't be filled properly? Dozens and dozens of jobs in the Department of Energy can't be filled. They're the jobs that would be filled by environmental engineers and scientists. There was an article in Monday's Wall St. Journal saying that there are approximately 10 jobs in the environment for every professional undergraduate engineer. These jobs go begging in the Department of Energy and industry and government agencies of all types. There are just not enough people out there who have any kind of expertise in the environment. Salaries are enormous: with a BA from a mediocre place you can get \$40,000 starting salary. (If some of you are looking for new lifetime opportunities...) Waste management, environmental restoration - just look at the Persian Gulf.

There's a lot of environment to be taken care of. Everybody's landfill, all the pollution problems, how to deal with radioactive waste. Is a critical problem and it's clear that it's going to get worse. In the next 3-4 years the Department of Energy alone, not to mention other industries elsewhere, will spend \$38,000,000 tidying up after the generations, mine and my father's, who exploited this landscape, and now we have to pay the tab.

And this third element - the economy on the economic side, the defense side - which were some of the old places where scientists and technologists worked, this third element. Ten years ago you couldn't beg your way into the Department of Energy for an environmental position - they did not exist. You had to be one of those feaky long-haired types that lived on a mountain in Colorado and had alternative ways of producing electricity - could do it cheaper, and so on. That just sounded kooky. Now we've got a situation where the tables are turned. It's clear that something's going on. Now it's also clear that Bush and Watkins and all these people, well-intended though they be, aren't to me getting the signals. Basically their attitude towards environmental engineers is, "Well, we'll just fix it somehow. We'll just take the same old 'We can beat 'em' mentality and we'll just go out there and get that environmental problem licked, by gum. There's nothing wrong with what we're doing, and nobody understands how we got into this mess, but - the Soviet Union is collapsing as a threat to the US and

Lincoln Laboratories, MIT, all the big beltway laboratories around MIT and the various universities are now desperate for employment for their scientists. Defense department contracts are dried up. And that money has to go somewhere. What they're thinking of is a war on the environment. The Persian Gulf kept things going for a little while, but now there needs to be a long-standing one, like the cold war - a new war on the environment. And we've got the scientists already trained and we'll just turn from the defense department contracts to the DOE. In other words, the thinking really hasn't changed. The attitude hasn't changed. There are signals out all over the place that the attitude towards education, which is the place you are actually going to cultivate those citizens, those scientists who are going to meet those pressures, those problems are still treated in the same old way - still conceived of in the same old way. The costs then will be not only material costs, but also human costs. On the one hand you want to get those Japs and Germans and beat them at their own game. We want to be still the economic titans; we're going to marshal all our resources, human and otherwise to do that. I don't think that's going to go anywhere. By the year 2000 which Bush has set as an objective.

The environment on the other side is calling out - calling out desperately. The United Nations, as you know, next year on Earth Day, 20 years after the first Earth Day, is planning an international conference - a big media event. Every government is going to send its highest level delegations to Brazil for a week's worth of meetings organized by the UN Committee on the environment and development. Environment and development - what a conjunction.

I've heard about an interesting man named Maruice Strong who is a multi-millionaire from the Colorado region, interested in things like Waldorf education, the Lindesfarn Association. He was a key figure in the conference 20 years ago which really set the stage for the environment, set the agenda. Now there's a new agenda - agenda 21, and he doesn't mince his words. First of all he says for example, "A fundamental change in our economic systems is absolutely essential. It is not a question of tweaking things around but of making fundamental changes. More environmental regulations are no longer enough. We just can't put more laws in the book. There are already 11,000 pages being pushed through. There's going to have to be a fundamental change.

This past summer a group of scientists, technologists, philosophers and so forth came together under the generosity of Lawrence Rockefeller, which I organized at Amherst. We met around the kind of thinking that we believe needs to be cultivated for that 21st century. One of the participants had an early copy of some of the agenda items for the UN meeting for 1992. It was depressing. Depressing in the sense that there was a lot of bravado but the feeling you had was treaty negotiations between warring factions - the environmentalists on the one side, the developers on the other side; the third world developing countries on the one side, the developed countries on the other. And how can one negotiate to save the Amazon rainforests. How can one negotiate preserves of biodiversity, as if one were negotiating a peace treaty? You had the feeling that that was absolutely critically important but completely insufficient. As long as that mentality which got us into the problem is not somehow addressed, there's really little hope for a long term solution. You'll only stave things off for a while; but there needs to be a more ... solution.

