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An American Jewish community organized in consonance with conditions of Jewish life in a democratic setting is in the process of slow evolution. To meet their growing needs and responsibilities — both philanthropic and cultural — American Jews have mustered unprecedented human and financial resources, and have sought a pattern of organization, representative of the total community.

Through the years, Jewish social service has become committed in an ever increasing degree to the need for the community organization to deal effectively with the complex social structure of Jewish life in America. It is evolving through a slow evolutionary process into an organization concerned with the needs of American Jews qua Jews.

A concomitant of this broader concept of social service has been the increasing concern with Jewish education. This has found expression in larger appropriations for it, in the surveys conducted in many communities and in the establishment of central community agencies for Jewish education, especially in the last dozen years.

The conception of the community’s responsibility for Jewish education has undergone considerable change. Providing for the Jewish education of the poor is still a major consideration. However, broader principles of community responsibility for Jewish education have gained ground in the course of years. These principles include the idea that the community should be interested in the Jewish education of all Jewish children if they are to grow into intelligent, loyal members of the Jewish community (Klal Yisroel); that Jewish education is a primary need of American Jews; that it is to
II.

the community's direct interest to provide for the maintenance of standards and an improved Jewish school system; and finally that Jewish education is an important factor in making the existential Jewish community into an essential one. To carry out its responsibility, there is a growing recognition that the Jewish community needs an instrument to coordinate Jewish educational work and to speak and plan on behalf of the total educational effort - namely, the central community agency for Jewish education.

This study presents the story of the central community agencies for Jewish education as they have developed in the last forty years, and outlines the writer's views on its program for the future.

The following sources have been used in the main: 1) The surveys and studies of Jewish education. 2) Annual reports prepared by the directors of the agencies. 3) The constitutions and by-laws of twenty-five central community agencies. 4) The annual reports of the Jewish Communities (khallah) of New York and Philadelphia. 5) The data gathered in the questionnaire sent out by the writer to the central educational agencies. 6) The minutes of meetings of several educational agencies. 7) Reports and articles by leading educators and social workers in periodicals such as Jewish Education, Sheviley Mahimah, American Jewish Year Book, Jewish Social Service Quarterly, and others. 8) The Information Bulletins issued by the American Association for Jewish Education.

It is the writer's hope that this study will lead to a greater understanding of the place of Jewish education in the Jewish community life in America.
CHAPTER I - THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE CENTRAL COMMUNITY AGENCY FOR JEWISH EDUCATION

PART I - FORCES WHICH LED TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CENTRAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY

The systematic attempt to deal with the problem of Jewish education in America on a community basis is only forty years old. The establishment, growth, and development of the central educational agency corresponds roughly with the stabilization of the mass immigration of Jews from Eastern Europe, and with the increasingly organized Jewish life in America.

The central educational agency is, as a matter of fact, one manifestation of organized Jewish life in America, and from its earliest beginnings is related to a Kehillah community organization such as the Federation, the Welfare Fund or the Community Council. In almost every instance, especially in the last two decades, the general community organization was responsible for initiating a survey of Jewish education, and for bringing the educational agency into being. The central community organization has also assumed the major responsibility for its support.

The first central agency for Jewish education, the Bureau of Jewish Education of New York, was opened in October 1910 by the Kehillah (Community). 1/


2/ There were organized efforts to improve and extend and standardize the system of Jewish education before 1910 on local and national levels. In 1838, the Hebrew Sunday School Society of Philadelphia was established. This was the first attempt in America at the organization of free communal schools unattached to any organization or congregation. It was not until the organization of the Philadelphia Federation of Jewish Charities in 1901 that the Society began to receive some of its funds from an organization representative of the community. See Joseph Jacobs, "The Federation Movement in American Jewish Philanthropy", American Jewish Year Book (1915-1916), p. 165; also Annette Taizin, "The Hebrew Sunday School Society of Philadelphia", Jewish Education, VII. No. 2, pp. 66-70. The experience of the Hebrew Sunday School Society probably represents the first time in America that the organized community, through the Federation, made an allocation to Jewish education. The Hebrew Sunday School Society was an agency for the poor, and throughout its long existence has continued to receive funds from the community.
It continued to function for a generation under the same professional leadership in
the person of the late Dr. Samson Benderly. The Bureau of Jewish Education of New
York was the pioneer in the development of American Jewish education. Dr. Benderly

2/(cont'd.) In 1848, the Hebrew Education Society of Philadelphia was established.
Its purpose was to establish schools to provide a religious education to all Jews.
See Fifty Years of the Hebrew Education Society (Philadelphia, 1892). In New York, the
Hebrew Free School Association was organized in 1864 by the then existing city congre-
gations. Its purpose was to counteract the activities of Christian missionaries. A
Board of Commissioners, one from each congregation, was appointed to be in charge of the
management of the schools as they were organized. About ten or twelve schools were
opened in rapid succession. The Association received funds from the state and the
city as a charitable institution, since the children were provided with food, clothing
and industrial training. The Hebrew Free School Association was the first attempt
to communalize Jewish education by taking it out of the jurisdiction of any particular
congregation. It was different from the Hebrew Sunday School Society of Philadelphia
in that it conducted school five days a week, and in that it was organized by a group
of congregations. (The Hebrew Sunday School Society of Philadelphia was largely the
work of a group of women from Mikveh Israel Congregation.) In 1899, the Educational
Alliance took over the work of the Hebrew Free School Association. See Dushkin, Jewish
Education in New York City, (New York, 1918), pp. 53-58.

In 1886, the Hebrew Sabbath School Union was organized by Hebrew Union College.
It was a national organization which set itself the object of providing "a uniform
system for all Hebrew Sabbath Schools in the United States by promulgating a uniform
course of instruction and by training competent teachers". This was an attempt to
improve education on a national level. In 1903, the Hebrew School Union was merged
with the Union of American Hebrew Congregations. See Appendix D in Dushkin, op.-cit.,
p.468.

In 1909, representatives of the Talmud Torahs in New York formed a "Central
Board of Jewish Education", with Dr. Joseph I. Bluestone as chairman. The Board con-
sisted of delegates selected by the Talmud Torahs on the basis of the number of pupils
enrolled. Its purpose was to develop a uniform curriculum for the T.T.'s of the city.
It ceased to exist after the organization of the Bureau of Jewish Education by the
Kehillah. See Dushkin, op.-cit., p. 93. When the Bureau of Jewish Education began to
function, and the larger Talmud Torahs became affiliated with it, it organized the
General Board and Principals Association of the affiliated Talmud Torahs. See:
S. Benderly, "Aims and Activities of the Bureau of Education of the Jewish Community
(Kehillah) of New York, 1912", reprinted in Jewish Education, XII No. 3 (1949) pp.92-112

The above represent early attempts at coordination and systematization. How-
ever, they were limited in scope and objectives. They did not represent efforts on
the part of an organized community. They were sectional, limited to the interests
of a particular group. With the exception of the Hebrew Sunday School Society, which
began to receive funds from the Federation in 1901, they were not financed by an
organization aiming to represent the total Jewish community. Cf. Julius K. Greenstone
"Jewish Education in the United States" American Jewish Year Book (1914-1915), p.90-127;
Israel Friedlaender, "The Problem of Jewish Education in America" Past and Present
(Cincinnati, 1919) pp. 279-308; Hyman Orinstein, The Rise of the Jewish Community
of New York (New York, 1946), p. 234; Leo L. Halprin, "Jewish Education in the United
lived to see the establishment of over thirty central community agencies for Jewish education throughout the country. The establishment of these agencies is in a sense the fruition of a life long dream and a living monument to his memory.

Community agencies for Jewish education have been established in the United States and Canada, bringing the total up to thirty-nine. The founding of thirty-nine educational agencies in a period of forty years represents the establishment of one agency per year. Fourteen were opened by 1925, mainly in the larger cities, and the others after 1937. No agency was established during the intervening period. Moreover, in 1939, the American Association for Jewish Education was established, which is a loose federation of central communal educational agencies, and the national coordinating agency for Jewish education. What is particularly significant is the establishment of twenty-five central educational agencies in a period of less than fifteen years. It is truly phenomenal!

What were the forces that made this phenomenal growth possible?

The factors making for communal responsibility for Jewish education may be outlined as follows:

1. The growth and development of Jewish community organization as a factor in the establishment and growth of central educational agencies.

2. The Jewish tradition and the insistence on community responsibility for Jewish education.

3. Dissatisfaction with the existing Jewish educational conditions.


5. The organization and activity of the American Association for Jewish Education.

1. The growth and development of Jewish community organization as a factor in the establishment and growth of central educational agencies.
The most significant reason for community interest in Jewish education was the general growth of community responsibility which had led to the Kehillah experiments, the development of Federations, Welfare Funds and Community Councils.

Generally speaking, the establishment and the evolution of the central educational organizations in Jewish community life can be explained by the need for a central pattern which could be followed throughout the country. The Kehillah pattern of New York, for example, has been that of a number of cities. The Kehillah was organized in New York in 1909, and it has been a model for other cities.

In 1911, a meeting was held to organize a Kehillah. Twenty organisations were participating. According to the report, the question of Jewish education was raised and a committee was appointed to study the problem.

The relationship of Jewish education to community organization, broadly speaking, may be described in three stages: a) A Kehillah (community) relationship; b) a purely fiscal relationship; c) a relationship, the core of which is the expanding concept of social service. To understand the basis for the inclusion of Jewish education within the framework of the community organization and the basis for the relationship, it is necessary to analyze the forces in community organization, particularly as they affected Jewish education.

Stage 1. A Kehillah (Community) Relationship

Two attempts have been made to organize a Kehillah to deal with the manifold problems facing the Jews of America qua Jews, one in New York in 1909 and the other in Philadelphia in 1911.

The immediate cause for the New York attempt at community organization was an accusation by the New York Police Commissioner in 1909 that the Jews were supplying 90% of the criminals of New York. It caused much indignation, and it was felt that

A/ Mr. Soreq, op. cit. p.166.

A/ There is some evidence that an attempt was made in Los Angeles to follow the Kehillah pattern of New York. See I. Soreq, Prakim B'Kehillah B'Los Angeles (L.A. 1930, M.A. Dissertation, p.70.) Mr. Soreq states that in 1911 a meeting was held to organize a Kehillah. Twenty organisations were participating. According to the report, the question of Jewish education was raised and a committee was appointed.
"a representative, permanent and authoritative organisation" should be formed to

4b/ speak for the Jewish people. The purpose of the Kehillah was to organise and
coordinate Jewish life in New York City. Dr. J. L. Magnes was elected chairman.

Jewish education was considered one of its most important and immediate problems. A
Committee on Education was appointed for the purpose of making a survey of Jewish
education in New York. Rabbi Mordecai K. Kaplan was appointed chairman of this
committee and the survey was conducted under the supervision of Dr. Bernard Crenson,
a New York public school principal. 4a/

The results of the survey were made public in 1910 at the first Kehillah

4a/ (cont'd.) convention. Mr. Jacob H. Schiff donated a sum of $50,000, for a period of five years,
and later a sum of $25,000 was added by the New York Foundation. Shortly thereafter

the Bureau of Jewish Education of New York was opened. 4d/

Jewish education was an integral part of the Kehillah from its very inception.

The story of the New York Kehillah, its relationship to Jewish education, and

its failure to become a permanent community organisation is well known.

The story of the Philadelphia Kehillah is not so well known. Following the

establishment of the New York Kehillah, Philadelphia Jewry, too, organised a Kehillah

4b/ J. L. Magnes, "The Jewish Community" (1909). Address delivered before the Con-
stituent Convention of the Kehillah. A. M. Dushkin, Jewish Education in New York City,
op. cit, p. 100-104.

4a/ The survey of 1909 may be found in Jewish Education, XX, No.3, pp. 119-116.

4d/ See Part II of this chapter for a discussion of the objectives and activities
of the Bureau.

4a/ Dushkin's book on Jewish education in New York has kept the story of the experiment
(at least as far as Jewish education is concerned) alive. However, it was probably
the continued existence of the Bureau of Jewish Education, after the collapse of the
Kehillah, that made educators and lay people cognizant of the Kehillah experiment.
in 1911 and Dr. Cyrus Adler was elected president. The purpose of the Kehillah was "to further the cause of Judaism and to promote concerted action by the Jews of Philadelphia, in respect to all matters of Jewish interest."42/

From the very beginning, the Kehillah considered the problem of Jewish education as one of its most important functions. At the first meeting of the Executive Council of the Philadelphia community, a Committee on Jewish Education was appointed, with Mr. Ephraim Lederer as chairman. The purpose of the Committee was "to consider the promotion of Jewish education in the city of Philadelphia, with the power to confer with all persons and bodies in Philadelphia engaged in that work". One of the first tasks the Committee (the organisation meeting took place on January 10, 1912) performed was to recommend a statistical study of Jewish education in Philadelphia and entrusted this work to Dr. Julius H. Greenstone. 43/

The second recommendation of the Committee on Education was the organisation of a "Jewish Educational Board to be composed of representatives of the various kinds of Jewish religious schools and of educational institutions, for the purpose of organizing Jewish education in the city of Philadelphia, and to arrange for the formation of a conference of teachers and others engaged in Jewish educational work in the City of Philadelphia." 44/

On November 3, 1912, the recommendation of the Committee on Education to establish a Jewish Educational Board was approved. In May, 1913, a community-wide conference, and a Committee of Fifteen was appointed and authorised to arrange a plan for the founding of a Board of Jewish Education in Philadelphia. Mr. Ephraim Lederer was elected chairman of this Board. Rules and regulations were drawn up and the Board began to function. 45/


44/ Ibid, p. 22. 

45/ See Appendix for "Rules of the Jewish Educational Board of Philadelphia". It is interesting to note that the Philadelphia Board proposed to work with all existing agencies engaged in Jewish education in the attempt to enlarge their scope, to increase their efficiency and to promote a more intimate relationship among them.
Unlike the Bureau of Jewish Education in New York, a professional educator was not engaged to implement the rules of the Philadelphia Board. Similarly, no special fund was made available to make the work possible. The agency did not continue to function when the First World War broke out. However, it did lay the foundations for future community efforts.

The two Kehillah experiments are historically important for Jewish education. In both cities, no question was raised as to the rightful place of Jewish education in the framework of Jewish community organization. On the contrary, Jewish education was accepted as a prime responsibility of the organized community with priority rights.

Stage b. The fiscal relationship

During the last fifty years, there has been a continuous quest for a pattern of Jewish community organization in consonance with prevailing conditions in this country and within the framework of American democracy. The attempt at the organization of a Kehillah was one such attempt. The subject is under continuous discussion in many quarters.

While the ideal pattern is being sought, the daily needs of the Jewish community and the pressure of events at home and abroad have made some form of community organization imperative. Three forms have evolved: The Federation, the Welfare

---

41/ Fourth Annual Report of the Jewish Community of Philadelphia (1914-15), p.21. An attempt was made to federate the Talmud Torahs, but the plan was not implemented due to the war situation. It was not until 1919 that the plan to organize the Associated Talmud Torahs was consummated.

5/ There is a vast literature on the subject. The Zionist Organization of America, the American Jewish Congress, the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, and many individuals have expressed their views on the subject of Jewish community organization in America. Numerous articles on the subject may be found in the publications of the above named organizations and agencies. For example, see Henry Harwitza, "Towards a Noble Community"; Manoah Journal XXXVI No. 4 (1946); Robert Gardner, "Creating an Organic Community", Commentary (July 1940); Frank Troger, "The Quest for Community", The Reconstructionist, IV, No. 12 (Oct. 20, 1920), p.13. Comprehensive studies of the subject may be found in L. B. Berken, Theories of Americanization (New York, 1920), Chapter 3; Dale W. Baran, The Jewish Community(Phila., 1943) Vol.1, p.3-50; Barsonai H. Kaplan, The Future of the American Jew (New York 1946) p. 106-123.
Fund and the Community Council.

The Federation was organized by mutual consent of many institutions for a three-fold purpose: a) to pool resources for the efficient collection of funds; b) to avoid duplication of effort; c) to eliminate unsavory competition for funds. In order to persuade the agencies to join it, Federation had virtually to promise complete autonomy and freedom from interference. To assuage budgetary fears, it had to concentrate almost exclusively on money raising efforts. New agencies could not be admitted easily. The Federation could not effectively study and plan in terms of needs and resources; it could not integrate existing agencies, nor launch new ones, and it was not an agency concerned with religious and cultural interests of Jews. (7). Its main interest was philanthropic and the basis for its organization. In 1901, when application was made for the charter of the Jewish Federation of Philadelphia, the purposes were set forth as follows: "The objective of the Association is to provide an efficient and practical mode of collecting voluntary contributions from the Israelites of Philadelphia and to devote the sums collected to the support and maintenance of Jewish charitable organization of said city, and to such other charitable purposes as may be provided for in the By-Laws, to the end that each institution may the more effectively carry on its charitable work by being relieved of the necessity to make separate appeals and collections".


7/ To extend its activities beyond the original objectives or to include new agencies, Federation had to obtain the consent of its constituents. "It should be stated at the outset that Federation was organized under a plan which contemplated the exclusion of religious educational activities. In order that there be no question that Federation is complying with the letter and the spirit of its pledges, it is now necessary for Federation to go to its constituent societies and to obtain their consent to the extension of its field of activity so that it may embrace philanthropic-religious endeavor," Report of the Special Committee of Seven on Religious Educational Societies Made to the Organization Committee of the Federation for the Support of Jewish Philanthropic Societies of New York City (March 12, 1917) p.9. Cf. B. K. Salkin, op. cit., p.67-68; S. Lowenstein, op. cit., p.193.
was fiscal.

At a time when the community was disorganised, Federation, despite its limitations, represented the most organised, the most unified, and on the whole, the most representative form of community organisation. The Federation admittedly was not the Jewish community, and would have to be fundamentally reconstructed if it were to become the Jewish community. Yet the Federation was the most important single organisation in the Jewish community. 8/

What was the relationship of this form of Jewish community organisation to Jewish education?

Under the setup of the Federation, Jewish educational institutions were not included, except indirectly in so far as religious schools existed in the institutions already included in the Federation, such as Y.M.H.A.'s and orphan asylums.

The inclusion of Jewish education in Federation was the cause of serious controversy in many cities. Two principal questions were raised:

1) Is it the proper function of the Federation, a charity organisation, to support education?

2) Does the community have a right to divert for religious educational purposes funds intended for the poor?

Opponents to the inclusion of Jewish education in Federation made the following assertions:

a) Religious educational work is divergent in objectives. "There was not the unanimity of opinion in the community, as regards the aims, methods and purposes of religious educational work which exists with reference to the other charitable and social service agencies." 9/ Not only is the community not a unit in religious belief, but in Federation there are represented the most divergent shades of faith. Faith of conscience and convictions are involved rather than those of policy and method. 10/

8/ Cf. Maurice J. Karpf "Jewish Community Organisation in the United States", American Jewish Year Book (1937-38) p.197
10/ Ibid, p.121.
b) The support of educational institutions was to a very great extent local rather than general. Religious education was properly the responsibility of those groups such as the synagogues, which insist upon having Jewish education. Each local group should conduct its own religious educational program, and if help is needed, it should come from those who want to help. It is not the concern of the total community.

c) The organization of religious education was in its beginnings and would need large annual additions to the appropriations, increasing more rapidly than appropriations to philanthropic organizations.

d) The Federation should confine itself to auxiliary work. Federation was established for the purpose of doing away with duplication of fund-raising efforts among the agencies engaged in doing charity work and it was agreed, it would be "unwise for Federation to complicate its problems at the beginning by taking over the support of institutions engaged in philanthropic-religious activities." 11/

In answer to these assertions, those favoring the inclusion of Jewish education in Federation pointed out the following:

a) The Federation should meet all the needs of the entire Jewish community. Religious education cannot be eliminated from the community. It was the responsibility of the Federation, the central agency for the community, to see to

11/ Quoted by Edwin Goldmacher, op. cit. p.119

12/ Report of the Special Committee of Frena, op. cit. p.10
"From the religious standpoint, religious education is in itself a communal need... From the broad point of view, it may be argued that Federation should respect the sentiments and ideals of any considerable section in the community, and adopt such a definition of philanthropic activity as will enhance not only relief, health, recreation... but also religious education for those classes in the community which are unable to bear the expense."
it that the educational work was done properly. Synagogues were not federated
and could not possibly assume the communal aspect of Jewish education work.
Many Jews are unaffiliated and need the assistance of the community. The
Federation is the only organization that can undertake to pay the tuition
of the poor.

b) The establishment of Federation made the present and future position
of the Talmud Torahs precarious. 13/ As the Federation became stronger and
allied to itself various elements in the community, it became increasingly
difficult for the Talmud Torahs to secure funds as independent organizations.
A proof of this was the fact that some of their contributors returned their
bills with the word "Federation" written across them. If the Talmud Torahs
organized a federation of their own to raise funds, it would be detrimental both
to Federation and religious schools. There would result a separation in the
community between those active on behalf of secular philanthropies and those
interested in religious education. 14/

c) Although in Federation there are represented the most divergent shades
of faith, "it is fundamental in the plan of Federation that each society shall
have autonomy in its internal management, and so long as this principle is
observed, there should be no reason why the difference of opinion or belief among
subscribers to Federation should constitute a bar to the admission of these
societies. If religious societies are admitted, Federation must have nothing
whatever to do with curriculum or religious beliefs. The control of the policies

13/ Community of Farm, 25, cit., p.8-9; Goldmesser, 26, cit., p.120.

14/ Community of Farm, 26, cit., p.9, 11. It was pointed out that the in-
clusion of Jewish education "will serve to unify the community and to win
for Federation support for general charities from elements which have
hitherto held aloof. In this way, greater harmony will be brought about
of the schools must be left to each individual institution, and there must be no foundations for any suspicion that the Federation is in the remotest degree seeking to influence them in instruction which they are to give in the matter of religion.15/ 

d) The Talmud Torahs are "agencies for ethical instruction, giving in modern garb to the children a presentation of Judaism leading to a sympathetic knowledge of their past. They foster an intelligent self-respect on the basis of an understanding of Jewish history. They tend to establish a bond of sympathy between the parents and the children, and thereby to maintain the solidarity of the family and beneficent home influences. These strivings are undoubtedly conducive to good citizenship, and societies promoting them may be regarded as properly within the scope of Jewish communal activity to be supported by the community as a whole."16/ 

e) It was the community's responsibility to provide for the education of the poor. The Jewish education of the poor should not be any less neglected than their physical being. The latter was the most potent argument for the inclusion of Jewish education, and readily understood by the charity-minded professional and lay leadership. 

When community support for Jewish education was accepted in principle by the Federations of New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Chicago, Minneapolis, Cleveland, Cincinnati and other cities, it was on the basis of responsibility for the poor.16a/ The Federation was chiefly sponsored by wealthy givers and 

15/ Iben. 
16/ The Committee of Savoys was impressed with this argument and agreed that the conclusion of Jewish education would bring injury "not merely to the cause of religious education but also to the work of the schools as moral influences in the community for bridging the gap between the parent and the child and for maintaining the influence of the home and the family." Committee of Savoys, op. cit. p. 10-11. 
16a/ Committee of Savoys, op. cit. p. 9: "...Federation...should adopt such a definition of philanthropic activity as will embrace not only relief, health, recreation, but also religious instruction for those classes in the community which are unable to bear the expense."
reflected their conceptions of Jewish communal work although purposing to represent the entire community.

For the most part, Federation leadership thought it advisable from a practical point of view to include Jewish educational institutions in order to avoid duplicating and conflicting money raising efforts. They aimed at 100% Federation as far as possible.\[27\] It was a matter of expediency rather than one of principle.\[28\]

\[27\] Minutes of Philadelphia Federation of Jewish Charities, November 14, 1918: "On motion it was decided that the Federation, in its contemplated campaign, take in all worthy charitable, philanthropic and educational organizations and adapt as its slogan 100%." On January 25, 1919, the Committee on Educational Institutions reported in favor of the admission of the Associated Talmed Toraah. Julius H. Greenstone wrote: "The Federation, which at that time extended its activities, with the aim of including all Jewish organizations of the city, recognized the Associated Talmed Toraah as one of its constituent members and allotted to it a stipulated sum to meet its deficits, on condition that it discontinue all of its own membership dues and desist from arranging affairs of all kinds for the purpose of collecting funds." "Ten Years of Jewish Education in Philadelphia." (1924)

\[28\] Committee of Seven, op. cit. p. 13: "An examination of the membership lists of the religious schools indicates that to a great extent their supporters are the same as those of Federation. It will doubtless meet with the wishes of such contributors, that societies for religious education shall be brought within Federation. On the other hand, as persons now interested in religious education become supporters of Federation, much will be achieved towards the uniting of philanthropic endeavor and bringing to the support of Federation the different elements in the community."

It is interesting to note that professional leaders in Federation were of the opinion that the inclusion of Jewish education was an act of expediency. Such a statement was made by the late Dr. Solomon Lowenstein at the Conference of the National Council of Jewish Education in 1931 as reported in the "Proceedings of the Annual Conference", Jewish Education, III, No. 3 (1931) p. 196. Dr. Lowenstein was referring to the early struggle for inclusion.

However, professional leaders were in favor of including Jewish education. See S. Lowenstein, "Community Organization" (1923) op. cit. p. 194. Speaking for a committee of nine which prepared the report on community organization, Dr. Lowenstein stated the following: "The inclusion of educational agencies has been a subject of violent controversy in many cities, and in but few have they received that measure of support which they deserve. But among their supporters and their opponents with reference to their inclusion in the scope of Federation, there have been grave doubts as to whether they should be considered of such character as to warrant their inclusion in the group of agencies supported by Federation, but it is the unanimous opinion of this committee that they must be so considered and that every true Federation must make provision for them."
The first stage of the struggle for community responsibility for Jewish education, although limited in conception, was won. The recognition of this principle led to the establishment of the central educational agencies in the larger cities, or if associations of Talmad Torahs were already in existence, the central community fund-raising organization gave them support.

However, the principle of community responsibility for Jewish education was put to a critical test in the 30's. The severe economic crisis stirred up one more the question of the function of the Federation and its relationship to Jewish cultural and educational institutions. In times of depression, it was asked, shall it be "bread or education"? This was really a wording of the questions: "Is it the proper function of Federation, a charity organization, to support Jewish education" and "Does the community have the right to divert for religious educational purposes funds intended for the poor?"

Inherent in the question "bread or education" was the recurring concept that Federation should devote itself exclusively to feeding the sick and hungry and should have nothing to do with the spiritual needs of the Jews.

In Chicago, for example, no less than six committees were appointed in the 30's to study the place of Jewish education in the charities. Other communities had similar experiences and communal support of Jewish education was in jeopardy.

The "bread vs. education" idea was severely attacked by Jewish educators who fought it bitterly. Their main arguments were the following:

a) When Jewish Federations exclude Jewish cultural and educational activity from their programs, they then cease to be Jewish Federations. By restricting their activity to purely material relief, Federations sever the bond by which they are

integrated with the masses. The moral influence which they exercise upon the

19/ L. Brisker, Jewish Education in Chicago, p.10ff.

general Jewish community becomes considerably weakened.

b) Jewish education afforded by Federation does not mean the denial of bread. It is not "bread vs. education", but "bread and education" (vs. "bread alone") - in accordance with the traditional concept of "...not by bread alone doth man live." The money given to Jewish education cannot alleviate the national emergency which only the national government through its constituted authorities and extensive resources can possibly cope with adequately. 21/

c) Homes for the Aged, orphan asylums and similar institutions will always find support, since they are the object of general solicitude and not merely of Jews. If Jewish education, on the other hand, is neglected, who other than the Jewish community will assume responsibility for it? In child care institutions, it is taken for granted that the children should receive religious instruction.

Are the children, not in child care institutions, less entitled to Jewish education?

d) Federation would hurt its own existence if it did not provide for education which is a deep interest of many of its contributors.

Jewish education, although hard hit, weathered the depression. In Chicago, the majority opinion of every committee set up by the Charities, concluded that it was the proper function of the Charities to support the central agency for Jewish education, although new ways were suggested for raising funds.


No central community agency for Jewish education closed its doors during the depression period.

The victory in the 30's was significant. Not only was the principle of community responsibility for Jewish education more firmly established, but Jewish education was recognised as a fundamental need of the Jewish group which could not be dispensed with in an emergency period.24/

24/ At the 1931 Cleveland Conference of Federation Executives, the position of Federation was summarised as follows: "Jewish education is fundamentally not of an emergency character. It is a basic need of the Jewish group and cannot be dispensed with in an emergency period. It is generally recognised, however, that Jewish educational institutions have sustained a decrease in self-support. But these organisations cannot turn to public agencies for support. They are dependent wholly upon the Jewish community. Recognition of their needs must therefore be made by Federations and other community-wide agencies. It is also to be borne in mind that Jewish educational institutions have only recently begun to receive community support and are in greater need of protection and care of the agencies through which community support is secured."

Stage 3. The expanding concept of social service and its effect on the relationship of community organisation to Jewish education.

The extent, nature and quality of Jewish communal organisation resides in the social, economic and cultural sanctions for organisation prevailing at any given period. Accordingly, since charity and philanthropy were the principal sanctions of Federation in its early stages of development, Jewish education was included on that basis. Providing for the education of the poor through the medium of a central educational agency or through individual institutions had its parallel in the fiscal Federation.

Significant changes have taken place in the philosophy, program and functions of the Federation. These changes are noted in the recent studies and analyses of community organisation. 25 Through the years, Jewish social service has become committed in an ever increasing degree to the need for the community organisation to deal effectively with the complex social structure of Jewish life in America. From an organisation concerned with pure relief and philanthropy, it has evolved through a slow evolutionary process into an organisation concerned with the needs of the total Jewish community. This commitment to a larger area of social service has led to change and development in the program of Federation and to new forms of community organisation: The Welfare Fund and the Jewish Community Council.


The Welfare Fund was a product of the 30's and 40's and coincides with the advent of Hitlerism, the struggle for Israel, and the expanding needs of Jewish life here and abroad which placed an unprecedented responsibility on American Jewry. In many communities, the Federation and Welfare Fund exist side by side and complement each other's work. In small communities, the Federation has expanded its activities to encompass national and overseas needs.

26/ Central Community Organization in Large Cities, p. 19f.; Central Community Organization and Planning in Intermediate Cities, 1933; p. 16 f. Federation could be expanded into a Welfare Fund in those communities where the Jewish Federation was not part of the Community Chest. Where the Federation was part of the Community Chest, new agencies had to be set up to care for special Jewish needs. The relationship of the Federation to Community Chest had an influence on the assumption of responsibility of Jewish education by the community. In Cleveland, Detroit, Cincinnati, the central educational agencies had to raise their own funds for a number of years because the community organization received its funds through the Community Chest. In Philadelphia, when the Jewish Federation became part of the Community Chest, responsibility for the support of Jewish education was transferred to the Allied Jewish Appeal, the newly created agency to care for Jewish needs on a local, national and international level.

On the other hand, the Miami Federation did not become part of the Community Chest and hence could include within its scope of activities national and overseas needs.

In some respects, the three forms of Jewish community organization have become increasingly interchangeable. In the smaller communities particularly, there is an attempt to combine and integrate the three in order to develop a medium to encompass the entire field of Jewish communal affairs. Again the Miami Federation and its development is a case in point. The agency was organized in 1938 to avoid the duplication of fund raising campaigns and to bring order out of chaos in philanthropic endeavors. Several years elapsed and it became evident that community planning was imperative in such a fast growing community. A Community Planning Committee was set up and it proceeded to study the needs of the community in terms of the care of the aged, recreational needs, hospitals, Jewish education, etc. The Federation was organized on a more inclusive and democratic, representative basis. See Stanley C. Myers and Max C. Gottinger, "The Jewish Community Center of Age", Jewish Floridian, Miami, Florida, September 8, 1950, p. 24.

An analysis of the objectives and functions of Jewish community organization gives evidence that Jewish community organization in America is in a stage of transition and constant flux, but is definitely moving in the direction of becoming an over-all planning and service agency. See Central Community Organization in Large Cities, 1933; p. 2.
The Jewish Community Council represents an effort to broaden the base of Jewish community organization as well as more effective community planning.\textsuperscript{27/}

What were the conditions that made the changes imperative? What were the sanctions which caused the Jewish community organization to expand its program to encompass planning and social services not directly associated with charity and poverty, and which helped bring into being different forms of community organization.

It is not within the scope of this study to make a detailed analysis of community organization. But a brief discussion of three main reasons for the changing concept and program of community organization is pertinent to the growing interest in community responsibility for Jewish education:

1. The growth and development of governmental responsibility in the field of social welfare led to a shift in emphasis in Jewish community organization. In the last twenty years, national policy has been moving toward increasing assumption by public agencies of responsibility for Jews as for other citizens who may need services in relief, health and child care. The Jewish community organization had to examine its program to see how far it could, by freeing itself of primary relief demands, release funds for the support of distinctively Jewish communal activities.\textsuperscript{28/} Inasmuch as the strictly Jewish aspects of Jewish community work could not be cared for by an expanded social welfare program sponsored by the state and federal governments, it was logical to assume that the Jewish community would concentrate its efforts on behalf of specific needs pertaining to Jews. This development called for a new orientation in Jewish community organization and responsibility.


\textsuperscript{28/} B. N. Selchman, "The Federation in the Changing American Scene," \textit{cit.}, p. 70; \textit{S. G. Keats, \textit{cit.}}, p. 1276 f.
2. The stabilization of the mass immigration from Eastern Europe had a
decided effect on Jewish community organization. By the turn of the century,
the majority of the Jewish population, then numbering approximately one million,
was of East European origin. By the end of World War I, the East European Jews
not only were in the preponderant majority numerically, but had become firmly
established economically and socially. The growing influence and affluence of
East European Jews had a twofold effect on community organization. In the first
place, as the Jews became less dependent on the community for primary relief
needs, the community organization could expand its program in different directions.
The institutions originally organized to serve the indigent, the immigrant, the
orphan and potential delinquent, began to serve all the segments of the com-
29/
munity—all economic, all social and all ideological groups.

Secondly, the leadership became more composite, the membership in communal
organization more inclusive, and the base of participants broader. The concern
with Jewish affairs was not any more limited to the few. Due to the changing
economic and social structure of the Jewish population and the impact of American
democracy, the rift between the older and more recent groups narrowed considerably.
As understanding grew and attitudes changed, Jewish community organization
developed in complexity and diversity of services. The sharp reduction in im-
migration also helped bring about greater homogeneity, especially as the Jewish
population became predominantly native born in the adult as well as the youth
groups. The cultural and religious differences remained, but differences arising
out of variations in national origin and economic status became more attem-
The deep interest of East European Jews in Jewish tradition and Jewish institutional life made itself felt through the years with the result that greater emphasis was placed on the Jewish aspects of community life.

3. Rising and increasing prejudice, anti-Semitism and the destruction of European Jewry, and the struggle for the establishment of Israel, made for a greater awareness on the part of American Jewry of its financial responsibilities overseas, as well as its responsibility culturally and spiritually in America.

30/ Cf. S. S. Lears, "The Jewish Community", The Jews, 2nd ed., p.1278-1280. "Then the East European Jews finally acquired stability and self-confidence, they began to create institutions of their own, corresponding more to their philosophy and habits. Inevitably, this led to further multiplication and diversification of Jewish community effort...The more the East European Jew has prepared or won recognition for his achievements, the more class lines disappeared..." Some of the oldest Jewish families in the U.S. have already largely been assimilated into the general population. However, association, marriage between socially prominent Jews and Jews of other classes is perhaps more frequent than it is between the elite and middle classes in the country generally."

Lee L. Honor, Survey of Jewish Education in Boston (1930). In the introduction to this survey, Soloman Lowenstein points out that there is a direct relationship of community interest in Jewish education to the leadership in Federation. When the East European Jews attained economic independence and social standing, there developed on the part of their representatives in Federation a positive affirmation of what they believed to be the rights of their clientele and Jewish education. I consider the above statement important in view of the fact that Dr. Lowenstein was closely connected with the development of the Federation movement and knew the trend well. I. S. Chipkin, "Judaism and Social Welfare", The Jews, II, p.779. As an illustration of the broader base of participation, Dr. Chipkin points out that in 1911 a total of 27,000 individual gifts were received by the New York Federation. In 1942, the number rose to $65,000, and in 1944 to $95,000.


S. E. Baron, "The Jewish Community and Jewish Education", Jewish Education, XII No. 2 (1942);
In the 30's and 40's, Jewish group awareness was at its highest. There was a growing feeling that the Jewish community of America must look to its own resources for cultural and educational institutions. There came the slow realization that the spirit of philanthropy in the large sums collected by the Federations and Welfare Funds, is not sufficient in itself to make for a strong Jewish community in America, that "without an effective program of Jewish education the future of the Jewish community and of Jew in America is threatened." 31/

In the light of unprecedented world events, concerted action was imperative. The Jewish community girded its loins and faced its tremendous tasks with forthrightness. Fabulous sums were raised and herculean efforts made to alleviate Jewish suffering and to give active assistance in the establishment of the State of Israel. Concomitants of the concerted efforts were the rapid growth of community organization, the multiplication of social services rendered and a deeper concern with the problem of Jewish education. The concern with Jewish education found expression in larger appropriations for it, in the call for many surveys of the status of Jewish education, and in the establishment of central educational agencies.

"Whether there is a vital Jewish community in the U.S. in the years to come will depend on how well prepared Jewish youth will be ready to take over leadership. It is well to remember that much of what the present older generation is doing in the Jewish world is the result of influence during youth." Ibid, p. 1922.

Gf. S. A. Goldsmith, "Trends for the Future", Jewish Social Service Quarterly, XIV, No. 1 (1949): "In Jewish education lies one of the most valid and potentially one of the most productive of all communal activities established by the Jewish community." (p.36)


Also: C. B. Sherman, op. cit., p.224f.

Also: S. N. Baron, "The Jewish Community and Jewish Education", Jewish Education, XIX, No. 2 (1948): "Europe is ruined. We can no longer look to it as a source of leadership. We must build...our own wholly self-sustained cultural life." (p.9)

Also: David Rudavsky, Jewish Education in New York Since 1918. p.159-160.
To sum up: The Federation has expanded its objectives and activities to become not only a fund raising body, but the auspices, if not necessarily the instrument, for many other services. In the smaller communities, the Federation has assumed the responsibility for all major Jewish problems. Conditions also called for the creation of the Welfare Fund and the Community Council. These forms of community organisation are an extension of community responsibility to national and overseas needs and represent the trend in the direction of organizing and operating Jewish community activities on a more democratic and representative basis.

What effect did the changes in community organisation have upon community responsibility for Jewish education?

When the community organisation's scope was limited, the central educational agency's functions were limited too. When the scope of activities and responsibilities were expanded and new services added, with a corresponding change in outlook and philosophy, it had its direct effect on the interest in Jewish education and the growth of the central educational agency.

A recent analysis of communal organisation in intermediate cities shows that the Jewish community has come to recognize its responsibility in new areas which are primarily cultural and educational rather than economic in character. Outstanding in these new areas is the increasing concern with the program of Jewish education.

It is only in this light that the establishment of twenty-five central educational agencies in the last dozen years can be understood. A careful study of the surveys which led to the creation of central educational agencies in large,

32/ Central Community Organisation and Planning in Intermediate Cities, op. cit.; H. L. Lurie, "Intermediate Cities Change Scope", Jewish Community, V, No. 1 (1950); H. L. Lurie, "Community Organisation in Intermediate Cities", Jewish Community, V, No. 2 (1950); "In 1925 most of these cities (from 5,000 to 40,000 Jewish population) had no central organization...There was no central plan for local Jewish services...Even five years ago, fifteen out of fifty-five communities in this population group had no effective year round central organisation. Today the trend is definitely toward the establishment and strengthening of a central organisation concerned not only with fund raising but with social welfare planning as well...Out of 44 cities in this group which have established central bureaus of Jewish education, 27 report that they are constituents of the central community organisation."
intermediate and small communities, indicates that a prime consideration for their establishment was the recognized need for an agency to plan, extend, co-ordinate, standardize Jewish education on a community wide basis, to train teachers, to develop high school and adult education, etc. This recognized need goes beyond the conception of providing an education for the poor. The surveyors advocate that the community’s responsibility for Jewish education should be broad in scope and should become an integral part of the total community’s development.

The argument of providing Jewish educational facilities for those unable to pay is still of major importance. However, broader principles of community responsibility for Jewish education have gained ground in the course of years. One of these principles is that it is impossible to maintain standards and a coordinated educational system without community support. Another principle holds that the community should be interested in the education of all Jewish children if they are to grow into intelligent, loyal members of the Jewish community.33/

With a changing and evolving rationale for Jewish community organisation, Jewish education was given more sympathetic consideration.34/ It began to take its place as one of the vital social services not merely on the basis of caring for the poverty stricken, but assumed the aspect of the Jewish community’s concern for its continued existence, for its survival and even for its dignity. Jewish education began to gain recognition for the role it could and should play in the creation of a vital Jewish community.

The parallel development of the community organisation and the central

33/ See the section on “Insistence on Community Responsibility for Jewish Education” for a further elaboration of this principle.

34/ Not only were more funds made available, but larger sums set aside for supervision, guidance, and general development of Jewish education.
educational agency is patent in many respects. As was pointed out above, the fiscal
educational agency was like the fiscal federation. The central educational
agency operating an association of schools directly is similar to the functional
federation or over-all community agency. A more encompassing service agency in
Jewish education has its counterpart in the all-inclusive community organization.

In many respects, the problems of both agencies are alike. Generally
speaking, the scope of both agencies is affected by local traditions and
peculiarities, by group relations, by the quality of the community leadership,
lay and professional. The central educational agency's problems of inclusion, rela-
tionships with unaffiliated schools, of contact with the community-at-large are
similar to the problems which face the community organization. Both have diffi-
cult problems of coordinating their component segments which have different
ideologies, different objectives, and are diverse in approach to the problem of
social service and Judaism in America.

Regardless of the pattern of the central educational agency, Jewish educa-
tion has a recognised place in the community organization.

The concept of total community organization will no doubt continue to
evolve, change and take definite shape in accordance with conditions and needs
of the times. The central educational agency will very likely develop accordingly
and expand or contract its activities to fill the recognised needs of the com-
munity.

Without the framework of a community, no matter how faulty in organisation
and scope, it is doubtful whether the central educational agency would have
come into being. However, given an organised community, a central educational
agency is not necessarily a sequitur. Other factors and forces must be at work.

We now turn to a discussion of the other factors which played a role in the growth
of the central educational agency.
12. THE JEWISH TRADITION AND THE INSISTENCE ON COMMUNITY RESPONSIBILITY FOR JEWISH EDUCATION

Consistently, for many centuries, the Jews have shown a deep love of learning and an intense desire to transmit their religious and cultural heritage to their children. No community was too small to provide for the instruction of the young and no sacrifice too great. Although Jewish education was not compulsory in the modern sense, there was a moral compulsion stronger even than legal compulsion. Scholars have attested to the fact that, from early times, provision by the community for the education of the poor and underprivileged was considered a sacred obligation and that this obligation was fulfilled with devotion and love.

It is not surprising that the story of the Jews in the United States is also witness to this deep sense of responsibility of educating the young in the Jewish tradition and of making provision for the education of the poor. This is clearly evident from the earliest records of congregations and organised groups of Jews in America.

35/ Cf. S. Assaf, Nekorot Li Toldot Habimah Bi'Yisroel (Tel Aviv 1936) 3 volumes, passim. A. A. Neuman, The Jews in Spain (Phila. 1948) II, Chapter XV, "Schools, Curricula and Educational Ideals" p. 64-96. Dr. Neuman quotes a valuable statute drawn up by Castilian communities in 1432. It throws light on the attitude of Jewish communities to Jewish education and the manner in which they planned to carry out their responsibilities.

Israel Abrahams, Jewish Life in the Middle Ages (Phila. 1911) Chapter 19.

Levi Scharfstein, Toldot Habimah Bi'Yisroel (New York, 1945), I, passim.
Levi Scharfstein, Ehadot Bi'havah Hayahudim (New York, 1943), passim.

36/ The Shearith Israel Congregation of New York, organised at the beginning of the 18 c., made provision for the education of its members and for the children of the poor: "Any poor that shall be thought unable to pay for their children's learning shall be taught gratis." Dushkin, Jewish Education in New York City, Appendix A "Extracts from the minutes of the Shearith Israel Congregation", p.449. See also Appendix F, p. 480. We mentioned in note 1 supra, the efforts of the Hebrew Sunday School Society of Philadelphia and other attempts at organised Jewish education. For example, the Preamble to the Constitution of the Hebrew Education Society read as follows: "Penetrated with the conviction of the necessity of a thorough religious education of all Israelites and in view of the absence of proper schools...we the subscribers have associated ourselves for the purpose of raising funds, and to effect therewith the establishment of such schools..." Quoted in Fifty Years of the Hebrew Educational Society of Philadelphia, p. 9. Cf. Dushkin, Jewish Education in New York City, p. 23-62; Scharfstein, Toldot Habimah, op. cit., II, p.155 f.; Honor, "Jewish Education in the United States", op. cit., p.151 f.
The sacred obligation of Talmud Torah, the study of Torah was not neglected by the East European Jews when they began to arrive in large numbers after 1882. In accordance with their deep interest in Jewish tradition, and in accordance with their experience, the East European Jews established Talmud Torahs for the children of the poor in all parts of the country where they settled. The Talmud Torahs were for the most part supported by communally minded individuals interested in Jewish education and keenly aware of their responsibility to their tradition and heritage. 37/

Talmud Torahs were established in New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Boston, Baltimore, Buffalo, Detroit, Minneapolis, Indianapolis, Cleveland, Cincinnati and other cities. East European Jews, Orthodox in belief mainly, were the backbone of these institutions. 38/ The Talmud Torahs used many devices to raise funds. 39/

37/Dushkin, Jewish Education in New York City, Appendix E, "Extracts from the Constitution of Nachasikai Talmud Torah, 1885": "The object of this school shall be to instruct poor Jewish children gratis in the Hebrew language and literature and to give them a religious education."


39/ To cite one example, A. Klein, "A History of Jewish Education in Buffalo", op. cit. p. 30: "A variety of devices was employed to support the Talmud Torah... More novel, perhaps, was the scheme of a species of voluntary community tax. Throughout the city, the schochetin levied a two cent tax on every fowl slaughtered. It was estimated that at one time it provided $3,000 a year. The Talmud Torah also came to have a monopoly on the sale of matzoths..."
The efforts made by the Jews in America from early times to provide for Jewish education were on a congregational, or group, or Talmud Torah basis, and might be considered communal in the sense that the poor children of the community were welcomed and given an education. However, there was no community organisation as such, recognized as the representative of the total community, which assumed the responsibility of Jewish education. Furthermore, it is doubtful whether the East European Jews had a keen sense of community organisation. In terms of Jewish education, the East European Jews developed the private Heder and the Talmud Torah for the poor children.

As Jewish community life became more stabilised and began to take on organised form, individual Jews or organized groups of Jews laid claim to community assistance in the area of Jewish education. The claim to community support of Jewish education became stronger when the East European Jews began to find their place socially and economically in organized life. 40/

The recognition of their influence and right to support by the community organization has already been cited in the case of New York. 41/ The story of Jewish education in Chicago illustrates the same point.