Last Monday Prince Philip and a host of organizations - World Wildlife Fund and a whole variety of other environmental organizations, put forward a 130 point plan for saving the earth. It's called "Caring for the Planet - a Strategy for Sustainable Living". It is closer. It calls for a fundamentally different way of looking at the world, a fundamentally different way of living our lives. The implications of what we're up against are much larger than filling a new pipeline, filling another generation's worth of students, throwing these engineers into the breach and hoping the old way of dealing with problems will get us there. And they're right. And yet none of them, I feel, are really able to articulate clearly the kind of thinking which is being called for. They know something's wrong; they know what we have. Like Maurice Strong, they know that the economic system is one of the pieces of the problem that needs to be completely rethought, but what shall we do. They know that the way of thinking, life styles, or attitudes and so forth have gotten us into these problems but also that we need to be transformed, opened, liberated, freed up from the habits that we presently have.

How is it that we do that? What do those things look like? What are we talking about? It's not so clear. The call for change is there, but the change towards what is ill-defined, much less the means by which one gets there. How do you educate children in the classrooms for life in the 21st century? This is the beginning of the problem, right? It's not going to get any better. It won't go away. The United States still doesn't believe there's any problem. This is one of the countries in the world that says, there isn't any problem.

What does this have to do with Waldorf education? I think that's actually in an extraordinary close relationship with Waldorf education. When that child came home and asked, "What's the biggest number in the world?", the biggest number - and you were wondering, "Gosh I wonder what it is - something close to a million?", and the answer comes back 'one', that's actually the kind of thinking that means the most for our time. When they go out into the world and the world begins to speak to them with that voice of 'B's and so forth, that's actually the kind of thinking that needs to be cultivated, for the engineer and scientist, the hard-nosed engineer and scientist.

Now what do I mean by that? I mean something really specific. I don't mean something vague - isn't it wonderful to have B's coming out at you and all that, but I mean something really specific. It's a kind of scientific methodology - it's a way of approaching problems, it's a way of looking at the world and it's a way that starts with the whole and moves in. It's not something where you say, "Well all that stuff is too complicated. I don't want to deal with atoms. You get them straight first; then you take two atoms and you put them together and you get O₂ and then I'm going to take those two and put them next to something else and I'm going to compound the atmosphere, - and then from that I'm going to build up. In other words that method, which is a magnificent method, which is a powerful method, starts with small things and builds huge edifices like buildings. It's hard to build a building just sort of whole. You take a brick and it sort of fits in your hand, it's a nice size, you can carry a few at a time and; you build it up. The building rises, and you feel this is a metaphor for life: if I have something that's a big project, I break it down into little things and I build it up. And it's good and it's true. There's authenticity to that and the enthusiasm of that methodology, of that way of compounding the world from fragments, out of small bits, is one way of thinking. Again I want to say it's a valid way of thinking, in certain circumstances a very important, valid way of thinking. But it has overshadowed another very important way of thinking, thinking that really moves in from the periphery, that comes at things from the outside.

That first grade classroom, you know that first day, there's the teacher, there are the children. They come to school and the teacher says, "Good morning Jessica, Good morning Anthony", and you're on the outside, and it's going to be your job to move closer and closer to the inside of that person that's before you.

10

It's really important to be able as a teacher, to delicately, gently move your understanding, your caring into the inner dimensions, aspects, interests, potentialities, problems of that human being before you. You can't wait till you have all the atoms figured out, you can't do it by artificial intelligence and say well, it's got to be programmed right and don't talk to me about complications; I've got to get first things first and I'll get the next things later, and so I'll build it up - rather than having to deal with that human being as a whole first. When you do that, you come to know them as they live with you, as you move with them, as you engage them. It doesn't mean it's just sort of random, unintellectual, just sort of find what's amusing. It's actually careful and deliberate and insightful; you really know them well; the teacher's really working well and the parents - with an adolescent for example, they're really working into that child's newly developing nature. It is just as clear and

(11)

and as insightful as the atomistic way of constructing the world. Even in things like physics this is happening - people are beginning to realize that building things up from the ground course, like building blocks, is not the only way to approach a problem. Anybody read the Chaos book which just came out? Here's something that's actually pretty hard to understand. If you take something like a fluid and you put it between a hot plate at the bottom and a cold plate at the top and you create convection, and you get magnificent patterns. If you actually had to write a program to describe what every single molecule is doing there, or every single unit cell, you'd get it wrong. But it's not so important that you get the details right because you can approach it from the other side. You can give up something on one side and you can approach it from the other side. You begin to see that system; you can move in and say, really there is a law here. It looks kind of noisy, it's a chaotic growth of some kind; but you can characterize that chaos. It looks like chaos but really it has an order. You can approach even physical systems, first things whole, then move in and gain insight which lives, as it were, in that whole and move in towards the solution, towards the problems.