40/ It is interesting to note that in Chicago and Baltimore where Orthodox Jews formed separate federated charities, support of Jewish education was included almost from the very start. The United Hebrew Charities of Baltimore was organised in 1902 and the Federated Orthodox Jewish Charities of Chicago in 1913. In the survey of Jewish education made in 1919, Mr. Louis Hurwicz states that the Orthodox Charities supported seven Orthodox Talmud Torahs. See Louis Hurwicz, 1919 Survey of Jewish Education in Chicago; See also C. L. Mishkin, "Talmud Torahs of Chicago", p. 49. The Federated Orthodox Jewish Charities of Chicago represented a segment of the community, but the inclusion of Jewish education in its program as testimony to the deep interest on the part of East European Jews in Jewish education, and their feeling about the community's (even if it is their own brand of community) responsibility for Jewish education.

41/ See notes 12, 14, 16, 16a, 20. It should be noted that the Committee of Seven took into consideration the possibility of the organisation of a special federation which would be in competition with the Federation and injurious to its work: "It is further submitted by the applicant societies that if they were to form a federation of their own to finance their activities and make an appeal to the public, the result would be detrimental to both the religious schools and the Federation, the community would be disorganized by the establishment of more than one Federation, and the endeavor to unify philanthropic activities would be frustrated. There would result a separation in the community between those now active on behalf of secular philanthropies and those who are interested in religious education..." Special Committee of Seven, app. cit. p. 9.
One of the conditions of the merger of Federated Orthodox Jewish Charities and the Associated Jewish Charities of Chicago into the new organization known as the Jewish Charities of Chicago, was the inclusion of Jewish education. One of the objectives of the Charities, it was stated, would be to put "into practical operation, the best systems of relieving and preventing want; to aid the sick, the aged...and to aid organisations engaged in teaching Jewish children..."42/

It seems evident that the inclusion of Jewish education was motivated by the desire to avoid multiple fund raising campaigns and by the recognition that East European Jews were sufficiently influential and affluent to conduct campaigns of their own which could have a detrimental effect on Federation. However, sight must not be lost of the fact that the leadership in Federation was of German descent and that German Jews played a significant role in Jewish community organisation in America, particularly in the development of the Federation. While it is true that they were mainly interested in the philanthropic aspect of Jewish community life, it is also true that their keen sense of community organization made the inclusion of Jewish education possible and helped to stabilize the Jewish schools educationally by giving them financial security.

It is no less significant to point out that Jews of German descent played a prominent role in alerting the community to the need of a proper system of Jewish education. Louis Marshall considered a proper system of Jewish education the sine qua non for the survival of Jewish education in America.43/ Without the assistance of Marshall, Schiff, Magness, the Bureau of Jewish Education in New York could not have been possible. They not only launched it, but gave it support

42/ Quoted in H. Bricker, Jewish Education in Chicago, p.6. Inclusion of Jewish education seems to have been one of the conditions of the merger of Federations in Baltimore. Cf. Solomon Lowenstein, "Community Organisation", National Conference of Jewish Social Service (1923) p.197.

throughout the many years of existence. They had an understanding of the principle of community responsibility for Jewish education.

In short, when Jewish education was included within the framework of the community organisation, it represented an extension of local responsibility on the part of communally minded individuals, or particular groups (such as a federation of Orthodox Jews) to the over-all community organisation, which in many communities was under the control of American Jews of German descent.

From the very start, although the community's responsibility for educating the poor was the chief argument, there was a much broader principle of community responsibility emphasized. It is the insistence on this broader principle of community responsibility which became basic to the concept of the central educational agency and which played a role in its growth and development.

The core of this principle is that the problem of Jewish education is so vast in scope that no element in the community by itself is capable of coping with it. Therefore, there is the need for the organization representative of the community to assume the responsibility for the total educational needs of the community.

Dr. Samson Benderly, Dr. Israel Friedlaender and Dr. Nordecai M. Kaplan began to lay stress on the principle of community as early as 1909 and

---

43a/ Ibid., p. 45. Benderly relates that the organization meeting of the B.J.E. took place in the home of Louis Marshall and that all subsequent meetings of the Trustees of the B.J.E. (1910-1929) were held there and that Marshall was present at all of them. Marshall's interest in Jewish education was deep. In 1916 when his wife died, he set aside a sum of $150,000 as the Florence Marshall Memorial Fund for Jewish Education.

43b/ J. L. Magnes, "The Jewish Community", op. cit.
Marshall, Schiff, Magnes supported them on this view. They and the younger men who came under their influence continued through the years to elaborate and interpret the idea to the leadership of the communities in which they served.

Report of the Executive Committee of the Jewish Community (Kehillah) of New York, Feb. 26, 27, 1910. The statement by Dr. Kaplan included the following: "No substantial improvement can be made in the work of Jewish education unless a radical change takes place in the system of financing it which is at present in vogue. Instead of being left to individual societies, the work must be controlled by one central organization. Such an organization cannot be brought about unless that part of our community which has been foremost in establishing the largest institutions of charity, awaken to the need of perpetuating Judaism and to the recognition that the best way it can be perpetuated is by establishing institutions, where each child can receive at least six hours of Jewish instruction each week for a period of at least six years. Let the Kehillah give strong and unequivocal expression to such a demand." (p.25-26).

J. L. Magnes, "The Jewish Community of New York City", American Jewish Year Book (1910) p.44f.

Jewish Community (Kehillah) of New York Third Annual Report April 1912. The following statement was made by Dr. Friedlaender: "Problem of Jewish education was so vast that no organization...can be expected to cope with it single-handed. The solution can only come from the united efforts of the Jewish people themselves..." (p.24).

Samson Benderly, "Jewish Education in America", Jewish Exponent (Philadelphia, January 17, 1908) reprinted in Jewish Education, XX, No. 3, p.80-86; Samson Benderly, Aims and Activities of the Bureau of Jewish Education of New York, 1912; Samson Benderly, "Jewish Education A Communal Responsibility", Jewish Education Nov., I, No.2 (1923); "Community responsibility in Jewish education should be understood in a different sense than it is in the case of the sick, poor and aged. In philanthropic endeavor, not more than 5% are beneficiaries, while 95% of the community are benefactors. In Jewish education, practically all are beneficiaries." Samson Benderly, "The School Man's Viewpoint", address delivered at XXX Council, Union of American Hebrew Congregations, Cleveland, 1927. Reprinted in Jewish Education, XX No 3, p.86-92. Samson Benderly, "Jewish Education in the United States", Jewish Education VII, No. 1 (1935): "Jewish education is of vital importance to, and the responsibility of, the entire Jewish population...Jewish education cannot be treated as a philanthropy...The primary responsibility of the federations and welfare funds should be that of the overhead expense in Jewish education. The community fund raising agencies must defray the entire cost of organization, supervision and coordination..." p.7-8.

Mordecai M. Kaplan, Judaism As A Civilization (New York, 1934): "There will have to be developed that communal support and social pressure without which no system of education can function." p.479. Cf. Leo L. Honor, "Shekash Shekashpe-si"(The Three Who Influenced), Sefer Havrot Shel Agudath Haemorin (New York, 1944) p.350f.
What are the basic tenets of the principle of community responsibility?

First and foremost is the idea that there is a Jewish community, no matter how weak, faulty or unorganised, and that the child should be helped to grow into the Jewish community. Kkl Yisroel is set up as the ideal. The gradual "socialization of the Jewish child into the Jewish group" implies the idea of a Kkl Yisroel on a local, national and international level.

This concept of a Jewish community is based on the faith that as part of the American community, it is possible for Jews to educate their children Jewishly, and that the American Jewish community can continue, for a long time, to be an important branch of the world Jewish community with Israel as the cultural and spiritual center. Furthermore, it is also predicated on the idea that Jewish life can be regulated within the cultural and spiritual pattern of the larger democratic American community. The idea of Kkl Yisroel is also based on the concept that it is possible, while recognizing and accepting differences, to arrive at larger areas of common action in Jewish living and in Jewish education.

Hordecai H. Kaplan, Judaism As A Civilization, (New York, 1934), p.483. The function of Jewish education "is to qualify the child or youth to play his part, and cooperate with his fellow-Jews so that Jewish life, as represented by its net work of institutions and organizations, will produce a wholesome, integrated and creative personality."

Isaac B. Berkson, Theories of Americanization, (New York, 1920). Berkson sees all minority groups as having basic community interests - political, social, economic, industrial. However, beyond these there are spiritual and cultural interests which depend for their richness upon variety and multiplicity. This theory does not call for a separate school system nor for a separate community existence apart from the American community. The school and other communal cultural agencies are to supplement the work of the public school and the American community. Chapter 3.

Secondly, granting the existence of an organised community or at least one in the process of developing a definite pattern, an idea central to the community principle is the recognition of the community as an essential instrument for improving Jewish education. What is true of all Jewish social service which is committed in an ever increasing degree to the need for the organised community to deal systematically and effectively with the complex social structure of Jewish life, is also true of Jewish education.

Thirdly, the community principle holds that education is a social process which takes place at its best when schools are conceived as communities of children, reflecting in some measure, the general community. Jewish education, too, has its outlet into the Jewish community. This community should be engaged in fostering education for all Jewish children.

Fourthly, the heterogeneous Jewish social scene necessitates the community principle in Jewish education. The constant shifting and changing of ideological thinking, the heterogeneous membership in organizations, the confusion that exists among young adults about Jewish life, Judaism and Jewish education, make a larger community framework necessary. In such a community framework, there is room for exchange of ideas and interplay of differences and the possibility of arriving at basic principles in Jewish life and in Jewish education.

Fifthly, the democratic environment in which differences are recognised as inalienable rights is a compelling factor in Jewish community life leading to cooperation in common areas. Jews are obligated to recognize the same principle to differ among themselves. It is the recognition of a common unity underlining the structure of divergent and variegated cultural and religious patterns.

49/ Beredechi M. Kaplan, Judaism As A Civilization, op. cit. Chapter 31.
A. M. Dushkin, "The Community Principle in Jewish Education", op. cit. "Jewish Education, like all education, should be socially expansive... The child should be made aware that he is growing up in an ever widening fellowship... which commencing with his home circle, his school and congregation, expands to the local community and to the larger community." p.19.
49/ Leo L. Honor, "Jewish Education in the United States", op. cit. "American
Sixthly, from a practical viewpoint, conditions in Jewish education made the community principle in education an obligation and responsibility of the community. These conditions include: 1) the need to support and maintain schools; 2) the need to improve the quality of instruction; 3) the need to expand and equalize opportunities for education; 4) the need to supplement educationally that which individual schools cannot do by themselves. 50/

It has been pointed out that the community principle in Jewish education should be recognized as still "largely in the realm of hypothesis of faith, rather than of demonstrated reality". 51/ This statement may be correct in the midst of more specialized claims of parties, groups, congregations. However, persistent promulgation and advocacy of the principle has had influence on community leadership and has been an instrumental factor in the establishment of the central educational agency.

49/ (cont'd.) Jewish education is the story of the impact of the American environment upon the varied interpretations of the age-old aim of preparing the young to live as Jews, as well as the interplay of these ideals themselves." p.151. See also Leo L. Honor, "The Function of a Community Agency for Jewish Education", Jewish Education Register and Directory 1951 (A.A.J.E.)

50/ The practical viewpoint of the community principle in Jewish education is emphasized in almost every survey conducted in the last thirty years. This viewpoint is found expressed in the writings of Chipkin, Dushkin, Ben Rosen, Honor, Berken, Dinin, etc.

3. Dissatisfaction With Existing Conditions

In 1906, Dr. Benderly had pointed out the need for many changes in Jewish education in order to develop an American Jewish educational system. Changes were needed in personnel training, curriculum, physical facilities and philosophy of Jewish education. As communities were made aware of conditions and problems in Jewish education, there was a growing dissatisfaction with the old methods, curriculum and techniques, with the small number of children enrolled in Jewish schools, with the uncertain achievements in Jewish schooling, with the type of personnel engaged in teaching, with the school facilities.

This dissatisfaction gave rise to a strong desire on the part of many communities, to examine the situation and to take steps to cope with the serious situation.

Furthermore, excellent public school facilities, new methods of teaching, and the responsibility of the state for education, helped point up the deficiencies and needs of the Jewish schools, and caused native-born American Jews to look to the Jewish community for improved educational facilities, better organization and standards and more effective teaching. Experience with the American public school system led Jewish educators to the view that Jewish education

52/ S. Benderly, "Jewish Education in America," op. cit., p. 81f.
J. L. Magnes, "The Jewish Community of New York City", American Jewish Year Book (1909): "Thousands of dollars and boundless energy and affection are expended each year on the education of the Jewish child, but it may be said that we have no Jewish educational system. Some schools are good, some are not. What the community might do is to help such a movement as is now beginning to develop, that of forming a Board of Jewish Education...This would be instrumental in introducing something like a uniform system into the various Jewish schools of this city, and of improving their teaching methods. It would help to correct many abuses practiced by unlicensed and incompetent schools and teachers..."p.9-10

53/ S. Benderly, Aims and Activities of the Bureau of Jewish Education (1912): "The farsighted, realizing the futility of the old methods of education in the new environment, have long been casting about for new ways," p.6.

52/ This dissatisfaction is clearly evident in the numerous surveys conducted in many communities. Every survey reveals dissatisfaction with the small number of children receiving a Jewish education, with the physical facilities, with the curriculum, with the personnel, and with the results achieved.
was deservant of community support and Jewish educational work should be con-
sidered somewhat analogous to the public school system. 54/

The concern with conditions in Jewish education led community leadership
to make surveys and to encourage the opening of central educational agencies. 55/

It should be pointed out, however, that the desire to change and to modernize
Jewish education was as great as the desire to bring order out of chaos. It was
part of the trend to raise standards in general communal work, including Jewish
education.

4. The Existence of the New York Bureau of Jewish Education as a
Factor in the Establishment of Central Educational Agencies.

The Bureau of Jewish Education of New York, established in 1910, was not
directly responsible for the establishment of central educational agencies in
other cities. However, it was in no small measure responsible for stimulating
the organization of central educational agencies and for the general direction
the educational agencies took. 56/ Its mere existence had tremendous influence
and gave impetus to the idea of centralizing Jewish educational effort. The

54/ U. S. Engelman, "New Trends in Jewish Education in Buffalo", Jewish Education,
XVI, No. 1 (1944) p. 141: "He should organize our system of Jewish education on
the same plan as the city public system of education". (Quoted from Committee
Report to Board of Directors of the Buffalo Bureau of Jewish Education).

55/ A. E. Dushkin, "The Community Principle in Jewish Education", 1944, p.19:
"...What the general state community has been able to do for orderly develop-
mant of public education, the Jewish community should be called upon to perform,
at least in some measure, for Jewish education."

"During the five year period of 1941-45, especially in the past two years, the
number of surveys of Jewish education carried out probably exceeded the total
number of such studies made in all previous years...The large number of educational
surveys (17 in five years) is probably indicative of a growing conviction on the
part of an increasing number of Jewish communities that the era of rugged indi-
vidualism in Jewish education is passing, and that individual and congregational
initiative in Jewish education must be supplanted, or at least supplemented, by
community planning. This is borne out by the fact that in most cases the recent
surveys led to the establishment of some kind of community boards and programs of
Jewish education." p.31.

57/ Julius H. Greenstone, "Jewish Education in America", American Jewish Year Book
(Phila., 1914-1915): "More important perhaps than all these activities is the
part the Bureau has taken in arousing the conscience of New York Jewry, and that
Bureau of Jewish Education was the first attempt at a practical application of the principle of community responsibility. Other communities followed the example of New York: Boston, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Chicago, and others. The Bureau of Jewish Education became the clearing house of all educational ideas and plans, and through its established machinery, rendered all kinds of assistance when called upon for service. As a matter of fact, the Bureau itself recognized its responsibility to communities outside of New York and sent its personnel to conduct surveys in several sections of the country.

What is most significant, however, is the fact that when a community was ready to embark on the project of a central educational agency, there was an address to turn to for guidance, for surveys and particularly for personnel to implement its educational program. In regard to personnel, the contribution of the Bureau was invaluable. Without the availability of trained personnel, the central educational agency would have been slow in developing, and perhaps would not have developed at all. Dr. Samson Benderly made a significant contribution by "the winning over of a group of young American trained men and women to the concurrent study of both Torah and the science of education, in preparation for professional careers as Jewish educators."58/ These men were appointed to

56/ (cont'd.) of the Jews of the whole country to the gravity of the situation and to the need of concerted efforts in providing a solution to the problem at the earliest possible date." In 1924, Dr. Greenstone made the following statement: "The creation of the Bureau of Education in New York, with Dr. Benderly as its head, stirred the attention of Jews of the whole country and directed their thoughts to this vexing problem in American Jewish life." ("Ten Years of Jewish Education in Philadelphia", January 21, 1924).

57/ Ibid., p. 111; also A. M. Dushkin, Jewish Education in New York, op. cit., describes the establishment of a Department of Information which conducted surveys in the Middle West (1913) and in New England and Middle Atlantic States (1914).

58/ Joel L. Honig, "Jewish Education in the United States" op. cit., p. 161-162. In 1914 Dr. Greenstone wrote: "It (the B.J.E.) has succeeded in interesting in the problem of Jewish education a number of college men, some of whom have become so enthusiastic about it that they have determined to make it their life work." Greenstone, op. cit., p. 111.
key educational positions in the larger cities where they attempted to put into practice the principle of community responsibility for Jewish education and to lead in the development of American Jewish education. 59/

In brief, the Bureau of Jewish Education, by its mere existence, by the services it rendered through surveys, by the training of personnel, gave added impetus and stimulation to the growth of the central educational agency.

In brief, the Bureau of Jewish Education, by its mere existence, by the services it rendered through surveys, by the training of personnel, gave added impetus and stimulation to the growth of the central educational agency.

5. The American Association for Jewish Education and the Establishment of Central Educational Agencies.

The American Association for Jewish Education was organized in 1939 as the national coordinating and service agency for Jewish education in America. Its underlying aim has been to influence the thinking of Jewish communities throughout the country on the problem of the total educational problem and to create a willingness on the part of Jewish communities to accept Jewish education as a major community activity and responsibility. In the declaration of purposes the following two statements were included: 1. "to stimulate communal

59/ Isaac E. Berenson, 1926 Jewish Education Study of New York: "It may be said that all the leading ideas, now prevailing in the United States, designed to reconstruct the Jewish educational work in line with American conceptions and conditions - while keeping it true to the traditional Hebraic tradition - have emanated from the Bureau of Jewish Education of New York. Part of its effort was to train a group of young men and women who would devote themselves professionally to the tasks of Jewish education in America. From this group have developed most of the men now directing the educational work in various cities in the United States. The work of the Bureau opened a new epoch in Jewish education in the United States; as a matter of fact, created the term "Jewish Education," p. 32. A. M. Bushkin, "Two Decades in Jewish Education, A Survey", Jewish Education, IV, No. 1 (1932) p. 3; Z. Scharfstein, "Hizkim Shmot Hamah T'hadai Be'America", Hafer Hayovel Shel Amudath Haomerim: From the time of the Bureau "there began a period of brightness in Jewish education in America, a period of centralization and supervision..." p. 158.
responsibility and local organization of Jewish educational endeavor; and
2. to cooperate with existing Jewish educational agencies throughout the country."

During the thirteen years of its existence, the American Association for
Jewish Education has conducted many local studies and surveys of Jewish educa-
tion in a number of communities in the United States and Canada (more than
twenty-five surveys have been conducted). It has been instrumental in setting
up regional organizations for Jewish education and local Bureaus of Jewish
Education. Through its various departments, the American Association has stimu-
lated nation-wide publicity campaigns for Jewish education, has placed personnel
in many communities, has gathered and distributed valuable educational data,
has focused attention of lay people on the importance of communal responsibility
for Jewish education. Under the leadership of the late Mr. Ben Rosen, Dr. Israel S.
Chipkin, and now Mr. Judah Pilch, the A.A.J.E. has played no small role in secur-
ing local and national recognition for Jewish education. The existence of the
A.A.J.E. and its readiness to service the Jewish communities of America, was a
further stimulus to the establishment and growth of the central educational
agencies.

41/ B. Rosen, The American Association for Jewish Education (1944); I. Kraft and
A. P. Schoolman, Report of Special Study of the American Association for
Jewish Education (April 1949).
CHAPTER II - THE CHANGING CONCEPT OF THE CENTRAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY

The thirty-nine central educational agencies have a variety of names: Associated Talmud Torahs, United Hebrew Schools, Bureau of Jewish Education, Board of Jewish Education, Jewish Education Association, Jewish Education Committee, Council on Jewish Education, and several other variations. The agencies differ in many respects: a) the circumstances and auspices under which they arose and function b) the objectives, functions and scope of activity c) the manner of obtaining and distributing funds d) representation and structure e) relationships to other agencies in the community.

The differences are inherent in the organization of the Jewish community and the stage of its development, in the complexity and diversity of Jewish life, in the changing concept of the function of the educational agency, as experienced and expressed by professional educators at the respective times when the various agencies came into being.

During the course of the last forty years, four dominant ideas have prevailed in regard to the function of the central educational agency. They may be classified as follows: 1) The central educational agency as a lever in education, 2) The central educational agency as an association of schools, 3) The central educational agency as a service agency, mainly to one type of school. 4) The central educational agency as a service agency, encompassing various educational segments in its program.

1. The Leever Idea

In 1909, New York Jewry launched the Kehillah, the first experiment and attempt to organize a Jewish community in America to deal with problems pertaining to Jews. Various departments were set up by the Kehillah (community) among which the Bureau of Jewish Education was one. It is noteworthy that education was one of the first problems on the agenda of the Kehillah, and the establishment of the
pursue of Jewish Education was a concrete manifestation of this concern.

What was to be the function of the agency? Dr. Semen Benderly recognized
that large sums of money would be required to deal with the total problem of
Jewish education in a city as large as New York. It was clear to him that the
fund available should not be spent in propping up one or that institution but
should be used as a lever for the study and improvement of primary Jewish educa-
tion in New York City.

In order that the fund at the disposal of the Kehillah should be used as a
lever, Dr. Benderly proposed that the Bureau of Jewish Education of New York
should have the following objectives:

"1. To study sympathetically and at close range all the Jewish educational
forces in New York City....

"2. To become intimately acquainted with the best teachers and workers who
are the mainstay of these institutions; and organize them for both their material
and spiritual advancement.

"3. To make propaganda through the Jewish press and otherwise, in order to
acquaint parents with the problem before them and with the means of solving it.

62/ In Philadelphia, too, when the Kehillah was organized in 1912, an education
committee was set up to deal with the problem of education. Although nothing came
of this committee, the underlying idea of the value of coordinated efforts in the
field of Jewish education took root, and in 1915 the Associated Talmud Torahs was
organized. See supra p.

See Appendix II in Dushkin, Jewish Education in New York, supra p. 135

Extracts from Act of Incorporation Jewish Community (Kehillah) New York:

"The objects of said corporation shall be, to stimulate and encourage the
instruction of Jews residing in the City of New York, in the tenets of their
religion and in their history, language, literature, institutions and traditions
of their people; to conduct, support and maintain schools and classes for that
purpose; to publish and distribute text books, maps, charts and illustrations to
facilitate such instruction; to conduct lectures and classes in civics and other
kinds of subjects; to establish an educational bureau to further the foregoing
purpose...." (January 1913)

63/ Bulletin No. 1, The Jewish Community of New York City, The Bureau of Jewish
Education (1910)
To operate one or two model schools for elementary pupils, for the purpose of working out the various phases of primary education, these schools to act also as concrete examples and guides to now existing Hebrew schools, which will undoubtedly avail themselves of the text books, methods, appliances, etc., worked out in the model schools, as soon as public opinion shall have ripened. These model schools, while devoting themselves to the solution of the problem of primary education, might also act as preparatory schools, that is, teachers to the Teachers' Institute founded last year. 64/

The leaders of the Bureau who worked closely with Dr. Benderly understood that the agency was to serve as a laboratory by the aid of which it would be possible to raise the people and help to organize and systematize Jewish education. 65/

In the early days of its existence, the Bureau decided that due to limited funds and due to conditions in the Sunday Schools and Congregational Schools, the best plan would be to use the available funds as a lever for the study and improvement of primary Jewish education in New York with particular reference to the larger Talmud Torahs which of themselves offered to affiliate with the Bureau, provided they met requirements of tuition fee collection, curriculum, teaching salaries, licensed teachers, and other requirements. 66/

64/ Ibid.

65/ J. L. Magnes, Jewish Community (Kehillah) Third Annual Report (1912), p.14; also Isaac Friedlander, Ibid., p. 24: "...The Bureau of Jewish Education could only be meant to serve as a lever, as a stimulus calling forth the energies which lie dormant, to lay, as it were, the wires, at best to install the machinery, but the current and the motive power must be supplied by the Jewish community as a whole."

66/ S. Benderly, Aims and Objectives of the Bureau of Jewish Education, op. cit.: "The only existing schools that appeared to be in a position to benefit by the cooperation of the Bureau were the religious schools attached to the orphan asylums and settlements and the Talmud Torahs," p.10.
How was the "lever" concept translated into activities? The activities of the Bureau of Jewish Education from 1910 to 1918, may be summarized as follows:

1) The Bureau served as a Jewish Education Foundation. This included: studying the field scientifically and gathering information; preparing text-books and suggested curricula; elaborating record forms and methods of management of schools; disseminating information and giving advice to schools in New York and in other parts of the country. 2) It served as a Department of Education of the Jewish community including such activities as: granting financial aid to a select number of Yeshivot with an eye to standardization; sending general and special supervisors to schools; taking charge of central activities such as investigation of truancy and collection of tuition fees; attempting to certify teachers; coordinating the work of the principals. 3) It served as a Board of Experimental Schools by conducting ten extension schools, five preparatory schools for girls, and two associations of high school students. 67/ All these activities reflect the continuous and persistent attempt to carry out the lever idea proposed by Benderly in 1910.

After 1918, the Bureau gave up a great deal of its work on the elementary level and concentrated on other aspects of education such as the Hebrew High School, the Junior Hebrew High School, The League of Jewish Youth, extension work and text-books for youth, Camp Ashvah. 68/ All this was done with an eye to the development of education in the neglected and untried areas.

67/ Dushkin, Jewish Education in New York, op. cit., Chapter IV, pp. 100-126
68/ David Rudovsky, Jewish Education in New York After 1918, p.100.

Rudovsky states that Benderly turned to secondary and adolescent education for two reasons: 1) This field was totally unexplored and Benderly always laid great stress on the importance of the adolescent years for Jewish education. 2) It was a new area without the so called vested interests and traditions which ordinarily may to obstacles in the development of Jewish education.

It might be added that engaging in new activities and exploring new fields in order to show their possibilities was consistent with Benderly's idea of a lever agency. Perhaps he moved into the area of adolescent education when he felt that some demonstration had been given as to what should be done at the elementary level, and that it was now up to the schools to carry out a more
In 1936, Dr. Benderly presented a statement of the purpose and work of the Bureau of Jewish Education. The ten purposes discussed represent an elaboration of the broader concept enunciated in 1910 and in 1912, and represent the guiding principles of the Bureau’s activities throughout the many years of its existence. The ten purposes may be listed under three major headings:

1. To make Jewish education a community responsibility. According to Benderly this meant a definition of American Jewish education which would make it possible for the Jewish community to perpetuate its life in harmony with the American environment. This called for the development of a new curriculum and program of education designed to do the following: a) take into consideration the modern world in the selection of content for Jewish education, b) evolve methods of instruction fully in accord with modern educational theory and practice, c) schedule Jewish education so that it would take into consideration the time available to the American Jewish child, stressing the utilization of the summer months for Jewish living and study, d) place the education of the girl on a par with that of the boy, e) meet the educational needs of the pre-school child by the preparation of materials and arousing the interest of mothers in the need for building the emotional basis for the child’s Jewishness. The evolution, coordination and conduct of such a program required a mastering of all the spiritual resources in the community, and also the financial support for purposes of experimentation, initiation, organization, coordination and supervision. It also called for the willingness on the part of the community to accept Jewish education as one of its major activities and a readiness to give to it the authority of its name and credit. 69/

69/ (cont'd) effective program. It is also important to point out that when the separation of the Bureau from the Kahillah took place, and when soon thereafter, the Federation allocated money directly to the larger Kahiloth Terah, the Bureau’s influence became considerably weakened in the area of elementary education. The Bureau turned to other fields of educational endeavor.

69/ See Appendix for Benderly’s 1936 full statement.

69/ S. Benderly, Purpose and Work of the Bureau of Jewish Education of New York (1936)
2. To make Jewish education, in the sense of maintenance of schools, a self-supporting undertaking. A system of Jewish education called for a three-way partnership consisting of the parents, the local organization (or local community) and the general community. Maintenance cost, teachers' salaries, scholarships for children unable to pay and local supervision should be borne by the local groups through tuition fees paid by the parents and local contributions. The general community could not possibly assume full responsibility for a system of education. However, Jewish education would do well "if the community could assume financial responsibility for experimentation, initiation, organization, coordination and general supervision."70/

3. To build up professional leadership with high standards. This included creating a Jewish teaching profession fully qualified both Jewishly and in the general field of educational theory and practice, but above all imbued with an abiding faith in the worthwhileness of their task and in the possibility of Jewish life in the American environment.72/

In the program envisioned in 1910, in the aims and activities outlined in 1912 and in the principles enunciated in 1936 (based on twenty-five years of experience) there is the same underlying idea of the Bureau of Jewish Education acting as a lever in the scientific study of the facts in the development of a new curriculum for the American environment, in the training of leadership, in the assistance given to raise standards for teachers, in the preparation of new texts and in the attempt to find new methods and techniques. Tenderly never lost sight of the primary function of the Bureau, namely, that of a lever.72/

70/ Ibid. p.2
72/ Ibid.
Through its varied activities in the thirty years of its existence, the Bureau of Jewish Education of New York engaged in experimentation, creation, stimulation, and standardization. Under Benderly's guidance the Bureau sought to pave the way, to set the direction and tone, to spin the ideas and prepare the materials, to prepare the personnel and to envision the future of American Jewish education. The Bureau charted a broad course and experimented with the community principle on a wide front. However, the plan was premature. It grew out of an idea of an organic Jewish community (the Kehillah). When the Kehillah idea failed to materialize, the Bureau remained, but it had lost its relationship to the total Jewish community. The Bureau failed to become the agency responsible for the improvement of Jewish education on a community-wide basis and with the years, its influence declined.

73/ I. B. Dorson, 1936 New York Study: "The B.J.E. established under the Kehillah in 1926 was organized with the express purpose of elaborating a type of education, which while rooted in Jewish tradition, would nevertheless be adjusted to the needs of the Jewish child and the Jewish community in America. In the many new ideas expanded and experimented with by the Bureau, the thesis of adjustment of Jewish education to American life was implicit." cf. Benderly, Purpose and Work of the Bureau of Jewish Education of New York (1936); cf. E. Rudovsky, "The Bureau of Jewish Education After 1926," Jewish Education, XX no. 3 (1949); "The Bureau has been a great testing ground for educational ideas....Dr. Benderly was not concerned with establishing institutions, but rather in discovering new and better techniques, leaving it to others to continue where he started or from where he left off," p.52.

I.B. Dorson, 1936 New York Study, op. cit., Dr. Dorson gives five cogent reasons for the decline of the B.J.E. of N.Y.: 1) Due to the First World War and the aftermath, Jewish communal organizations became engrossed in overseas relief and in Zionism. 2) Dr. Magne and Miss Zeidler concentrated their activities on Palestine which meant that the Bureau lost important lay leadership. 3) The Jewish education idea had a few friends among communal workers, but did not have the full support of the German Jews who were the backbone of organized communal work. 4) Benderly's uncompromising advocacy of changes created personal antagonisms which interfered with public support. 5) The Bureau suffered because the personnel it had trained was transferred to other communities.

Another important reason for the decline may be ascribed to Benderly's initiating a project and dropping it before some group or agency was ready to undertake it and carry on with it after its possibility had been demonstrated by Benderly.
However, although the Bureau of Jewish Education presumably became another of the educational institutions or agencies in the city, when it lost its relationship to the total community, its influence was felt throughout the years. It was a unique experiment. No other central educational agency in the country has been organized under similar circumstances, nor has educational agency had similar experiences nor exerted such far flung influence. 74a/ 

As indicated above, the existence of the Bureau and what it stood for had a deep influence on the establishment and development of central educational agencies. The concept of the "lever" has become an integral part of the program of the central educational agencies. This concept has been particularly strong in those agencies headed by professionals who had gained their initial experience under Benderly's guidance or had come under his influence. 74b/ 

2. The Concept of a Central Association of Talmud Torahs

In the first two decades of this century and in the 20's, the prevailing plan for the organization of Jewish education in many American cities was to establish a central community Hebrew School in the most populous district with branches in other districts and to have all under one administration. 75/ In the larger cities, independent Talmud Torahs joined into one organization usually known as the Associated Talmud Torahs or United Hebrew Schools. 76/ During this period Jewish:

74a/ S. Benderly, Purposes and Work of the Bureau of Jewish Education (1936): "In view of the fact, however, that the policy of the Bureau has always been to do its work with an eye toward stimulating the work done by others, we are often able as a bi-product of these activities, with little additional cost, to exercise a centralizing and coordinating influence on the schools. At times this indirect method is more acceptable and more effective," p.9

74b/ cf. A.L. Bashkin, "The Community Principle in Jewish Education" esp. p.18. "The Kehillah collapsed" but the impulse it gave to community thinking was transmitted through the personal influence of those whom the Bureau had trained, and through the adoption of the idea by many of the Federations of Charities and Welfare Funds...."p.22

75/ Minneapolis, Indianapolis, Pittsburgh, Cleveland

76/ Boston, Philadelphia, Detroit, Baltimore, Milwaukee, Dallas
educators were of the opinion that the Talmud Torah would remain the prevailing type of Jewish school, supplementary to the public school and being somewhat analogous to it by reason of the fact that it aimed to include all Jewish children.

The conception of "community" which was being tried out widely in philanthropy and overseas relief, was applied in a limited sense to the field of education, namely that of caring for the education of the poor. The prevailing idea of the purpose of the central educational agency - the Associated Talmud Torahs or the United Hebrew Schools, or the Bureau of Jewish Education - was to act as a federated fiscal agent on behalf of the Jewish community in the area of religious education.

The Federation or Welfare Fund granted funds directly to individual Talmud Torahs if they were not united or associated, or indirectly through the association representing a consolidation of the communal educational institutions. In New York, for example, funds were allocated directly to each of the several Talmud Torahs included in Federation and also to the Bureau of Jewish Education. This arrangement was continued until the Jewish Education Committee came into being in 1939. 7/7

In the other communities, the funds were allocated to the Association of Talmud Torahs. This was an improvement over the New York situation, since the association could engage in the development of a uniform program for its schools, give them better supervision and direction, bring about standardization through central administration, and engage in activities much broader in scope.

Yet the Association of Talmud Torahs, though central educational agencies, were limited in scope and function by the very nature of the set-up. Their main

7/7 In 1906 and 1907, the Central Board of Talmud Torahs was organized but it did not continue in existence for long. The Bureau of Jewish Education organized a General Board and Principals Association of Talmud Torahs affiliated with the Bureau. See B. Benderly, "Ass and General of the Bureau of Jewish Education, 1906-1939." The Bureau, of course, was not an association of Talmud Torahs. When the Special Committee of Seven recommended the inclusion of Jewish education in Federation, it specifically recommended that funds should be allocated to individual institutions. Channeling the funds through the Bureau was not recommended, nor was there any suggestion that the Bureau should act in some supervisory or advisory capacity in regard to the funds allocated to the Talmud Torahs. It is interesting that the Jewish Education Committee of New York is now attempting to organize an Association of Talmud Torahs in order to strengthen their position financially.
function was to utilize the funds provided by the community for the operation of a group of communal schools in which were enrolled a large percentage of poor children. As far as the community was concerned, standardization and the development of Jewish education were incidental to the budgeting process. Under such a set-up inclusion of new schools was difficult or practically impossible. The general community organization had little concern with direction, supervision and planning. It adhered strictly to the policy of non-interference with the autonomy, ideology, and functions of the central educational agency, and recognized its responsibility only in terms of allocating funds for the education of the poor.

It is true, however, that wide interpretation was given to the idea of centralization by professional educators, especially by those who were intimately acquainted with the New York experiment, and recognized the trends in Jewish community organization. They attempted to introduce some of the "lever" ideas, making the agency more than a fund distributing organization and more than a functional, administrative agency for a limited number of schools. Hebrew high schools, extension high schools, teacher training institutions were established by these agencies. Educational materials, programs and text-books were prepared and used widely and services rendered to unaffiliated schools.

In New York, for example, Talmud Torahs which were declining continued to receive funds (e.g. the Uptown Talmud Torah) while new Talmud Torahs were not included.

The Philadelphia Associated Talmud Torahs, under the direction of the late Ben Rosen, is an outstanding example of an Association of Talmud Torahs engaged in a variety of activities. See Leo L. Honor, Philadelphia Survey (1943), Section on A.T.T.
The concept of the central educational agency acting as a federated fiscal agent for the community was also applied in the late 20's and 30's to the Bureau of Jewish Education which were not associations of Talmud Torahs and which did not have direct control over all the schools affiliated with them. In many instances the Bureau conducted the Talmud Torah or a group of Talmud Torahs, but did not have direct control over the affiliated congregational schools, and Sunday schools. 80/

The central educational agency, in those instances, acted in a dual capacity conducting the Talmud Torah, and acting as the fiscal agent, the "watch dog" of the community's funds. 81/

The concept of the fiscal educational agency is still strong today, although there is a growing recognition that the agency should be concerned with more than the distribution of funds, that it should engage primarily in educational work leading to better standards and achievements, and that the agency should insist on the fulfillment of definite requirements on the part of affiliates.

In many communities, there is evident a changing concept and trend, and the central educational agency is in transition.

3. The Concept of the Service Agency

In the 20's when the Association of Talmud Torahs was the prevailing concept of the central educational agency, other ideas and patterns were beginning to take root and develop. The Jewish Education Association of New York was experimenting with the idea of rendering a variety of services to schools for their improvement.

80/ Cleveland, Cincinnati, Buffalo, Rochester

81/ The Los Angeles Bureau and the Jewish Education Association of Newark were typical of central educational agencies whose main function was to re-allocate funds. See A.L. Dushkin, Los Angeles Survey, 1944. Dr. Dushkin points out that one of the weaknesses of the L.A. Bureau was that its main function from 1937 to 1944 was to re-allocate subventions to schools. See also Community Organisation for Jewish Education (Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, 1939)p.5.

82/ Financing and Budgeting of Central Agencies of Jewish Education, Bulletin No.13, (American Association for Jewish Education, Feb.1946). In 1946, fourteen out of nineteen agencies spent more than 50% of their budgets on subventions. In several it was as high as 60%.
The pre-occupation of Federation with purely philanthropic needs, the limited funds allocated to the Talmaid Toreah and the Bureau of Jewish Education, called for the establishment of an agency concerned with the increasing educational needs of the community and which would engage in promoting the cause of Jewish education by providing for such wider financial support and by providing many needed services. The Jewish Education Association of New York established in 1921, invited to serve on its Board persons representing various views in the community, but friendly to the cause of Jewish education in the more inclusive sense. The Bureau of Jewish Education encouraged the founding of the new central educational body of lay people.

During its twenty years of existence, the professional leadership of Dr. Israel S. Chipkin, the J.E.A. engaged in a variety of activities, the core of which was the idea of rendering service (mainly to Talmaid Toreah) without interfering with the internal autonomy and the curricular activities of any school. The services rendered by the J.E.A. may be summarized under five major headings:

1. Propaganda and promotion of Jewish education through fund-raising affairs, systematic pupil enrollment campaigns, the organization of Ivriah (a body of women interested in Jewish education), and other activities designed to bring Jewish education to the attention of the Jewish community and thereby give encouragement to the educational institutions.

2. Financial aid to schools through scholarship funds, building repair funds, special service fund, assistance in local fund raising and a mortgage service. To be entitled to financial aid, certain standards had to be met, including a responsible board, a minimum of 150 children, safe and sanitary quarters, proper financial and enrollment records, the employment of licensed teachers, proper supervision and other requirements.

3/ The J.E.A. was merged with the Jewish Education Committee of New York in 1940.

4/ The clause of non-interference was included in order to obtain wide support. In the early thirties, the J.E.A. began to receive reports on curriculum. See I.R. Berkson, *1936 New York Study*, op. cit., p. 36-37.
3. Educational services including the development of a research and record department (Jewish child population and Jewish school census); stimulation of attendance by the establishment of prizes; aid to the principals' association in curricular activities; aid to the yeshivot (the J.E.A. acted as agent of the Board of Education in such matters as bus service, state aid for free lunches, etc.)

4. Improving the status of the teachers including the Board of License, insurance and teachers' old age fund, and aid in the settlement of controversies.

5. Cooperation in community enterprises of educational nature including such activities as assistance in the development of the Israel Friedlander classes at the Jewish Theological Seminary, active participation in the introduction of Hebrew in the public high schools and colleges, the organization of a Women's Institute for Jewish Studies, and the Jewish Teachers Association (public school teachers), mass lessons in Jewish philanthropy, and the founding of the American Association for Jewish Education.85/

The Jewish Education Association of New York had as its primary objective the organization of the community for Jewish education by laying emphasis on the need for specific educational services and by stressing community effort and community responsibility in order to make these services available. The significance of the J.E.A. lies in the concrete demonstration of the pattern of a service agency.

The concept of an educational agency engaging in numerous activities in the attempt to serve all educational components of different ideologies in the community was inherent in the evolving program of the J.E.A., although it was not explicitly expressed, and although the agency gave its attention almost exclusively to the Talmud Torahs.

The pattern developed by the J.E.A. of New York had a marked influence on the program of central educational agencies throughout the country. This influence

85/ The brief description of the J.E.A.'s activities is based on Israel S. Chipkin's "The Jewish Education Association of New York", Jewish Education, Jewish Education, Jewish Education XII, no. 3, p. 130-145
made itself felt after the establishment of the American Association for Jewish Education which was called upon to conduct surveys in many communities and to present blueprints for the organization and progress of central educational agencies. Many of the ideas were adopted, especially by the more recently established agencies.

Strictly speaking, however, the J.E.A. was not a central educational agency since it was not supported by the Federation, the only organization representing the organized Jewish community. The J.E.A. was an independent agency and raised its funds independently.

It was in Chicago that a new concept for the central educational agency may be said to have begun to take shape. It was a fusion of the lever and service concepts applied to the conditions indigenous to the Chicago situation.

1. The Concept of "Unity in Diversity"

a. The Chicago Pattern

When the Associated Jewish Charities and the Federated Orthodox Jewish Charities merged in 1923 to become the Jewish Charities of Chicago, one of the stipulations called for the continued allocation of funds to the Talmud Torahs affiliated with the Federated Orthodox Jewish Charities. Subventions continued as agreed upon, but a Committee on Jewish Education was appointed to develop a general plan of Jewish education in Chicago. Dr. Alexander H. Bushkin was invited to make a survey and shortly thereafter, was appointed executive director of the Committee on Jewish Education, which changed its name in 1926 to the Board of Jewish Education.

What was to be the function of the Board of Jewish Education? Several possible policies suggested themselves: 1) To establish several model schools in the city, which by example, would influence the other schools throughout the city. 2) To re-allocate the funds made available by the Charities to eight Talmud Torahs, formerly recipients of funds from the Federated Orthodox Jewish Charities, and to help them do a more effective job. 3) To act as a service agency to the whole

By Louis Harwich conducted a survey in Chicago in 1929. The Bushkin survey was made in 1923, at the time of the Federation merger.
community, attempting to give such educational help as was needed by particular neighborhoods and by particular schools. 

Although the Board of Jewish Education established several experimental schools as part of the community program, it was felt that these could not form the whole of the program.

Re-allocating the funds to the Talmud Torahs, as was done in New York, without the Board concerning itself with the educational work of the schools or caring for the extension of Jewish education in the city, was not satisfactory. It was the responsibility of the Board to see to it that the money should be spent most effectively. The development of the curriculum, standardization, the introduction of some of the ideas experimented with by the New York Bureau, were considered important functions of the Board of Jewish Education.

In this respect, the Chicago Board of Jewish Education in its early stages, followed the pattern of the Associated Talmud Torahs of Philadelphia, the United Hebrew Schools of Detroit and similar agencies, whose primary function was to conduct the educational work of an association of Talmud Torahs.

However, this could not be conceived as the total program of the Board, namely, limiting its work to the Talmud Torahs receiving funds from the community.

Moreover, the 2000 children in the Talmud Torahs, recipients of community funds, represented only a segment of the 11,000 children enrolled in the seventy-one Chicago schools. The Talmud Torah was strong but the trend was in the direction of the rapid establishment of congregational schools. As Jews moved into new neighborhoods, they organized congregations. Those congregations could be expected to care for their immediate financial problems, but they were in need of educational guidance and supervision. The schools were not affiliated with the Charities and


68/ It is interesting that the late Ben Rosen attempted to broaden the services and scope of the Associated Talmud Torahs of Philadelphia, to make of it an overall community agency, but was unable to implement the idea because there was too much resistance to it.
it was considered wise to relieve the congregations of their financial responsibilities. The Board of Jewish Education began with extension of its services to unaffiliated schools, and in time took into affiliation congregational schools which were self-supporting, if they maintained standards set up by the Board.

By 1926 the work of the Board of Jewish Education had been expanded considerably beyond the coordination and standardization of the work of the schools receiving subsidies from the Jewish Charities.

It was therefore the third policy which was adopted by the Board of Jewish Education, that is, to act as a service agency for the entire community.

In 1926 the following principles of policy were adopted by the Board of Jewish Education:

1) "The Board of Jewish Education should act as an educational service agency, rendering such help to the Jews of Chicago in the education of their children as particular groups find necessary – in some instances financial subsidy, in other instances educational help and supervision.

2) "In all of our work we must avoid imposing any one type of Judaism or any one program of Jewish education upon all schools affiliated with us. We are strictly a non-partisan Board, reflecting the interest of Orthodox, Conservative, Reform, Zionist, and non-Zionist Jews. While there is a fundamental unity in all Jewish education, and certain common basic subjects in arrangement of curriculum, in the selection of teachers, we are to act in the capacity of advisers. The final determination in all of these matters must remain with the local group – the congregation and its rabbi.

3) "Our Board is to supplement the work of Jewish education in our community by undertaking those necessary activities without which a school system is impossible, but which no single congregation can undertake; namely, secondary education for the graduates of elementary schools, training of teachers, extension education, and improvement of texts and methods."

89/ Quoted in Drucker, Jewish Education in Chicago, op. cit., p. 21.
Under the guidance of Dr. A. M. Dushkin (1923-1934) and Dr. L.L. Honig (1934-1945), and such members on its staff as Dr. Jacob Golub, the late Dr. Ben Edidin, and others, the Board of Jewish Education attempted to put into practice the three basic principles.70/ Out of their experience grew the pattern for broadening the scope of the educational agency and providing educational services to all segments in the Jewish community including Talmud Torahs, Orthodox, Conservative and Reform Congregational schools, the Sorosis Circle Schools, the Folkshulen and the Shalom Aleichem Schools.