Think of a way in which the curriculum fosters that kind of thinking time and time again. The fact that my son had to stumble to figure out what was main lesson - what was it - was it music, was it art, was it history, was it drama? They were all just done together, they sort of were lived. History was lived; it wasn't interdisciplinary in the sense that there was a little bit of this next to a little bit of that next to a little bit of this. They were just like life: they all happened together. And you didn't feel the compulsion to separate it out into 20 minute periods. It actually had this whole capacious period where you could move through in a very lively way all those aspects.

Think of the way you would study or introduce mathematical concepts like a triangle. The very first thing you do is you live the triangle. You run around one very fast. There they are running around triangles. You just feel them. And then sometime later on they'll draw the triangle they'll make triangles. First they are triangles, and then they make the triangles. And they they see the triangle, they judge the triangle - there's a bit of distance there. First they're just in it - then they draw it and they see it's beautiful. And then at some point they close the book and they realize that those are only representations of triangles. The real triangles happen here, and they think triangles and that's really fun. To think triangles. When you get to the right age it's just great. It's like a moment of enlightenment that this world here is as real as those triangles I drew. I can draw them there - they're even more perfect - in fact they are perfect. It's the only place they can be perfect. And then you can have that rich moment in life of the mind with the same kind of drama, the same kind of life, this same kind of

enthusiasm which you have when you're running around them when you're in third grade.

The letters are drawn out of the world - they precipitate as it were out of the world. They're not built up dot by dot, they're actually drawn out of life. You see the whole first. You see the face, and then the letter comes out of the brow - if you can find the right word - the brow.

This is not the future and means of educating for that future that most of America in the political world and in the educational world really has in mind. They just can't see it. They're still with great intensity, seeing the problem and throwing troops at it; they're going to throw these resources into the breach, but the way of seeing that problem is still the old way of seeing the problem. The question is how can one foster within the children a way of life, a way of seeing, those new kinds of attitudes. What is it that needs to be fostered? What's that inner resourcefulness that needs to be fostered? Otherwise one is really tyrannized, one is at a loss as it were, unfree to respond. There's no flexibility; one is locked in a particular way of looking at the world.

So what Waldorf education is really schooling is a way of seeing - a very important way of seeing - a way of seeing that starts with wholes and works its way in, like the way we meet each other, the way we meet the planet. To see it whole, take responsibility for it - not as an intellectual, but just because that's way you see it. It's not a kind of thing that you can think through - because you can move into that modality and appreciate that feeling for what it is.

And it happens in lots of little ways. It happens throughout the curriculum, it also happens around the curriculum. We happen to have a lovely little hillside on which our school is located. There's a compost spot which has been conveniently located at the farthest and most remote part of the field. Children have to take the compost bucket, all their lunch scraps, whatever, and you'll see two little ones with the compost bucket, and they have to walk all the way across this 15 acre field to the other end, just plodding along, and put the compost in the compost pile, and then they come on back. Which is part of the ritual of life. You sit down at a meal. Before you eat, what do you do? You think of the whole from which this food came - the rain and the sun, the air, the earth. You thank the farmer, you thank the animals that fertilized it in order that you might eat. There it is. It's images: image of a planet, images of a civilization that has made this possible. You place it into the whole. It's in the way you eat your meals, in every aspect of the curriculum, throughout the life the children lead in this school.

In the Waldorf school we educate children so that they eat and they live and walk and they see from the periphery inwards. And that, combined with that wonderful technical mastery which every

one of them will certainly be capable of as they go out into their high school and college years - they'll have all those methods and techniques - do not worry - they will have those methods and techniques. And they should have those, right to the cutting edge. But they will live in a different kind of imagination; they will have something that surrounds them, which really makes them free to see something that is otherwise unseeable. It is something which really prepares them properly for the 21st century. for the needs of that 21st century. They will be able to approach those problems in ways which, with all their good intentions, individuals like Bush and cannot.

To me that's why there needs to be a Waldorf School in Lexington, and in Vermont, and in Amherst. For seventy years or so there have been these schools working with this way of thinking. It's quite extraordinary to think of it. This way of cultivating the imagination did not crop up with the enviromental crisis. It came out of the first World War when many of the same forces were at work. It was an answer to a need which has been present and continues to be present until our time and it is solace to me to think of a million or two children who have gone through this kind of education, and then, like an invisible potentized remedy, make their way out into the world, out into the planet and cast their bread upon the water. And I hope that maybe some of that which has lived in them provided them with the basis for a response to some of these challenges which we have created. To live from the periphery inwards means preparation for the 21st century. To see the "B"s in the brows, to know that the biggest number in the world is really one. It's not just sentimental and cute. It's actually a way of thinking, and it's the important way. It needs to be there in the 21st century.