The Board of Jewish Education of Chicago incorporated in its program some of the lever ideas advocated by the New York Bureau, especially in the areas of secondary education, youth education, teacher training, preparation of texts, materials and suggested curricula, and experimental schools. With the communal schools, the Board worked towards coordination and standardization. However, it extended services to other school groupings with an eye toward improving and influencing their educational work without control. Whereas the Jewish Education Association developed the concept of service mainly to the Talmud Torahs, the Board of Jewish Education of Chicago, taking into consideration the several educational segments in the community, developed the concept to mean several types of service to be rendered to ideological groupings.

The concept came to be called "unity in diversity." The idea central to this concept is that the "various elements in the community which share a positive attitude towards Judaism and Jewish life can continue to hold divergent points of

70/ See Appendix for a detailed outline of the scope of activities and underlying aims of the Chicago Board of Jewish Education. Dr. Jacob Golub carried the ideas initiated and experimented with in Chicago to Cincinnati where he was the director of the Bureau of Jewish Education for five years. See Bernard D. Perlman, History of the Bureau of Jewish Education of Cincinnati (U.A. Dissertation, University of Cincinnati). Dr. Edidin did likewise in his capacity as director of the Bureau of Jewish Education of Buffalo.
What were to be the functions of the Jewish Education Committee? They were to be divided up into three major departments.

1) Educational research, experimentation and educational materials.
2) Educational, administrative, and financial services to existing schools.
3) Public relations, propaganda and membership.

As envisioned by the surveyor, the first department would a) maintain experimental schools for the purpose of working out suitable educational programs; b) experiment with new types of instruction and educational activities such as home study groups, summer vacation programs, extension and informal educational programs; c) prepare texts and educational materials; d) publish educational reports and bulletins, statistical reports, etc.; e) make available research fellowships in the development of curricula and textbooks.

The second department would render a variety of services such as: a) supervision, cooperation with teachers institutes, maintenance of pedagogic and audio-visual-aid library, arts specialists, cooperation with public high schools and other organizations interested in Hebrew, etc.; cooperation in adult education; c) financial aid: scholarships, building repairs, subsidies, etc.

The third department would concern itself with the development of membership and financial support of the J.E.C.; assistance to local committees in their fund raising campaigns, parents' education; general publicity to develop a better understanding of the Jewish educational problem.

A very significant recommendation was made with regard to the use of the Friedsam Foundation Fund. In view of the conflict and difference of opinion in educational circles on the implementation of this recommendation, it is quoted in full:

"It is understood that the funds for Jewish education from the Friedsam Fund,
obtained, will consist of a definite sum to be expended within the course of a specific number of years. If divided among the many Jewish schools, the fund would not go very far and at the end of its availability, the institutions would be thrown upon their own resources. While some temporary relief may thus be obtained, a precious opportunity for utilizing the funds for constructive purposes of lasting significance to the development of Jewish education would be lost. It is therefore urged that the Jewish educational funds to be derived from the Friedsam Foundation should be conserved for projects designed to improve the quality of Jewish instruction, such as maintaining a school or schools for experimental purposes, development of courses of study, methods and text books, issuance of publications. Specifically the recommendation is to allocate the Friedsam Foundation to the Department of Educational Research, Experimentation and Educational Materials....95/

Dr. Berkson laid special emphasis upon the experimentation without denying the other functions of a central educational agency. The "lever" aspect of the central educational agency's function was, to his way of thinking, the most significant and the most basic.

Dr. Alexander H. Bushkin was invited to direct the work of the Jewish Education Committee. In 1940, one year after the establishment of the J.E.C., he made clear his interpretation of the function of the agency: The J.E.C. proposed to work with all groups in Jewry that stand for the teaching of positive values and with all forms of Jewish education, barring only the Communist Yiddish Schools. To do this the J.E.C. did not plan to conduct schools of its own but would collaborate with central educational bodies representing each of the Jewish groups and each of the Jewish educational types.96/

95/ Berkson, 1936 New York Study, esp. p.11
Accordingly, the J.E.C. developed its program along two directions: a) A trans-partisan program which called for working with the various educational segments in the community. The J.E.C. fostered the organization of educational groups along party lines or types of schooling so that the agency would have representative bodies to work with. These representative bodies included the Associated Talmud Torahs and Hebrew Schools, the New York Council of the United Synagogues, the Orthodox Council of Jewish Schools, the Education Committee of New York Reform Temples, the Commission for Yiddish Schools, the Central Institute for Jewish High Schools. Specialists acceptable to the J.E.C. and to the particular groups were appointed to develop each program under the guidance of the J.E.C. In using this approach, the J.E.C. sought to develop a differentiated program which encouraged "differences where differences are natural and inevitable and to foster unity where unity is possible and desirable." b) A non-partisan program, cutting across party lines but concerning the community as a whole, such as statistical information, research, publications and educational publicity; guiding the teaching of Hebrew in the public high schools and colleges, education in the arts (music, art, craft, dramatics, dance), teachers' welfare; grants-in-aid; supervision and consultation, and a variety of other services.

In the development of its program of services, the J.E.C. followed pretty much the pattern outlined by Dr. Berkson. However, in one important respect, there was a difference of opinion and interpretation. Dr. Dushkin did not accept the suggestion that the Friedsam Foundation Fund should be used for the establishment of an experimental school or schools.

98/ A.M. Dushkin, "The Community Principle in Jewish Education", p.23
The failure of the J.E.C. to establish experimental schools of its own for the purpose of working out educational programs, curricula, methods of teaching, administrative techniques, etc., was the cause of a serious controversy between Drs. Berkson and Dushkin. The conflict was not due merely to the failure of the J.E.C. to implement a part of the 1936 Study. It goes deeper than that. The conflict embraces the total conception of the future of Jewish education in America and the role the central educational agency should play in its development.

Dushkin’s conception reflects itself in the pattern which he set in motion in Chicago, and which he developed further in New York. Briefly, this conception holds that Jewish life is diversified and divergent and is thus reflected in the organized school groupings. No one has the right to legislate any group out of existence. It is not the function of the community educational agency, if it is to speak logically of community responsibility for Jewish education, to speak in the name of one type of Jewish education however worthy, nor in the name of one group however large. It is not the function of the central educational agency to impose one type of curriculum on any school grouping.

"We feel we have no right to speak in the name of the community and for community responsibility, unless we make a most earnest effort to work with the various groups in Jewish for projects cherished by them, or accepted by them at our suggestion.... A community program that will include the whole gamut of opinion and forms in Jewish education will not, and should not obliterate differences, but it may raise them to more significant levels."100/

A more definitive formulation of the "unity in diversity" concept was made recently by Dr. L.J. Honor.100a/ In accordance with this concept, the community agency must serve all elements in the community which have a positive attitude to
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Jewish life. Each element must be helped to maintain its educational program on the highest possible plane, and should be encouraged to maintain its distinctive interpretation of Judaism and Jewish life. Unity is essential; uniformity is undesirable. The concept of "unity in diversity" should be reflected in the educational program of each element. The children of all elements should be encouraged to develop a tolerant understanding and appreciation of the points of view, philosophies and attitudes of other Jewish groups. Changes in existing programs can be brought about without interfering with the educational goals of each group by encouraging each group to set up a maximum and optimum program in accordance with its specific goals; by encouraging each group to conduct experiments in the attempt to discover more effective content, method, techniques and educational organization for the achievement of its aims; and by encouraging individuals to organize themselves for the purpose of experimenting with new approaches to Jewish education in America.\(^{100a}\)

Dr. Berkson's Conception of the Function of the Central Educational Agency:

Dr. Berkson takes vigorous exception to this conception of Jewish education and of the function of the central educational agency. What are the major ideas propounded by Dr. Berkson?\(^{101}\)

Dr. Berkson holds: 1) Financial and pedagogical services rendered to the existing schools are legitimate functions of the central educational agency, but the status quo, educationally speaking, should not be accepted as the norm representative of Jewish life in America and the central educational agency should not rest content with this program. The various educational programs now followed are, to a large degree, transplantations. Some adjustments have taken place, but

\(^{100a}\) Dr. Enoch has pointed out to the writer that his view of "unity in diversity" does not include the idea of attempting to discover common elements or a common denominator in the Jewish educational programs of the various elements as worked out by Dr. Dushkin in his Common Elements in Jewish Education.

rarely have these been the result of a well thought out conception. "The central problem of Jewish education is the working out of a program that would give all Jewish children a common grounding of Jewish knowledge and ideas, related to the needs of the children and youth as they grow up under the influences of American life." To develop such a program of common ideas, common understanding and common ideals is the major task of the American Jewish educator in the decades to come. The Sunday School, the All Day School, the Yiddish School have a legitimate place in the total educational scheme at present, but it is the Hebrew weekday school which should be taken as the basis for working out a common course of study. The Talmud Torah includes both the religious and cultural elements; is rooted in tradition and yet responds to new trends and conceptions.

2) The communal educational program should not be based on a particular ideology. Jewish education should not begin with the theory of any "ism" (nationalism, Zionism, Conservative, Orthodox, Reform Judaism, etc). "There is an essential difference between a common program which allows for diversity and one based primarily on a particularistic ideological conception." The Jewish school, like the American public school, should aim to avoid "isms", and should concentrate on the effort of developing a common community life. Like the common public school, the Jewish school should attempt to create a consensus on fundamental ideas and values. Within this consensus, democracy allows for diversities. The Jewish school program, consisting of a consensus of ideas and values, and allowing for diversities within the consensus, would be in consonance with the principles of democracy. The attempt to build an educational program on ideological bases and differences means nourishing the present divisions in American Jewish life which, to no small extent, are grounded in differences and antagonisms developed in the past.

3. To work out a program based on common essentials in consonance with Jewish tradition, American life and educational fundamentals, it is necessary to conduct
experimental schools directly maintained by the central community educational agency. The program elaborated in these schools would be available to guide other schools. The function of the central educational agency would be that of a "lever" in developing a program of Jewish education in America. This program cannot depend on a gradual working out by the historical process. It needs conscious direction on the part of educational leadership.

In working out the program, "there is no question of imposing a point of view, but of proposing. The Jewish educator has no right to impose a program on any schools, nor could he do so if he tried. But he has the duty of proposing one."

Out of the heated discussions on the subject of the conception and functions of the central educational agency, particularly since the establishment of the J.E.C., new ideas have evolved. Basic Elements in Jewish education have been proposed 103/, discussed and adopted in New York and Los Angeles, and new plans for a community system of Jewish education have been proposed 103/. These will be discussed in the chapter dealing with the future of the central educational agency.

For the most part, the central educational agencies established after 1936, benefitting from the experiences of the agencies organized earlier and from the formulation of the philosophy underlying the function of the agency, base their program primarily on the principle of "unity in diversity" and have designed their programs to render services to all educational segments in the community. 103a/

Many of the agencies established in the 20's are undergoing transition and are moving in the same direction.

102/ A. M. Dushkin, "Basic Elements in Jewish Teaching". Jewish Education XVI no.1 (1945) p.5-13


103a/ See Appendix for guiding principles of the Miami Bureau of Jewish Education.
Let us cite several examples:

In 1924, the Jewish Educational Association of Indianapolis was organized "for the purpose of establishing and maintaining a uniform method of Jewish education throughout the city of Indianapolis, maintaining such branches as may be necessary."104/ In the survey of Jewish education in Indianapolis made in 1944, Dr. Honor points out that in view of the changing educational situation, the by-laws are not broad enough for the type of program which should be fostered by a central community agency for Jewish education; that it was time to re-examine the principles and functions of the J.E.A. and to amend its charter in terms of the present needs and in terms of the broader conceptions of Jewish community responsibility for education.105/

Another example is the Cincinnati Bureau of Jewish Education. In 1925, the scope of the Bureau was stated as being: "To promote Jewish education in the city of Cincinnati and its vicinity; render financial and moral aid to affiliated schools, increase the educational facilities of the community, and make scientific studies of the problem of Jewish education in all its communal phases."106/

In 1944, the purpose of the Cincinnati Bureau was stated as follows: "The object and purpose of the organization shall be to promote Jewish education for children, youth and adults....to serve the educational and cultural needs of the entire community and to encourage all the positive elements in Jewish life seeking survival on a creative plane; render financial and educational aid to affiliated schools, increase the Jewish educational facilities of the community and make specific studies of the problems of education in all their communal phases; and serve as a coordinating and cooperating service agency for the purpose of guiding, assisting and encouraging the educational, cultural progress of all.

104/ quoted by L.L. Honor, The Jewish Educational Association of Indianapolis (1944)
105/ Ibid.
106/ Minutes of Board of Delegates of Bureau of Jewish Education of Cincinnati
agencies engaged in the promotion of Judaism.\footnote{107/}

The central educational agencies in Cleveland, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, St. Louis, Newark, Pittsburgh and others have undergone changes since 1936 and have geared their programs to the prevailing trend\footnote{108/}, in accordance with the recommendations in the surveys conducted by Drs. Heron, Lipkin, Dushkin, Engelman, and others.

\underline{SUMMARY OF PART II}

The central educational agency has evolved from a unilateral to a multilateral all-inclusive agency, from the concept of a unilateral attitude to the problem of curriculum, to a pluralistic approach, recognizing the propriety and efficacy of several curricula based upon the diversities and divergences existent in Jewish life. Although the conception has been changing constantly, it has not followed a straight line logically or chronologically. To state that one idea grew out of another would be a misstatement. The ideas are overlapping, concurrent, co-existing. The evolving concept of the central educational agency is best understood in the framework of time and place, changing conditions and the changing organized Jewish community. It may be said, however, that a certain idea prevailed at a particular time, as described above.

Established for the most part as a fiscal agent for the purpose of re-allocating funds to a particular school or schools on a purely philanthropic basis, it has developed over the years into a service agency for all the educational segments in the community. Less stress is laid on the philanthropic and more on the idea that Jewish education in its entirety should be the concern of the organized community. With continued growth, the central educational agency may move in the direction of becoming a planning agency whose purpose shall be to plan for Jewish education.

\footnote{107/ Constitution of the Bureau of Jewish Education of Cincinnati, adopted June 29, 1924.}

Jewish education on a community basis, in addition to the manifold services it
is now rendering.

The changing concept of the function of the central educational agency has
not been an abstract principle spun in the fertile minds of educators. It evolved
out of concrete experiences and conditions. In the first place, as the concept
of Jewish community organization changed from that of purely fiscal and philan-
thropic responsibilities to that of over-all planning and more inclusive social
service to the total community, it had a tremendous impact on the conception of
the central educational agency. On the other hand, quite independent of this
development, sometimes parallel and sometimes intertwined with it, the concepts
held by Jewish educators and their persistent stress on community responsibility,
were important factors in shaping the attitude and the thinking of community
leaders towards the educational agency and the functions it should perform.

The decline of the Talmud Torah, the rapid growth and development of the
congregational school, and the rise of the Yiddish school, brought to a focus the
need for an all-encompassing type of central educational agency. The emphasis
laid upon diversification and denominationalism by national bodies, led to the
recognition of the need for a unifying educational force in each community if the
community was not to be split up into many fragments. This led to the practical
acceptance of the idea of servicing all-existing educational groups without interfer-
ing with their ideological and religious philosophies. The actual experiences
in the day-to-day educational work of men like Chipkin, Dushkin, Rosen and Rosen,
led to the conclusion that it was imperative for the central educational agency
to follow the pattern of "unity in diversity."

Accepting the trends of denominationalism and building American Jewish educa-
tion on existing programs of education, has been challenged and severely criticized,
particularly by Dr. Bartman. He contends that the central educational agency has
lost sight of the "lovers" idea of the first Bureau of Jewish Education, which should
be the core of its program. Dr. Berkoen does not deny the usefulness of rendering services to existing groups, but emphasized that the educational agency must take the lead in proposing a common program of Jewish education in consonance with Jewish life in America.
CHAPTER II - ACTIVITIES AND ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE CENTRAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES

PART A - ACTIVITIES

In a previous chapter we discussed the changing concept of the functions of the central educational agencies as experienced and envisioned by Jewish educators. The functions were described in terms of the "iever" agency, the association of schools (mainly the Talmud Torah type), the service agency, mainly to one type of school (as exemplified by the now defunct J. E. A. of New York) and the idea of the all inclusive service agency (the concept of "unity in diversity"). The range and extent of the activities engaged in by any particular agency will, therefore, depend upon the objectives of the central educational agency, the size of the community, the funds available, and other factors indigenous to the community. The activities vary from community to community. They may be grouped into seven areas:

I. Setting Up of Standards
II. Developing Standards of Instruction
III. Teacher Training
IV. Youth and Adult Education
V. Financial Aid to Schools
VI. Information and Interpretation
VII. Coordination and Cooperation
I. SETTING UP OF STANDARDS

1. Building Facilities

The central educational agency has in most communities set up standards of health and safety and has insisted that schools shall maintain physical quarters in accordance with acceptable standards of hygiene and safety, if they are to be affiliated and receive financial aid from the community agency. 1/

Not only have standards been set up, but in some communities funds have been made available to help schools implement the program to improve housing facilities. 2/

Holding to the view that an aesthetic and pleasant environment is an important component of the educational process, the central educational agency has pointed to the need of aestheticizing the school rooms and buildings. Encouraging the use of pictures, maps, charts, bulletin boards and other media making for a pleasant school environment as well as keeping the school buildings in good condition, have occupied the attention of central educational agencies.

1/ Baltimore, Chicago, Newark, Los Angeles, Miami, New Haven, New York, Philadelphia have included minimum requirements in regard to buildings as requirements for affiliation. The J.E.C. of N.Y. has set down specific regulations for proper school facilities including such items as minimum size of classroom, artificial and natural light, ventilation and heat equipment, lavatories, fire alarm systems, water supply. See Information Bulletin No. 16 Bureau Subventions for Jewish Schools (American Association for Jewish Education, March 1951) Appendices A to G, inclusive.
The size of the school and administrative practices are important standards in determining affiliation. The minimum required enrollment varies in different cities. Most agencies require that affiliated schools adopt standard administrative practices including record keeping, and the submission of reports on every phase of the school program.

The central agency is interested in the physical plant where the educational process takes place as well as the manner in which the school is conducted administratively and educationally. The latter will be discussed below.

1/ (cont'd) The J.E.C. of N.Y. in order to assist schools to provide proper school facilities has issued several building manuals describing standard equipment, maintenance, hygiene, etc.

2/ In 1946-47, the Philadelphia Council on Jewish Education conducted a comprehensive study of the school buildings in Philadelphia. On the basis of this study, the Allied Jewish Appeal provided a special fund for the construction of fire-escapes and for the maintenance of safety standards in communally supported schools, affiliates of the Council. The J.E.A. of N.Y. established a special mortgage and building loan fund service. The J.E.A. expended over $21,000 in building repairs and loaned about $450,000 to 50 institutions. See I.S. Chipkin, "The Jewish Education Association of New York City", Jewish Education XII, No. 2, p. 137-139. The J.E.A. of New York has continued to make special grants-in-aid to schools that need improvement or maintenance of hygiene standards. The J.E.C. provides the fund on condition that the institution too share the necessary expense.

In Philadelphia, as a result of the 1943 Honor Survey, Gratz College was painted and the appearance of the classrooms improved. The J.E.A. of Essex County allows incentive grants to schools for the improvement of school facilities.

3/ In Los Angeles, a school must have an average daily attendance of 50 pupils and at least one teacher who teaches 20 hours per week. Conditional grants are provided to small schools if the B.J.E. expects the schools to achieve the required enrollment; in Newark, the minimum requirement is an attendance of 35 pupils, 3 times per week; in New York, schools must have: (a) a minimum average register of 50 pupils, (b) a minimum of 3 classes, (c) a minimum of one teacher, (d) a minimum of 10% of the enrollment in free pupils;
2. Personnel

The Board of Jewish Education of New York, from its inception, gave serious thought to the personnel engaged in the task of teaching. Dr. Benderly focused attention on the need for American trained teaching personnel and laid down a five fold requirement for qualified American Jewish teachers: a) They must possess all the qualifications of public school teachers and be inspiring personalities; b) They must have a thorough knowledge of Judaism; c) They must have an understanding of American Jewish life; d) They must possess faith in the Torah, in the Jewish people and its future; e) They must have faith in the future of American Jewry.

3/ (cont'd.) In Miami, a school must have a minimum of one teacher and a minimum of two classes; in Cleveland, schools must maintain a minimum enrollment of 50 pupils; in New Haven, a school must have a minimum attendance of 35 pupils, attending three times a week; in Philadelphia, in order for a new school to be established it must have a minimum of 40 pupils. See Information Bulletin No. 18 op. cit., Appendices A to C.

In the discussion below on coordination and cooperation, we shall point up the fact that the central educational agency attempts to bring about the amalgamation of small units for greater efficiency and the elimination of duplication of facilities, and also that the agency cooperates in new neighborhoods in the establishment of proper school facilities.

4/ Idem.

5/ Benderly stated that the Jewish teacher must, in a measure, be superior even to the good public school teacher in knowledge and personality. S. Benderly "American Activities of the B.J.E. of N.Y.", op. cit., p. 99. It should be pointed out that while Benderly, as director of the Bureau, was in a position to interpret the need for American trained Jewish teachers and to make an effort to find and train them, it was Dr. M. M. Kaplan who first pointed this out very clearly in the survey made in 1909. See M. M. Kaplan and Bernard Cronson, "First Community of Jewish Education in
Benderly realized that the ideal teacher was not to be found nor trained easily. The status of the Hebrew teacher was deplorable and to make Hebrew teaching a profession equal to any of the learned professions would require radical innovations and changes.

The Board of Jewish Education took important steps to remedy the situation: 1) Subsidies were offered to a selected number of Talmud Torahs in the form of scholarships for children whose parents could not pay tuition fee, provided the number of such children did not exceed 1/3 of the total attendance. In return for this assistance, the affiliated Talmud Torahs agreed to abide by five requirements, two of which pertained to teachers: 7) to increase teachers' salary according to scale and to employ licensed teachers only.

2) The Bureau established a Board of License (the first of its kind) to examine and license teachers. By 1912, the Board of License had held nine sessions and granted one hundred and four temporary certificates. 8/

5/ (cont'd.) New York City, 1909", reprinted in Jewish Education XX No. 5 (1949) p. 116. "It is inevitable that the type of teacher who will best succeed, will be the one who has received both his secular and Jewish education in this country."

See also E. Benderly, Purpose and Work of the B.J.E. (1936) op. cit., sections on professional teachers and professional leadership p. 11-14.

6/ In an article entitled "She'losah Shehishpee-u" in the Sefer Hayovel, Dr. Honor describes the five questions Dr. Benderly put to him when he was first drawn to Jewish Education. The questions correspond to the above five requirements Dr. Benderly laid down.

7/ Benderly, "Aims and Activities of the B.J.E.", op. cit.

The other requirements were: to follow the adopted curriculum, to raise tuition fees after investigation by and advice from the Bureau, to transmit financial and educational data to the Bureau for research purposes.
3) At the request of the teachers of the large Talmud Torahs, several courses were established.

4) With the cooperation of M. M. Kaplan, the Bureau enlisted the interest in Jewish education of 110 young men attending C.C.N.Y., Columbia and N.Y.U. and began to train them for Jewish teaching. An experiment was also begun in training young women to teach in Jewish Schools.

The Bureau of New York, in short, set the basis for the pattern of activities designed to set up standards and improve the status of the teachers along the following lines: setting up the standards, licensing teachers, establishing standards for remuneration, seeking to attract to the profession the finest type of young men and women, and making provision for in-service training.

8/ The first attempt to establish a Board of License was premature and was soon abandoned. Benderly, it would seem, made the mistake of trying to license teachers already in service, rather than put emphasis on newly employed teachers.

9/ Idem

10/ Idem. See also M. M. Kaplan, "The Impact of Dr. Samson Benderly," Jewish Education, XX No. 5. Kaplan's quotations from his personal diary are interesting. It seems that it was Kaplan who made the suggestion of recruiting for Jewish education, students in the colleges and training schools, who were preparing themselves to teach in the city schools, and to encourage them to prepare themselves also as Jewish teachers by taking courses at the Teachers' Institute. See M. M. Kaplan and R. Cronson "First Community Survey of Jewish Education", op. cit. p. 116.
The central educational agencies have placed the development of standards of teachers and the improvement of their status in a primary position, and engage in activities designed to maintain and raise standards.

The activities may be divided into two groups:

a. **The establishment of Boards of License.** 11/

These boards have sought to establish minimum requirements for Jewish teachers and to stipulate working conditions in the Jewish schools. In Baltimore, Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Los Angeles, New York, Newark, New Haven, Philadelphia, St. Louis, permanently licensed teachers are required to have diplomas from Hebrew Teachers' Training Schools, or equivalent education, and successful completion of at least two years work at a secular college, and several years of teaching experience. The employment of licensed teachers has been made a condition of affiliation and financial aid in a number of Jewish communities. 12/

The boards of license have recommended salary scales for

---

11/ The following cities have Boards of License: Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Los Angeles, New York, Newark, Philadelphia and St. Louis.

12/ The J.E.A. of N.Y., together with the B.J.E. had set the pattern when it required that in return for scholarships, schools shall maintain certain standards, one of which was the employment of licensed teachers. Baltimore, Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Los Angeles, New York, Newark, Miami, Philadelphia. See Information Bulletin No. 18, pp. 64, 78, appendixes A - G. In Los Angeles, subsidies to schools are given in the form of 70% of teachers' salaries.
licensed teachers, including starting salaries, annual increments and maximum salaries. Codes of professional practice have been adopted in a number of cities or are under discussion. The codes include provisions for pension and health insurance, tenure, the adjustment of controversies, sabbatical leave, etc.

The A.T.T. of Philadelphia instituted a group sick benefit plan in 1922, and the J.E.A. of N.Y. instituted a group life and health insurance plan in the early thirties. When the J.E.A. was merged with the J.E.C., the group and health insurance plan was continued, and a pension and retirement plan was adopted. The teachers, schools and the J.E.C. share equally the cost of the plan. Chicago and Cleveland have similar plans for the protection of the teacher in conjunction with the Welfare Fund organization.

In Philadelphia, permanent employees of community

---

15/ Salary scales have been established in Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Los Angeles, Miami, Newark, New Haven, Philadelphia.

14/ The United Hebrew Schools and Yeshivas still follow the plan.

15/ A. Eisenberg, "Jewish Education in Cleveland - 1945", op. cit. The plan was part of a general plan adopted by the Cleveland Jewish Welfare Federation.

In 1949-50, 15 out of 37 agencies (46.1%) reported that they have made some provision in their budget for group insurance and retirement. The aggregate sum allowed for this purpose was small, but it's an indication of a trend to improve the status of the teacher. See U. Z. Ragozin, "Jewish Education in Facts and Figures", Jewish Education Register and Directory 1951 (AATB) p. 80.
supported schools are enabled to join the overall pension and retirement plan of the Allied Jewish Appeal and the Federation.

Job tenure is recognized in only a few cities, although codes of professional practices call for it. The rule of tenure is in practice in Baltimore, Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Los Angeles, Miami, Newark, New York, Philadelphia, St. Louis.16/

The sponsorship by the American Association for Jewish Education of a National Board of License has given further stimulus to the development of teacher standards. The National Board of License has assumed the responsibility of approving local boards of license17/, issuing national licenses to teachers, and certificating teacher training schools.

Admittedly, much remains to be done in the field of licensing teachers and giving a sense of security. Yet, it must be recognized that this activity of the central educa-

---

16/ Based on information obtained from Dr. A. Kessler, secretary of the National Board of License and Codes of Practice. In Miami, not all schools adhere to the principle completely. In Philadelphia, tenure is the rule in the United Hebrew Schools and Yeshivos.

17/ The National Board of License has given recognition to the following: Chicago Certification Committee, Los Angeles Board of Review and Certification, New York Board of License, Board of License and Review of Essex County, and the St. Louis Board of License.
tional agencies, on a local and national level has set in motion a trend which has been and will be of invaluable benefit to the future and quality of Jewish education in America.

b. The second group of activities designed to improve the status of the teachers have been those which encourage the professional growth of the teachers. Central educational agencies, large or small, plan and conduct in-service training courses, seminars and conferences; to deepen the teachers' knowledge, to improve their methods of teaching, to keep them informed of new developments in education, to provide them with opportunities of reporting on special projects and experiments. Teachers in some communities are encouraged to attend national and regional conferences. 18/

The central agencies in many communities have also taken the

---

18/ When the writer was in Miami, the Bureau set aside a special sum annually to make it possible for a representative of the teachers organization to attend national conferences of Jewish teachers and educators. Other communities (Chicago, New York, Newark, Boston, etc.) have made similar provisions. In Philadelphia, several teachers were given substantial sums so as to enable them to visit and study in Israel (1949).
initiative to stimulate the organization of teachers and
principals associations or have worked closely with them. 19/

To help the professional growth of teachers, the central
educational agencies provide library facilities which make
available to teachers, books, educational periodicals, films,
recordings, etc. The publication of special pedagogic and
news bulletins for teachers is another activity whose main
purpose is to help the teacher grow in his profession. 20/

The larger agencies provide special consultants and
supervisors to work directly with teachers. 21/

The establishment of camps for the training of teachers
has had a beginning in Camp Sharon. Prospective teachers
are given an opportunity to spend their summers in intensive
study. 22/

19/ New York, Boston and Chicago were instrumental in
organizing Principals' Associations.

20/ Further discussion on this below in the section dealing
with supervision.

21/ This, too, will be discussed in the section dealing with
supervision.

22/ Although it was mainly established to serve Chicago,
Camp Sharon has campers from many cities. In 1947, the
Miami Bureau sent a young lady to the camp. Buffalo,
too, sent students to Sharon.
3. Graduation, Confirmation and Bar Mitzvah

By establishing high schools (see below), by stimulating curriculum development, by setting up admission requirements to the Hebrew High School, by insisting on the proper keeping of records, by providing consultation and guidance, the central educational agencies have encouraged the establishment of the tradition of graduation from the Talmud Torahs and congregational schools. In Baltimore, Boston, Chicago, Cincinnati, Cleveland, New York, Philadelphia, graduation is an accepted practice. In a number of communities, citywide graduations for graduates of affiliated schools are sponsored by the central agencies.

The agencies have also been active in establishing common practices and high standards for Confirmation. The standards include age requirement, basic knowledge of Judaism, reading knowledge of Hebrew, attendance requirements.

22a/ In Miami, the rabbis of the affiliated congregations and the B.J.E. adopted a set of regulations calling for Confirmation from the 10th grade, age 15½, 5-year attendance at a particular school, over all 75% attendance in last 3 years, a reading knowledge of Hebrew, examinations in History, Bible, Holidays and Festivals, 2½ hours of study on Sunday.

In Philadelphia, the Committee on Reform Religious Schools, an affiliate of the Council on Jewish Education, succeeded in establishing uniform age requirement for Confirmation in all schools.

In Chicago, the Board of Jewish Education has succeeded in setting up regulations for the Sunday Schools Confirmation and developing higher standards in the schools (licensing of teachers, age requirement for Confirmation, curriculum). Cleveland has worked closely with the Council on Religious Schools in the attempt to raise the standards of the curriculum, culminating in Confirmation.

New Haven, Buffalo, Baltimore report activity in this area.
Establishing standards and requirements for Bar Mitzvah preparation and the public celebration of the ceremony in the synagogue on the Sabbath is another activity of the central educational agencies. The Chicago Board of Jewish Education was probably the first to establish standards on a community wide basis. On February 3, 1936, the Allied Jewish School Board of the Chicago Board of Jewish Education adopted the following requirements for Bar Mitzvah preparation: "(1) a minimum of three years attendance at a daily Hebrew School of recognized standing or (2) evidence of the candidate's fitness to be determined by the B.J.E. through examinations that will test the following: a) understanding of the Hebrew equivalent of what is expected of pupils in affiliated schools who have studied for a period of three years, b) understanding of the customs and ceremonies of Jewish life, c) knowledge and understanding of the major events, personalities and movements of Jewish history, and of the contemporary Jewish world with special emphasis on the positive and constructive phases of present-day Jewish life."

When these regulations were approved by two-thirds of the affiliated schools, the regulations became binding upon all schools affiliated with the Board of Jewish Education.

Other agencies throughout the country have passed similar two or three Bar Mitzvah regulations, usually with the cooperation of the local Rabbinical Association. The regulations
allow for transition periods until they are put into effect and call for minimum requirements in terms of Jewish knowledge.

The agencies assume the responsibility of issuing special certificates of eligibility. The agencies in the smaller communities especially have been active in this work: Akron, Buffalo, Columbus, Indianapolis, Miami, New Haven, Rochester, Schenectady, Syracuse. 22b/

II. DEVELOPING STANDARDS OF INSTRUCTION

Supervision, consultation and educational guidance form the core of the central educational agencies' activities. Without exception, the agencies exercise some form of supervisory responsibility over affiliated schools. However, since most of the agencies are "one man" agencies, supervision is given by the director and adequate supervision becomes extremely difficult.23/

The agencies in New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Los Angeles, and Baltimore maintain departments of supervision staffed by trained experts. Through them services are made available to affiliated schools.

The Jewish Education Committee of New York includes on its staff consultants for the Talmud Torahs, Conservative and Reform congregational schools, Yiddish Schools, Kindergarten and Nursery schools, youth work in public high schools; and general consultants in the arts (music, artcraft, dramatics, dance). As far as possible, the staff represents the various groupings and ideologies in Jewish life as they reflect themselves in the schools.24/ This policy is in accordance with the underlying philosophy of the J.E.C., namely, that of the concept of "unity in diversity" discussed in a previous chapter.25/

The Chicago Board of Jewish Education was the first agency to establish and develop a department of supervision.

24/ When the J. E. C. was organized, the Vaad Haharedi (Council
and set the pattern for the rest of the country. Consultation is made available to the affiliated schools which desire it, congregational and communal. Music, dramatics and arthcraft are included in the program of supervision. Recently, an arrangement was made with the affiliated conservative congregations for the engagement by the B. J. E. of a consultant who is to devote the major part of work to the supervision of their schools.

The Philadelphia Council on Jewish Education provides limited consultation service to its affiliated systems of schools including the communal Talmud Torahs, the one-day-a-week schools (the communal Hebrew Sunday School Society and the Reform Religious Schools), the Orthodox and Conservative Congregational Schools. The Council has on its staff a full time music director. The limitations of the consultation service are somewhat offset by the fact that each system of education has a professional at its head who guides its work educationally as well as administratively. The Council works closely with the directors of the systems.

The Los Angeles Bureau of Jewish Education has established departments of supervision and the Arts with specialists at the head.

A department of Testing and a supervisor for the Reform Religious Schools are included in the Baltimore program of supervision.

26/ (cont'd.) (of Orthodox Schools) received a subsidy to cover the expenses of a special consultant, but this relationship was discontinued when the Council became affiliated with the Mizrachi Organization in 1944.
The Buffalo Bureau employs part-time music, artcraft and dramatic consultants.

What does the supervision program consist of? For all the agencies, large or small, the major task of the supervision work is the improvement of classroom instruction. Every agency attempts to achieve this through the following activities: 26/

1. **Direct and close guidance of the classroom teacher by:**

   a. classroom visits
   b. individual teacher conferences
   c. grade and group conferences
   d. local school teachers' conferences
   e. testing program 27/
   f. maintenance of proper school, classroom and pupil records 28/
   g. self-improvement of teachers (lesson planning and adequate preparation)
   h. Assistance in the training of new teachers 29/

2. **Improvement of Curriculum and Methods of Teaching by:**

   a. standardizing old curricula, projecting and

---


26/ Based on annual reports issued by the agencies, personal conversations with the directors of about a dozen agencies, and the following articles on supervision:

I. B. Rappaport, "Is Supervision Essential in a Program of Jewish Education", *Jewish Education* VI No. 2 (1934) p. 87-94

E. A. Nudelman, "Improving the Work of Our Schools", *Jewish Education* X, No. 2 (1938) p. 91-96

E. Chomsky, "Three Years of Experience With a Consultation Program", *Jewish Education* XXI No. 2 (1950) p. 17-22

M. Liebman, "Supervision Through Inservice Training, Conferences and Demonstration Teaching", *Jewish Education"
evolving new curricula. 30/

b. preparing new texts, materials, teaching guides and
bulletins in all subjects in the Jewish schools. 31/
c. conducting experiments and research in the study of
the Jewish school subjects. 32/
d. working out new techniques and trying out new approaches
to Jewish education.

e. introduction of new curricular and extra-curricular
programs and materials such as Keren Ami, dramatics,
artcraft, music, dance and audio-visual aids. 33/
f. conducting seminars, discussions, conferences and demo-
stration lessons.

g. conducting in-service training courses.
h. publishing teachers' bulletins. 34/
i. providing up to date reference and pedagogic materials.

J. S. Golub, "Supervision for the Creative Teacher", Jewish
A. F. Gannes, "Supervision in Agencies With Limited Personnel",
S. Bugatch, "Supervision Through Testing in Baltimore",
R. G. Lurie, "Three Years' Experience With Unit Approach"

27/ E.g. Baltimore, Boston, Chicago, New York, Los Angeles,
Philadelphia. The Boston program of testing has been a
very valuable instrument for maintaining standards in the
Talmud Torahs. See L. Hurwitz, "Standard Examinations in
Greater Boston Hebrew Schools," Jewish Education, I, No. 2
(1929) p. 114.

28/ E.g. Chicago, New York, Philadelphia (in days of the late
Ben Rosen) worked out all kinds of record forms which were
introduced into the schools.

29/ Chicago through the College of Jewish Studies and the Dept.
of Supervision of the Board of Jewish Education, and
Philadelphia in cooperation with Gratz College, give close
5. Assistance to Ideological Groupings by
   a. providing special consultants
   b. helping each establish its maximum and optimum curricular objectives in accordance with its own outlook.
   c. conducting conferences to discuss the implementation of the program.
   d. joint preparation of tests, texts and curricular materials.
   e. conducting joint experiments.

4. Assistance to Rabbis, Principals and School Committees by
   a. finding and placing teachers
   b. helping in the organization of the school (school schedules, record forms, etc.)
   c. guidance in setting up the curriculum

29/ (cont'd.) supervision to beginner teachers (students or graduates of the two institutions.)

d. providing funds for special projects.

The activities listed above are by no means exhaustive, but they give some indication of the variety of activities carried on by many of the agencies in one form or another. Naturally, the agencies in the larger cities are enabled to engage in them more fully. However, some of the smaller agencies, with limited personnel, may be more effective in reaching all the teachers and influencing the educational work in the schools.

It is not easy to measure the success and effectiveness of the supervisory program of the central educational agencies. However, judging by the reports of the directors of the agencies, some tangible achievements can be pointed out: 30/

30/ (cont’d.) X, No. 1 (1938) p. 35.
B. Rosen and W. Chomsky, "Improving the Teaching of Hebrew in Our Schools", Jewish Education XII, No. 2 (1940) p. 97.


31/ The work of New York, Chicago, Cleveland and Phila., and more recently, Los Angeles, has been prolific. The texts, guides, etc. are used throughout the country.


33/ E.g. Chicago, New York, Phila. (especially in the days of the late Ben Rosen and the A.T.T.), Los Angeles, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Baltimore, Buffalo, Newark, New Haven.

34/ E.G. Buffalo, Cleveland, Chicago, Los Angeles, Miami, Newark, New York, Philadelphia.

34a/ E.g. The J. E. C. of New York and the United Synagogue Commission on Jewish Education.

34b/ E.g. Baltimore, Chicago, New York, Philadelphia.
More and more of the affiliated schools employ licensed teachers and attempt to implement a standard course of study systematically. Affiliated schools have introduced better texts and new curricular and extracurricular activities (especially music, artcraft, dramatics, Keren Ami, audio-visual aids). As a result of the adoption of a standard course of study, the students are better prepared to continue their education in Junior and Senior Hebrew High Schools. Graduation from elementary schools has become a tradition in many schools. Better records are kept by schools. The testing program has helped the schools analyze and improve their work. As a result of the supervision program, a growing literature has been developed including Jewish histories, Hebrew and Bible texts, special guides and bulletins dealing with the teaching of the Siddur, customs and Holidays, current events, etc. The material has found its way into most of the Jewish schools in the country. In many instances the supervision service has

35/ References to achievements as a result of the supervision program are found in the annual reports of the agencies. E.g. New Haven, Miami, Rochester, Atlanta, Schenectady, Buffalo, etc. In the articles listed below specific references will also be found. These articles are cited as illustrations:

given teachers a larger perspective, incentive and courage
to improve themselves professionally and to do more effective
work.

The difficulties encountered in the attempt to conduct
an effective supervision program are numerous among which are
the following:

1. The agencies are understaffed and direct work in the
classroom situation is inadequate. The agencies resort to
many group conferences. While these are important, follow
up in the classroom is essential to implement the program.86/

2. There is a dearth of trained and expert personnel to
plan and execute the supervision program.

3. The supervision program is of an advisory nature.
Suggestions cannot be enforced. The acceptance of guidance
and consultation is dependent upon the good will of the teacher,
principals and rabbis, as well as the good will of systems or
ideological groupings. The principle of "influence without
control", one of the basic underlying principles of the central
educational agencies, is no mean task to achieve. Unusual
educators and well qualified and understanding teachers are
required. The task is further complicated by the problems of

35/ (cont'd.) S. Linick, "The Teacher's View on Supervision and
the Supervisor", Jewish Education XXI, No. 2 (1950) p. 31-33.
S. Dinin, "A Five Year Plan for Jewish Education in Los
B. Isaac, "The History of the United Hebrew Schools of
Detroit".

86/ Thirty seven agencies reported for the 1948 year that they
budgeted for direction and supervision $659,475 or 30% of
their aggregate budget. The proportions allowed for this
purpose by the different types of agencies varied greatly,
ranging from 9.8% for agencies conducting united or associ-
denominational groupings, affiliation and the authority of the central educational agencies. These will be discussed in a later chapter. They are mentioned at this point because the effectiveness of the supervisory program depends to a large degree on these relationships.

III. TEACHER TRAINING

In the quest for qualified American trained Jewish teachers and as part of their program to maintain and raise teachers' standards, the central educational agencies have worked closely with existing teacher training institutions in their communities, have established and maintained such institutions under their auspices, or have assumed responsibility for them after the institutions were established. Today there are thirteen teacher training institutions in ten different communities. Of the eight leading and larger Hebrew teacher training institutions, three are directly conducted by the central educational agencies and the other five are under the independent or seminary auspices. Of the remaining teacher training institutions, four are under the aegis of the central educational agencies and one under seminary auspices.

37/ Gratz College, Teachers Institute of the Jewish Theological Seminary, Yeshivah University Teachers Institute, Baltimore Hebrew Teachers College, Boston Hebrew Teachers College, Herzliah Hebrew Teachers Institute, Chicago College of Jewish Studies, Hebrew Teachers Training School for Girls and the training schools in Pittsburgh, Detroit, Cleveland, Buffalo and Los Angeles.


39/ Baltimore, Chicago, and until recently, Boston. The Hebrew Teachers College of Boston is now independent of the Bureau of Jewish Education.

40/ Buffalo, Cleveland, Detroit, Pittsburgh.
A. Cooperation With Existing Teacher Training Institutions

The central educational agencies have had direct contact with all the teacher training institutions, with the exception of three. With three institutions which are under independent and seminary auspices, the central educational agencies have worked very closely, namely the Teachers Institute of the Jewish Theological Seminary of New York, the Gratz College of Philadelphia, and the University of Judaism of Los Angeles.

1. The Teachers Institute of the Jewish Theological Seminary

The story of the Teachers Institute cannot be understood without reference to the Bureau of Jewish Education. The former was opened in 1909, and the latter in 1910. The Bureau and Institute worked in close cooperation. The interests of Dr. Kaplan and Benderly and the late Dr. Israel Friedlander coincided in the effort to build a new pattern for American Jewish education, to find candidates for Jewish educational leadership and to train personnel able to translate this program in terms of American Jewry.

41/ Los Angeles. When the Bureau of Jewish Education of L.A. was organized in 1935, it launched a program of in-service training and organized special courses for the training of Sunday School and week-day school teachers. This work has been taken over by the Teachers Institute of the University of Judaism and the College of Jewish Studies. See S. DiNin, "A Five Year Plan for Jewish Education in Los Angeles", Jewish Education XXII, No. 1-2 (1950-51) p. 59 f.

41a/ Yeshivah University Teachers Institute, Herzliah Hebrew Teachers Institute, Hebrew Teachers Training School for Girls of New York. Each of these institutions has been engaged in teacher training, has developed high standards for teacher preparation and has made a contribution to personnel training. However, this study is limited to
The two agencies working in close cooperation stimulated a transformation of Jewish education not only in New York City, but left a marked impression on the development of Jewish education throughout the country. 45/

Three major activities of the Bureau had bearing upon the growth and development of the Teachers Institute:

a) The standardization of the Talmud Torahs. b) Professionalization of Hebrew teachers and the recruitment of personnel.

c) The establishment of the Hebrew High School.

a) The Standardization of the Talmud Torahs

On the basis of a careful study, and in view of the lack of large funds needed to standardize all the Talmud Torahs, Dr. Benderly came to the conclusion that the Bureau should work with the larger Talmud Torahs in New York. The Bureau and eight of the larger Talmud Torahs arranged thirty-one conferences and succeeded in working out a uniform program of studies. 44/ To be eligible for subsidies from the Bureau’s Education Fund, the school had to meet five conditions. 45/

The program agreed upon formed the basis for unifying the

41a/ (cont’d.) those institutions with which the central educational agencies have worked closely. See Hurwich, "Hebrew Teachers Colleges in the United States" the Sameer Hayevel, a description of the work of the three institutions.

41b/ Although the Gratz College was the first teacher training institution in America, it was not until the late 20’s that a relationship was developed between the College and the Associated Talmud Torahs, the agency in charge of Talmud Torahs, and it was not until 1945 that it became part of the Council on Jewish Education at the time of its establishment. In discussing the three teacher training institutions, more space is given to the Teachers Institute
work of the Talmud Torahs. While it cannot be said that the improvement in the work of the Talmud Torahs is to be solely ascribed to the efforts of the Bureau, it may be said that the Bureau's influence was felt and recognized by the Talmud Torahs leadership. The better prepared students of the Talmud Torahs served as a reservoir for the Teachers Institute and as a source of students for the Hebrew High School when it was organized in 1912.

41b/ (cont'd.) of the Jewish Theological Seminary because of the parallel development of the two agencies and because of the many years of continuous cooperation between them in the development of Jewish education in New York.


44/ S. Benderly, "Aims and Activities of the B.J.E.", op. cit.

45/ See discussion on personnel, supra.

46/ Cf. L. Konowitz, "Breishit Hanihud Ha-Ivri B'America", Sefer Hayovel.
b) Professionalization of Hebrew teachers and the recruitment of personnel: By its insistence on higher standards and better economic conditions for Hebrew teachers as prerequisites for affiliation\(^47\)/, the Bureau made a direct contribution to the professionalization of Hebrew teachers. The establishment of a Board of License, the increase in salary with annual increments, the emphasis upon security and dignity for the Jewish teacher, were potent factors in attracting American young men and women to Jewish education as a vocation.\(^47a\) The Teachers Institute gave the young people an opportunity for training and preparation in this field.

Dr. Benderly was in immediate need of trained young men and women to develop the pattern and curriculum of American Jewish education. As already mentioned above, Dr. Benderly and Dr. Kaplan combed the local colleges for able young men and women Jewishly inclined, who could be interested in making Jewish education their life work.

\(^{47/}\) See discussion above on personnel.

\(^{47a/}\) Cf. S. Dinin, "Twenty-five Years of Teacher Training", \textit{op.sit.}, p. 26

L. L. Honor, "Educating Teaching Personnel for Jewish Schools", \textit{op.sit.}\)
This group received comprehensive training at the hands of Benderly, Kaplan and Friedlander. They received their Jewish schooling at the Teachers Institute and their educational experience in Bureau schools. Working in close cooperation, the Bureau and the Teachers Institute produced a group of devoted men and women who have, through the years, not only occupied the most important administrative, supervisory and academic posts in the field of Jewish education, but who have helped shape the course of American Jewish education.


49/ Among these are the following: Berkson, Brickner (prior to his preparing for the rabbinate, he was deeply interested in Jewish education. Rabbi Brickner has continued his activities in Jewish education after he became a rabbi), Chipkin, Dinin, Dushkin, Gamoran, Golub, Honor, Rosen, Schoolman, Soltes. --- Cf. Chipkin, "Twenty Five Years of Jewish Education in the United States", --- L. L. Honor, "Comparative Study of Hebrew Teacher Training Schools in the United States", --- S. Dinin, "Twenty Five Years of Teacher Training", p. 26: "It was the Institute which gave them the requisite knowledge, an understanding of the problems facing Jewish life and Jewish education and a vision of the future. It was the Bureau which gave them the practical educational experience, the opportunity to work and experiment, a program of action, and continuous wise and expert guidance along many lines. It was these men in turn who are responsible for most of the still younger leaders in Jewish education."
c) The establishment of the Hebrew High School:

The organization of the Hebrew High School by the Board of Jewish Education in 1912 for the graduates of the Talmud Torahs and of the Bureau experimental schools, was one of its most important and lasting contributions to Jewish Education in America, and more particularly was of great significance to the teacher training program of the Teachers Institute.

The Hebrew High School gave boys and girls an opportunity to continue their Jewish studies beyond the elementary level, placed emphasis on the idea that Jewish education must be viewed as a continuing process, and stimulated the elementary schools to maintain high standards so as to enable their graduates to enter the Hebrew High School.

By bridging the gap between elementary Hebrew schools and the Teachers Institute, the Hebrew High School not only brought into reality the idea of Jewish education as a continuous process from childhood through advanced to adulthood, but also made possible the expansion of the work of the Teachers Institute. It served as a reservoir of potential students, and because of its better prepared students, helped raise the standards of instruction at the Teachers Institute. The Bureau thus became a partner in the teacher training program of the Institute. 50/

50/ Cf. Z. Scharfstein, Toldot Habanim B'Yisroel II, p. 309-310
Throughout the years of its existence, the Hebrew High School (now known as the Marshahiah) has continued to serve as the source of students for the Teachers Institute and its program has been planned to encourage its graduates to continue their Jewish education on a college level.

The Teachers Institute has recognized its debt to the Bureau. The register of the Seminary contains the statement that the Teachers Institute raised its standards for admission and graduation, increased its staff, and broadened its scope of instruction due to the Bureau's successful efforts to improve the quality of instruction in the principal week-day Hebrew Schools, to encourage young men and women to choose Jewish teaching as their profession and to establish the Hebrew High School.

The Teachers Institute also worked in close cooperation with the Jewish Education Association of New York. When the Unterberg Memorial Building for the Institute was built, it was "to be used to extend the opportunities of the Teachers Institute of the Seminary which shall cooperate with the Jewish Education Association in furthering the cause of Jewish education in New York City and throughout the country." 51/

In the 1936 New York Education Study, it is recommended that the J. E. C. shall "cooperate closely with teachers institutes and assist them in various ways, such as supplying critic teachers, 52/ instructors in club leading, dramatics, arts and crafts, and giving assistance in providing opportunities for practice teaching." 53/

The Gratz College

The Gratz College, established in 1895, is the oldest teacher training institution in America. During the fifty-five years of its existence, the College has rendered significant service to the Philadelphia Jewish Community. More than 500 men and women have been graduated and many others attended without completing their studies. Approximately one third of the Jewish teachers in the Jewish schools of Philadelphia are graduates and former students of the College. More than a dozen of alumni entered the rabbinate and other fields of Jewish service. \(^{54}\)

The relationship of the College to a central educational agency has been a two-fold one: a) to the Associated Talmud Torahs, under the direction of the late Ben Rosen, b) to the Philadelphia Council on Jewish Education.

\(^{53}\) For a number of years Miss Leah Klapper was critic teacher for the J. E. C. at the Teachers Institute.


\(^{54}\) The history and development of the College are not the subject of this discussion. For a summary of the history of the College see the article by Solomon Grayzel in the \textit{Jewish Exponent}, Dec. 3, 1945; See also J. H. Greenstone, "Gratz College", \textit{Sefer Hayovel}, p. 276-279; A. A. Neuman, "Gratz College", \textit{The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia}; L. L. Honor and M. Kieferman, \textit{Jewish Education in Philadelphia (1943)}; L. L. Honor, "Educating Teaching Personnel For Jewish Schools"
In the period when the Associated Talmud Torahs developed its Hebrew High School, Gratz College was enabled to raise its standards. The Hebrew High School was an important source of its student body. To meet the needs of the graduates of the Hebrew High School, a more intensive Hebraic course was developed. The Gratz College Register 1928-29 states the following: "Arrangements have been made with the Hebrew High School of the Associated Talmud Torahs giving due recognition to the advanced character of its Hebrew instruction and offering special classes in Hebrew to its graduates." During the period (1928-43), the Hebrew High School of the Associated Talmud Torahs sent its graduates to the College.54a/

From the time of the establishment of the Council on Jewish Education, there has been close cooperation between the two agencies in the effort to set, raise and maintain standards for the training of teachers, and to expand the program of the College. Under the plan of organization of the Council, Gratz is a constituent agency. Presently, the

---

54a/ During this decade, the high school graduated 219 students of whom 132 had originally come from the Assoc. Talmud Torahs and 81 from the congregational schools, and 6 from private schools. The Assoc. Talmud Torahs reported that 80% of its graduates of the regular department registered at Gratz. See Honor and Liebman, Jewish Education in Philadelphia.
College receives more than 50% of its budget from the Allied Jewish Appeal.

Dr. L. L. Honor and Dr. A. Eisenberg, directors of the Council, served as acting deans of the College and gave their active assistance in the development of the College in the intensification of its program, in the development of the preparatory and Extension Departments, in increasing the number of years of study, in improvement of curricular standards and in interpreting the needs of the College to the general community.

Today, the relationship continues to be close. The Council and Gratz College cooperate in planning and conducting in-service courses and conferences for teachers, the close supervision of student and graduate teachers, and in strengthening the position of the College in the community.

The University of Judaism (Los Angeles)

The institution of higher learning for the training of Jewish teachers and for general adult Jewish studies on the west coast is a few years old, having been established in 1948. When the Bureau of Jewish Education was reorganized in 1945, it launched an in-service program for the teachers in the week-day schools, and organized special courses for the training of Sunday School and week-day school Jewish teachers. With the organization of the University of Judaism, the Teachers Institute of the University has taken over the work of training teachers for Hebrew and Yiddish schools, and the College of Jewish Studies has assumed the responsibility of
training Sunday School teachers. The Bureau of Jewish Education and its director, work in close cooperation with both institutions.\(^55\) While it is too early to say, the relationship of the Bureau of Jewish Education to the University of Judaism may be likened to the close relationship between the Bureau of Jewish Education of New York and the Teachers Institute. In the development of Hebrew High Schools, in setting up standards for graduation from elementary schools, in setting up standards for teachers, and in the general advancement of the profession of Jewish education.

B. Teacher Training Institutions Conducted by Central Education Agencies

In five communities, teacher training has been an integral part of the central educational agency: Baltimore, Boston, Chicago, Cleveland and Pittsburgh.

Generally speaking, the teacher training institutions have not only been engaged in training Hebrew and Sunday School teachers, but have been a force for greater interest in Jewish culture. Often Jewish cultural activities revolve around the colleges. Informal activities, such as the Melaveh Malkah, the Oneg Shabbat, Jewish Arts and similar social activities are often initiated, and these have added to the cultural development of the Jewish community. Adult studies and Club Leadership Training have been included in the program of the Hebrew Teachers Colleges sponsored by the community.

The five institutions are described briefly below:

1. Baltimore Hebrew Teachers College

The College was organized in 1919 under the leadership of Dr. Israel Efros as a school for advanced Jewish studies and for the training of Hebrew teachers. A high school department, a Sunday School teacher training department, and an extension program for adults, were added later. Under independent auspices, the college found itself in difficult straits.56/

In 1929 when Dr. Louis L. Kaplan was appointed director of the Board of Jewish Education, the College became part of the Board, a constituent of the Associated Jewish Charities of Baltimore. Since that time the college has been one of the most important functions of the Board of Jewish Education. Its activities are conducted by five departments: A Hebrew Teachers Training Department, a Department of Advanced Hebrew Studies, a Sunday School Training Department, a Department of General Jewish Studies, and a Hebrew High School preparatory to the College.

The College has maintained high standards for admission and has thereby had considerable influence on the program and standards of the elementary Hebrew Schools of Baltimore. The scholastic requirements and achievements of its students rank high among the teacher training institutions. It has been estimated that seventy percent of the teachers in Baltimore Hebrew Schools are graduates of the College, and many of its graduates are teaching in other communities and some have entered the rabbinate.

Although the student body of the College has not been exceedingly large, its importance and influence in the Hebrew


cultural life of the community has been out of proportion to the numbers enrolled in its various departments. 59/

2. Hebrew Teachers College of Boston

Organized in 1920 and opened for instruction in 1921, 59a/ the College was conducted by the Bureau of Jewish Education of Boston until recently. 60/ At first open to the graduates of the elementary Hebrew Schools, the requirements were gradually raised to include completion of a four year course in the Hebrew High School conducted by the College as a preparatory department (Froshdor) to the regular College course. 60a/

59/ L. L. Honor (see note 58) reported that in 1934 the total number of students enrolled in all departments (on a college level only) was 190. But in the Hebrew Teachers Training Department there were 8 students enrolled. Toshov, (see note 58) reported that in 1942, the student body in the College and in the Hebrew High School numbered 150. Hurwich (see note 57) reported that in 1943-49, the number of students in the Hebrew Teachers Training Department was 22. In the same report Hurwich lists the total number of graduates of the teacher training institutions with the exception of Baltimore Hebrew Teachers College (see p. 90 of the report).

59a/ Louis Hurwich, the director of the Bureau of Jewish Education of Boston, was the initiator of the project. See I. Pollack, "Beth Hamidrash B'Boston", Sefer Hayovel, p. 298-304.

60/ The College is now an institution separate and apart from the Bureau of Jewish Education, but is still supported by community funds.

60a/ By 1927 the Hebrew High School course had been increased to four years and graduation from public high school was made a requirement for admission. At this time too, it became necessary for candidates of degrees to do a minimum of two years' work at a recognized secular college.
In addition to the College and Hebrew High School Departments other departments were established: an Adult Extension Department, a Sunday School Teachers and Club Leaders Training Department; a Graduate Department.61/ However, the College concentrated its attention mainly on the training of Hebrew teachers.

Relationship to the Bureau of Jewish Education

From the time of its organization, the Hebrew Teachers College has been the chief concern and activity of the Bureau of Jewish Education. Under the leadership of Mr. Louis Hurwich, director of the Bureau for close to thirty years, and acting Dean and Dean of the College for fifteen years (1932-1947), the Bureau has spent most of its energy and money on the development of the College.62/

The Bureau of Jewish Education of Boston was unique in that it interpreted its community responsibility for Jewish education as being in the areas of secondary and higher education mainly. Its outstanding contribution is the

61/ At present the Adult Extension Education Department functions under the auspices of the Bureau of Jewish Education. The two year Sunday School Teachers Training Dept., reorganized in 1948, is under the auspices of the College. Special arrangements have been made with several New England Colleges and the Boston University School of Education whereby credit is granted for work done at the Hebrew Teachers College.

62/ L.L. Honor, Survey of Jewish Education in Boston (1930). Practically the entire budget was spent on the College and the cost of administration, leaving very limited funds for other activities. In 1930, as the depression continued and the cost of maintaining the Hebrew High School and Hebrew Teachers College increased, the Associated Jewish Charities of Boston, decided to eliminate the granting of
establishment and maintenance of the College.

The technique for standardization of the Talmud Torahs was the examination for admission to the Preparatory Department of the College. Because of the position of the College in the community, all the schools wanted their graduates to qualify for admission. Thus the work of the Bureau of Jewish Education in coordinating the Talmud Torahs through the adoption of a uniform curriculum, followed faithfully by all the Hebrew Schools in Boston, and in outlying communities, the introduction of uniform examinations, the insistence on qualified teachers — as requirements for affiliation with the Bureau — made possible a reservoir of students for the Preparatory Department and the College.63/

The College has been the center of Hebrew culture in

62/ (cont'd.) subsidies to schools in order to enable the College and the High School to continue their work. See Memorandum on Community Responsibility for Jewish Education (prepared in 1950 by the A.A.J.E. and the Boston Bureau of Jewish Education) presented to the Associated Jewish Charities Budget Committee on Education, p. 14. In 1951, for the first time in 20 years, the Associated Jewish Charities allocated a small sum (about $10,000) for subventions to schools.

Boston, and has given prestige and status to the Jewish teaching profession. 64/ Many of the graduates are teaching in Boston Hebrew Schools and in the schools of the surrounding New England communities. 65/

A significant achievement of the Hebrew Teachers College of Boston is the establishment of Camp Yavneh. Yavneh is a Hebrew speaking camp which provides children with an opportunity to continue their Jewish studies as an integral part of the summer camp program. One of the first of its kind in the country, the camp has exerted an influence not only on Jewish education in Boston, but on Jewish education in other communities as well. Children from many parts of the country attend it, and its work has been emulated by other central educational agencies. 66/ Louis Hurwich was the moving spirit of the camp until his retirement. It was due to his

The library of the College has about 20,000 volumes and has served as a means of intensifying interest in Jewish culture in the community.

65/ A total number of 190 students (93 men, 97 women) have been graduated. Of these, 120 (63 men, 57 women) received degrees. Nearly one third of the graduates are teaching in the Jewish schools of New England. See Hebrew Teachers College of Boston, Register 1948-49.
L. Hurwich, "Hebrew Teachers Colleges in the United States", p. 90. Mr. Hurwich lists 199 graduates from the College up to 1949.

influence that the Bureau of Jewish Education, through the
instrumentality of the Hebrew Teachers College, established
the camp, and persuaded the Charities to allocate substan-
tial funds for its operation.

5. The College of Jewish Studies of Chicago

Founded by the Board of Jewish Education in 1924
primarily as a school for adult education67/, the College
has, in the course of twenty-five years, developed a program
of Jewish education broad in scope and objective with many
ramifications reaching out into the entire Jewish community
of Chicago68/. However, the training of professional
teachers still remains one of the main objectives of the
College.

Throughout the years, the College has continued to
remain an organic part of the community program of Jewish
Education under the leadership, guidance and sponsorship of
the Board of Jewish Education, and its directors, Drs. A. M.
Dushkin, L. L. Honor69/, S. M. Blumenfield.

67/L. L. Honor, "Comparative Study of Hebrew Teachers Training
Schools in the United States",
68/Cf. S. M. Blumenfield, "The College of Jewish Studies of
Chicago", Sefer Hayovel, p. 292 f.
L. Katzoff, "The College of Jewish Studies of Chicago",
Jewish Education XXXI, Nos. 1-3 (1950-51) p. 29 f. About
Thirty courses in all phases of Judaism are offered at the
College.
69/ Dr. Honor was the Director of the College (1929-1945) and
was instrumental in putting the College on a high level of
standards and achievement. At present, Dr. Blumenfield is
the Superintendent of the Board of Jewish Education and the
President of the College.
Under the leadership of these three educators, the standards of the College were continuously improved. The Central Hebrew High School was organized by the Board of Jewish Education, thus bridging the gap between the elementary Hebrew Schools and the College and serving as a preparatory school to the College.\footnote{Originally, the College required three years' training in the Hebrew High School and the College course was three years in length. Since 1929 the College course was lengthened to four years and the Hebrew High School course increased to four years.}

The work of the College is divided into five departments: Hebrew Teacher Training, Advanced Hebrew Studies, Sunday School Teachers and Club Leaders, General Jewish Studies, Graduate Department.\footnote{In 1927 an arrangement was entered into with the University of Chicago whereby courses were offered at the University in the Hebrew language, history and institutions of the Jewish people in cooperation with the College, and students could include them for credit as part of their regular program of studies. In 1945, the Graduate Department was established to provide an opportunity for advanced study leading to Master's and D. H. L. degrees.} The College sponsors a Women's Institute, an institute for Jewish communal workers, an institute for cantors and a special course for the training of group workers and camp counselors.

A unique activity of the College is Camp Sharon which conducts an intensive educational summer program for Hebrew teachers in training.
As an integral part of the Board of Jewish Education, the College has been a positive force for the unity, cooperation, and integration of diverse elements in the Jewish community and is a continuous illustration of Jewish education from a community viewpoint.\(^72\)/

In teacher training and advanced Hebrew Studies, the influence of the College has been considerable.\(^73\)/ Many of the graduates of the Hebrew Teachers Training Department are engaged in Jewish teaching. Some of the graduates of the Advanced Hebrew Department entered the rabbinate and other Jewish professions. Most of the graduates are actively identified with Hebrew and other forms of Jewish activities and many are said to hold important positions in Jewish organizations.\(^74\)/

Generally speaking, the College of Jewish Studies has played an important part in the efforts of the Board of Jewish Education to raise the standards in the elementary and high schools, and to maintain high standards for teacher training and Adult Jewish studies.

---

72/ By 1948-49, close to 600 students were enrolled in the various departments and courses of the College. Adult education on a sustained basis is an important contribution of the College. The acquisition of a large building for educational purposes has given the College greater opportunity for serving the total Jewish community.

S. M. Blumenfield, "The College of Jewish Studies", Safer Hayovel, p. 295, reports a registration of 499 in all departments and courses in 1941.

L. L. Honor, "Comparative Study of the Hebrew Teachers Training Schools", reports a registration of 232 in all departments in 1954.
4. The Hebrew Teachers Seminary of Cleveland

The Teachers Institute of Cleveland was organized in 1925 by the late A. H. Friedland, director of the Talmud Torahs and the Bureau of Jewish Education. It has continued to be under the aegis of the Bureau. The main purpose was to train young men and women for Hebrew teaching. The scope of the activities increased as the institution developed. However, the financial situation impaired its development and growth. During World War II the institution declined in numbers.

Despite the difficulties and restrictions, the Seminary exerted considerable influence in educational circles in Cleveland and has played an important role in the Jewish cultural life of the Cleveland Jewish community.75/  

The Bureau of Jewish Education is continuing to sponsor the Teachers Seminary, and is now engaged in strengthening its position and developing its scope of activities.

75/ In 1949-49, 93 students (54 men, 39 women) were enrolled in the Hebrew Teachers Training and Advanced Hebrew Studies Depts. See L. Hurwich, "Hebrew Teachers Colleges in the U. S.", p. 75. --- In terms of graduates, by 1949, the College had graduated over 150 men and women from all its departments. Honor, in his 1935 survey of teacher training schools, gives the number of graduates as being 88; Bricker, Jewish Education in Chicago states that by 1939, there were 150 graduates among which were 88 Hebrew teachers. In 1948, Hurwich gave the number of Hebrew teacher graduates as 87.

74/ Cf. Honor, "Comparative Study of Teacher Training Institutions"; H. Bricker, Jewish Education in Chicago; S. E. Blumenfield, "The College of Jewish Studies of Chicago", Sefer Hayovel.

75/ By 1934, there were 80 graduates; Fifty were teaching Hebrew in Talmud Torahs, congregational and Sunday Schools; 20 were club leaders; several entered the rabbinate; most
5. Rosenbloom Teachers Training School of the Hebrew Institute of Pittsburgh

The Teachers Training School was organized in 1922 and became part of the Hebrew Institute of Pittsburgh in 1925. In 1931, it came to be known as the Rosenbloom Teachers Training School of the Hebrew Institute.

The graduates of the Hebrew Schools conducted by the Institute were eligible for admission to the Hebrew High School in preparation for entrance to the Teacher Training Department. Mr. Israel Abrams, the principal of the Hebrew Institute also served as the administrative officer of the Training School.

High scholastic standards were set up and the school was recognized by the local university. 76/

---

76/ (cont'd.) of the alumni were active in Zionist and general Jewish youth activities. In 1944, the number of graduates of the Teachers Seminary engaged in teaching was 36 (20 in Cleveland, 6 in New York and 10 in other communities). Many others had left teaching, some settled in Palestine. See L.L. Lillie, "Comparative Study of Hebrew Teacher Training Institutions"; M. Medini, "The Hebrew High School and Teachers Seminary of Cleveland", Sefer Hayovel, p. 308-31.

76/ Arrangements were made with the University of Pittsburgh for students of the Hebrew Teachers Training School to take courses in psychology and pedagogy at the University. Students of the Teacher Training School were given an annual reduction of $75.00 from the tuition fee. See I.A. Abrams, "The Hebrew Teachers Training School of the Hebrew Institute", Sefer Hayovel, p. 312-13. The University also gave credit for the Hebrew courses given at the Institute and included a listing of the Institute courses in its Bulletin.
Although the student body of the Training School has been small, the school has been in existence for a quarter of a century, and as part of the Hebrew Institute, has been important as an Hebraic cultural center in the city. Its graduates have served in the Jewish schools of Pittsburgh and have been active in Jewish community life.

77/ The 1935 Honor survey of training schools showed a registration of 33 in 1931-32 and a registration of 22 in 1934. In 1944, Mr. Abrams stated that 255 students had attended the school from the time of its organization.

78/ Abrams, p. 312-313.

79/ Honor, "Comparative Study of Teacher Training Institutions", reports 37 graduates and all but six were teaching in Hebrew schools. In 1944, Abrams reported that 39 had been graduated as teachers and 13 had entered the rabbinate.
IV. YOUTH AND ADULT EDUCATION

Activities and experimentation in untried and neglected areas as well as making provision for those elements in the educational program which no individual group or institution can undertake, have been a unique feature of the central educational agency's functions. This is particularly true in the field of youth and adult education. These activities, engaged in by many of the agencies, may be grouped as follows:

A. Youth Education

1. Hebrew High Schools
2. High Schools of Jewish Studies and Extension Education for Youth.
3. Assistance in the introduction of Hebrew into the public high schools.
4. Camping

B. Adult Education
A. Youth Education

The Hebrew High School is a unique institution in American Jewish education and its establishment may be ascribed in the main to the efforts of the central educational agencies. As in many other areas, the New York Bureau was the trail blazer. The Hebrew High School was established in 1912, two years after the organization of the Bureau. Dr. Benderly felt that the traditional curriculum was more suitable to the more mature youth than to the child. Adolescence is the time when the intellectual and emotional foundation is laid for Jewish living, and from the point of view of loyalties, social orientation, and vocational adjustment, the adolescent period in the life of the Jewish boy and girl is of the greatest importance and significance.

Providing an opportunity for boys and girls to continue their Jewish education on a secondary level was the prime objective of the Hebrew High School. Dr. Benderly laid great emphasis on continuation.

81/ In addition, the Hebrew


Cf. D. Rudavsky, "The Bureau of Jewish Education After 1918", p. 40;--- The trend of making secondary education an end in itself was similar to the one in public school education in the 20's when the compulsory age level in public school education was raised.
High School aimed to prepare students to enter the Teachers Institute and prepare themselves for teaching.

The Hebrew High School has functioned continuously since 1912. Today, more than 500 students attend its eighteen branches and central branch. Thousands of students have attended four years or less and probably more than 2000 have been graduated.82/

In 1929, when the larger Talmud Torahs began to decline and the supply of students for the Hebrew High School to decrease, the Bureau established a Junior Hebrew High School for the purpose of preparing students for the Hebrew High School in one year. Some fifty congregations were induced to adopt a curriculum leading to graduation at approximately one year below the level of the Talmud Torahs. Through this medium, congregational schools rearranged their curriculum, and organized graduations, and produced a number of students who might have been lost to further Jewish education.83/

In 1933, the Hebrew High School and the Junior Hebrew High School were merged into one and came to be called the Florence Marshall Hebrew High School (Marshalliah). The Junior Hebrew High School classes form a substantial segment of the school’s enrollment.

---

82/ No complete study of the Hebrew High School of New York has been made. D. Rudavsky (see note 81) describes the history and activities of the Hebrew High School. The writer was connected with the school from 1924 to 1944 as student, student-teacher, teacher and administrative assistant, and feels that the estimate of 2000 graduates is a conservative figure. The influence of the Hebrew High School on its many students and graduates is difficult to determine, but undoubtedly is appreciable. Many entered
Up to the time of the merger of the B.J.E. with the newly organized Jewish Education Committee, the Hebrew High School was a major activity of the Bureau. After the merger, an attempt was made to establish a separate board of directors in order to stimulate greater lay interest in the school and to develop new resources for funds. The office of the Bureau was moved to the Central Jewish Institute. To this day, however, its main support stems from the Jewish Education Committee which is its sponsor, although presumably it is not any more a direct function of the J. E. C. 83a/

The pattern set in New York was followed by other communities. The Hebrew High School of Philadelphia was established in 1922-23 by the Associated Talmud Torahs. It combined into one system the graduates of the communal Talmud Torahs and those of the congregational schools. 83b/ During the 20's and 30's, the Hebrew High School was an important educational institution. Close to 1000 students were graduated. 84/ The Hebrew High School had a direct

82/ (cont’d.) Jewish education, the rabbinate, social and center work, and are active generally in Jewish community organization. See the discussion above on the Teachers Institute and the Hebrew High School.

83/a, B. Rudavsky, Jewish Education in New York After 1918, op. cit., p. 40.

83b/ The Herzlia Hebrew High School receives a subsidy from the J.E.C. in accordance with the policy of the J.E.C. to give some assistance to high schools. Up to the time of the establishment of the J.E.C., the Herzlia did not receive any funds from the Bureau or from Federation.

83b/ L.L. Honor and M. Liebman, Jewish Education in Phila., p. 56: In the period (1933-1943), the Hebrew High School
influence on the standards of instruction at Gratz College. 85/

The Hebrew High School of Philadelphia is still in existence, but it has declined in numbers and influence. The shifting of the Jewish population to new neighborhoods with the concomitant decrease in Talmud Torah enrollment, the rapid rise of the congregational schools, and the decision by the Conservative congregational schools to conduct their own high school, have been factors in the rapid decline of the community Hebrew High School. 86/ As of the date of this writing, the Hebrew High School work is not a community-wide system, and the nature of its further development is uncertain. 87/

The Chicago Central Hebrew High School sponsored and financed by the Board of Jewish Education observed its 25th anniversary in 1951. It has continued to function effectively since 1926 in preparing students for the departments of Advanced Hebrew Studies and Hebrew Teacher Training of the College of Jewish Studies, and is providing an opportunity to

85b/ (cont'd.) admitted a total of 632 students, 445 of these students came from the Associated Talmud Torahs, and 187 from the congregational schools. During the same period 209 were graduated, of whom 132 had originally come from the Associated Talmud Torahs, 81 from the congregational schools and 6 from private schools.

84/ The first graduation was held in 1927 with 37 graduates. By 1938, 599 had been graduated from the school. Minutes of Hebrew High School Committee of Assoc. Talmud Torahs; also Annual Reports by Ben Rosen from 1932 onward; also special booklet entitled "Education to the Fore". An attempt was also made to establish a Junior Hebrew High School analogous to the one in New York.

85/ See discussion above on Teacher Training.
adolescents to continue their Jewish education on a secondary level. Since the school was founded, more than 1200 students have attended the four year course partially or completely. 86/

In the 30's a Hebrew High School was established for the graduates of the congregational schools. 87/ This was somewhat similar to the development of the Junior Hebrew High School in New York. 88a/

At the present time, the Board of Jewish Education of Chicago conducts a High School of Jewish Studies which is divided into three divisions: Communal, Congregational and General. The Communal division is a four year course (8 hours per week) designed for graduates from elementary Hebrew schools having a five-year program of instruction with a minimum attendance of eight hours per week. The congregational division — a four-year course with a minimum of four hours per week — admits graduates from daily congregational schools following the program of instruction prescribed by the Board of Jewish Education. 88b/ The General Division is open to

---

86/ The lack of a Hebrew High School in Phila. in the last few years has had a marked effect on the standards at Gratz College. The College took steps to remedy the situation by establishing a Preparatory Dept. and a pre-Freshman class. The Preparatory Dept. and the pre-Freshman class constitute a high school dept. For a discussion on the areas of conflict between the Assoc. Talmud Torahs and the United Synagogue schools in regard to secondary education, see Honor and Liebman, Jewish Education in Phila.

87/ High School work is one of the areas being studied by the Committee on the Self-Study of Jewish Education in Phila.

88/ Bricker, Jewish Education in Chicago, states that his study reveals that by 1940, 900 students had attended the high school and that by that time 220 had been graduated. The school records indicated that 25% of the graduates are
students in the freshman or sophomore years of the public high schools who do not receive any Jewish education.

The graduates of the three divisions are eligible to continue their studies in the several departments of the College of Jewish Studies.

The development of the High School of Jewish Studies has led to higher standards in the College, helped standardize the curriculum in the week-day schools, made graduation from the elementary schools a tradition and was an important factor in raising the level of Jewish cultural life in Chicago.

88/ (cont'd.) teaching in Hebrew and Sunday Schools in Chicago and elsewhere; 25% are attending the College of Jewish Studies; about 15% are attending universities; about 10% are professionals, rabbis or business men; 10% are secretaries, and 15% are housewives.

89/ From 1935 to 1950, the enrollment exceeded 1000 and about 100 were graduated.

89a/ The Junior Hebrew High School of New York was at first organized for the graduates of congregational schools. It was not planned for the school to "feed" the Hebrew High School. It was only later that the school was merged with regular high school under one principal and became a preparatory department for the Hebrew High School. In Chicago, congregational High School was never a "feeder" for the Central Hebrew High School.

89b/ The congregational division consists of seven units — six of which meet in congregations and one meets at the Jewish Education Building. The latter unit is maintained by the Board. The other six are maintained by their individual congregations. The communal and general divisions of the High School of Jewish Studies are maintained by the Board of Jewish Education.

90/ Bricker quotes the principal of the Hebrew High School as stating that the records of the graduates and non-graduates "indicate that the students, who have left the school, particularly the graduates, continue their contacts with
Community Hebrew High Schools have been conducted in Baltimore, Boston, Cleveland, Detroit, Minneapolis and Pittsburgh for twenty years or more.

In Boston, the Hebrew High School was organized in 1923, and is maintained by the Hebrew Teachers College. It began with courses extending over a period of two years. In 1927, two more years were added to the curriculum. Graduates of a six-year course elementary Hebrew School are eligible for admission to the high school. The high standards maintained by the Hebrew High School have stimulated intensive work in the elementary schools.

The Baltimore Hebrew High School — a four-year course — is conducted by the Baltimore Hebrew Teachers College. Graduates of a six-year elementary Hebrew course are eligible for admission into the first year. Some of the Hebrew schools maintain a Junior High School division where the children

90/ (cont'd.) Jewish affairs by attending synagogue services, Zionist meetings and general Jewish cultural affairs. Graduates are filling leading positions in synagogues, Hebraic, Zionist and youth work". p. 47
attend a seventh year or pursue a more intensive course of study during the fifth and sixth year. Upon completion of this course, the students enter the second year of the Hebrew High School. In 1950, the enrollment in the Central Hebrew High School was 74.

The United Hebrew Schools of Detroit organized a high school in 1924 and held its first graduation in 1928. The standards are high and admission is open to the graduates of United Hebrew Schools and to those who have equivalent education. 91/

The Minneapolis Talmud Torah has conducted a Hebrew High School for more than twenty-five years. In 1948, the director of the Talmud Torah reported an enrollment of 148. During the twenty-five years of its existence, the High School has maintained high standards and has produced graduates who possess an intensive Jewish education.

The educational agencies in the smaller communities and the more recently organized central educational agencies have been active in the establishment of schools or classes on a high school level.92/

By stimulating the establishment and growth of Hebrew High Schools, the central educational agencies have encouraged the tradition of graduation from elementary schools, have made possible continuation of Jewish schooling on a higher level, have given impetus to the improvement and standardization of the curriculum in elementary schools by setting up admission requirements, have served as a reservoir for teaching training institutions and preparation for higher learning, professional work and lay leadership, have stimulated the improvement of standards and curriculum in the teacher training institutions, and helped raise the general level of Jewish education in America.

92/ The Buffalo Bureau of Jewish Education conducts a high school with an enrollment of close to fifty. The Miami Bureau organized a high school in 1946. The first graduation was held in June 1951, and six students were graduated. In Los Angeles, there are three high schools in the community: The Yeshivah High School, the Hebrew High School and the Yiddish Kittleshule. Each of these schools has come into existence at the initiative of the Bureau of Jewish Education. The Bureau supervises the Hebrew High School classes which have an enrollment of close to 100 students. The Bureau hopes to organize a city-wide high school under its own aegis. Cincinnati, Cleveland, New Haven, Rochester report Hebrew High School classes conducted by the Bureau of Jewish Education. The Cincinnati Bureau conducts a high school with two divisions: a Junior and Senior High School (each is a 3-year course) and reports an enrollment of 33 students. The Cleveland Hebrew High School reports a registration of 59 students for the 1950-51 school year.
2. High Schools of Jewish Studies and Extension Education for Youth

The central educational agencies have been deeply concerned with the unschooled youth, i.e. those who discontinued their elementary Jewish education after a year or two, or had no Jewish training during their period of elementary school age. Efforts have been made to reach the unschooled youth of high school age, and to develop special programs and techniques suitable to youth, with a view of inspiring them with the romance of the tradition and history of the Jewish people and inculcating in them the desire to live as Jews and to perpetuate Jewish life in America.

These efforts have assumed various forms: organization of Extension High Schools (or High Schools of Jewish Studies), conducting youth movements, servicing and guiding youth groups.

A survey conducted in 1939 reveals that a total of 700 students were enrolled in extension high schools throughout the country. At that time, five central educational agencies reported that they conducted extension high schools...

---

92a/ In this area the Bureau of Jewish Education of New York conducted experiments before World War I. See Dushkin, Jewish Education in New York City, p. 107

or classes. Recent information obtained by the writer indicates that not more than 300 to 400 are enrolled in formal extension classes in Buffalo, Chicago, Cincinnati, Detroit, Miami, New York, Philadelphia.

It is quite evident that this aspect of Jewish education needs further development and the central educational agencies will have to take the lead in it.

More of an informal nature has been the work of the League of Jewish Youth established in New York and Chicago, as a movement of students attending the public high schools.

The Board of Jewish Education of New York organized the League in 1913. The central idea of the League was to "create a community of adolescents, which will bind the individual young man and young woman to all other young men and women in America. It utilizes the impulse of the adolescent self to expand, by having him pledge allegiance to

---

94/ Boston, Cincinnati, Minneapolis, New York, Philadelphia.

95/ The Philadelphia Extension High School was opened in 1923. During the period 1923-29, the highest enrollment in one year was 500, and an average enrollment of 300 to 350 in the six-year period. The Extension High School continued to function effectively up to the time of the late Ben Rosen's departure from Philadelphia. As recently as 1950, the United Hebrew Schools and Yeshivos continued to conduct one or two extension classes, but these were discontinued, and the High School is now defunct.

For a description of the work of the Extension High School see B. Rosen, "The Extension High School in Phila.", Jewish Education 1, No. 3, p. 185.
a cause greater than himself, that of the age-long past, the world-wide present, and the idealistic future of the Jewish people". 96/ The League of Jewish Youth continued to function until 1933 in several sections of New York City. Designed for high school age youth, the League conducted formal class work in history, Bible, customs and ceremonies, Hebrew, Palestine as well as extra curricular activities, such as rallies, picnics, social gatherings, forums and debates, dances, dramatics. Appropriate materials were prepared for use by leaders and members of the League. 97/

Its place was taken by the Hebrew Culture Council (at first it was called the Jewish Culture Council) also sponsored by the Bureau of Jewish Education. Now a department of the Jewish Education Committee, the Hebrew Culture Council has continued to render valuable service to Jewish education for youth. Its main functions have been to organize the students of Hebrew in the public High Schools into an extra curricular organization, to give every assistance in the development and intensification of Hebrew

96/ A.M. Dushkin, Jewish Education in New York City, p. 123-126
In 1918, Dushkin reported the membership to be 9000.

97/ The Outline of Jewish Knowledge by Benderly and Goldberg was used in the main for the study of history and Bible.
cultural programs, and to encourage the interest in the study of Hebrew in the public high schools of New York. The Hebrew Culture Council has achieved a large measure of success in this work.98/

The Chicago Jewish Youth League was modelled after the New York League. An organization designed to reach the Jewish students in the public high schools, it aimed:

a) to develop within Jewish youth an understanding of Jewish life, literature, art, customs and ceremonies, etc.

b) to foster a spirit of comradeship among Jewish high school youth

c) to encourage social and cultural activities which would serve as an expression of Jewish and American living.99/ To achieve these aims, a variety of activities was initiated similar in content and procedures to those engaged in by the League of Jewish Youth in New York.100/

---


99/ B. Edidin, "A Community Program of Extension Education", Jewish Education I, No. 3 (1929) p. 175-176; Bricker, Jewish Education in Chicago. At the time of this study (1939-40), the Jewish Youth League had a membership of 1000 in thirteen high schools in Chicago and the age range of the members was 13 to 17.

100/ See the printed report of the Board of Jewish Education entitled Sixteen Years of Organized Jewish Education. For many years the literary society of the Chicago League issued a magazine entitled Jewish Youth Magazine. The art club held annual exhibits, and the study classes prepared a number of students for the College of Jewish Studies.
The Jewish Youth League of Chicago has continued its work through the years in the attempt to reach the unorganized Jewish high school youth in order to give them an appreciation and understanding of their Jewish heritage and of Jewish life today.

Service and Guidance to Youth Groups

In the main, the central educational agencies function as service agencies in the field of youth work, recognizing that the local Jewish youth movements reflect the trends of divergent national and local Jewish movements and institutions. The policy of the educational agencies seems to be to maintain contact with as many youth organizations as possible and to offer services without interfering with their ideology, form of organization and functions. 101/

A careful reading of the annual reports issued by the central educational agencies reveals the following types of services rendered to youth groups: 102/

a) making available all kinds of educational materials (dramatics,

101/ In several communities the agencies have worked very closely with the Zionist Youth Commission and have taken an important role in the development of young Judea clubs. The agencies have furnished professional staff to prepare materials for them and have given assistance in the organization of clubs (Cleveland, Cincinnati, Chicago, Miami) See S. M. Blumenfield, "A Community Program of Jewish Youth Work", Jewish Education VII, No. 1 (1935) p. 20-25; A. Eisenberg, "Jewish Education in Cleveland-1945"; I. Levitats, "An Experiment in Communal Education", Jewish Education XVI, No. 1 (1944) p. 55-56.

102/ e.g. Annual reports of Akron, Atlanta, Buffalo, Chicago, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Des Moines, Louisville, Miami, New Haven, Rochester, Schenectady, St. Paul, Syracuse. Some of the groups which have been the recipients of services are the following: Young Judea, Masada, Jr. Hadassah, Hashomer Hatzair, Hashomer Hatzair, HaPoel Hamizrachi, IZFA,
audio-visual aids, songs, etc.) b) arranging special courses of study c) conducting forums, seminars and institutes d) initiating youth conferences and councils e) making available personnel and speakers f) conducting leadership training courses g) conducting special groups such as choral, dance and dramatic groups h) conducting city-wide youth celebrations on holidays and special occasions i) issuing special holiday guides, bulletins and periodicals j) cooperating with Scout groups in preparing Scouts for the Ner Tamid award.

In servicing and guiding youth, cooperation and joint planning with centers and Y’s are reported in several communities. 103/

The directors of the agencies recognize that the services rendered to youth groups are for the most part peripheral to the main objectives and functions of the agencies. However, they recognize and emphasize the import-

102/ (cont'd.) all the Bnai Brith youth groups, and also independent youth groups and clubs.

103/ e.g. Buffalo, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Miami, Rochester, Schenectady, St. Paul.

In Chicago, the College of Jewish Studies offers leadership training courses for club leaders. In Philadelphia, the Council on Jewish Education has cooperated with Gratz College and the Middle Atlantic Section of the J.W.B. in conducting leadership courses for youth organizations in the city. For a discussion of the cooperation between central educational agencies and group work agencies, see below, section on coordination and cooperation.
ance and need of this work in the effort to deepen the Jewish interests and knowledge of youth. This is especially true in the smaller communities where the central educational agencies are the only resource agencies for educational materials and programming.

3. The Introduction of Hebrew in the Public High Schools

A significant development in the past twenty years has been the introduction of Hebrew, as a modern language, into the public high schools. It has met with outstanding success in New York City where 7500 students are enrolled in thirty-six junior and senior high schools and four colleges. Hebrew has also been introduced in the public high schools of St. Louis, Newark, New Haven and Pittsburgh. In other communities the subject is under discussion and consideration.

The introduction of modern Hebrew into the public high schools — a responsibility of public education on a par with French, Italian and other modern languages — was made possible through the cooperation of many community leaders — Jews and non-Jews — and organizations in the community. However, it can be said that in those communities where it has met with a high degree of success, it is in no small measure due to the sustained stimulation of community-wide interest in the study of the language, and in the sustained technical and educational guidance provided by the central educational agencies. The technical and educational guidance includes
assistance to the Board of Education in the preparation of syllabi and text books, and generally acting in an advisory capacity in all matters pertaining to the study of Hebrew. 104/

104/ J. Lapson, "The Hebrew Culture Council and Two Decades of Hebrew in the Public High Schools of New York City"; J. Lapson, "Hebrew in the Public High Schools".
4. **Camping**

From the point of view of Jewish interests and studies, the summer months were, for many years, a complete liability to Jewish education. In the last twenty-five years, Jewish educators, recognizing the opportunities and challenge of the summer months, have pointed to the day camps and overnight country camps as the place where the two elements of time and environment, so badly needed in the Jewish educational process, are available. The country camp especially could be used both for formal study and the creation of a Jewish milieu. The camp could be a place where children, live, play and study — and in which both the Jewish and American influences could be harmoniously integrated.

The pioneering efforts in developing a summer camp educational program were made by men closely associated with the Bureau of New York and its director, and by the Bureau itself.

Cejwin Camps (originally known as C.J.I.) was the first Jewish institutional camp of its kind in America and has continued in existence under the same leadership (Albert F. Schoolman) since 1919. It gave the impetus to the Jewish educational approach in camping. The underlying principle of the camp has been to provide children with experiences in Jewish living as an integral part of the regular camp program through a program including songs, dances, dramatics, arts and crafts, daily and Sabbath services, and the warm and spirited atmosphere on the Sabbath. Cejwin Camps have
grown tremendously and can accommodate 1000 children and 400 staff during one season. In more than thirty years of continuous operation, the Camps have influenced thousands and thousands of Jewish children in their attitudes to Jewish life, culture and religious practices.105/

Experimentation with a Jewish camping program was attempted by a number of Jewish educators.105a/ However, among the private camps, Camp Modin has continued in successful operation for thirty years. Modin was organized in 1922, for children of parents who wanted a Jewish educational program but, at the same time, desired the benefits of the small, private camp. The directors of the camp (in the beginning Dr. Dushkin and Berson, A. F. Schoolman, and now Mrs. I. B. Berkson) are leading Jewish educators who were associated with the Bureau of Jewish Education of New York, and were deeply interested in finding new approaches to Jewish education in America. The program at Modin is similar to the one conducted at Cejwin.

Dr. Benderly recognized the potentialities of the summer months for education for Jewish living through Jewish living at a very early date: "A way must be found whereby

---


105a/ e.g. Samuel J. Boronsky, Emanuel Halpern, Samuel Grossman and others.
the Hebrew school can, so to say, be moved into the country for the ten weeks of the summer. There we will have an opportunity not only to teach our pupils about the Jews but live with them as Jews. To whatever phase we will turn in the problem of Jewish education, we will find a possible solution during the summer months.

"If we want to teach the children the Hebrew language, we can do so by gradually making the camp Hebrew speaking. It is possible this way for the child to learn more Hebrew in ten weeks than he can in the course of two or three years during the winter months.

"If we want the child to acquire a knowledge of services, the camp synagogue can do that in a way that cannot be done by the reading of the Siddur for years in the classroom.

"If we want the child to acquire knowledge of Jewish songs, I know of no place where he can do so as he can in camp." 106/

---


Dr. Benderly prepared a chart to prove that a child spends as much time in camp during the two summer months as he does at public school during the ten months of the school year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. of Months</th>
<th>No. of Days</th>
<th>No. of Hours per Day</th>
<th>No. of Hrs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In Camp</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In School</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quoted in the Benderly Memorial Volume, Jewish Education XX, No. 3, p. 109.
To demonstrate its possibilities, Dr. Benderly organized the first Hebrew speaking and study camp at Arverne, L.I. in 1926, under the sponsorship of the Board of Jewish Education. A select number of Hebrew High School students and graduates formed the nucleus of the camp. Limited to an enrollment of fifty to sixty "campers" (mostly public high school graduates or seniors in the public high schools) the camp program had several unique features:

a) It was open to those young men and women selected by Dr. Benderly on the basis of their Jewish interests, knowledge and personalities.

b) It was a Hebrew speaking camp.

c) The camp program included four hours of study daily.

d) The camp planned a program of complete Jewish living including daily and Sabbath services, discussion groups, and forums, publication of a weekly Hebrew newspaper, the arts with special emphasis on dramatics, dance and music — all of course conducted in Hebrew.

6) The camp program was planned and directed by the campers. It was a unique experiment in democratic living and planning. No counsellors, waiters, etc. were employed. The campers undertook the direction of the activities and cared for all their needs on a carefully planned basis.

The study and other phases of the program were continued in the winter months and correlated with the work and program of the summer months. All of this was done

under the direction of the Bureau of Jewish Education and Dr. Benderly.

The camp was conducted as a Hebrew speaking camp from 1927-1931 inclusive. In 1932, it was moved to Godeffroy, N.Y. where more campers could be accommodated. The objectives of the camp were changed and it became an experiment in Jewish camping on a mass scale. No longer a Hebrew speaking camp or study camp, it became more akin to Oejwin in objectives and program. 107a/

The three camps mentioned above — the institutional, the private, and the central educational agency camps — were the forerunners of Jewish educational camps in the country. Their successful experiments stimulated organizations and central educational agencies to establish similar institutions. 108/

Central educational agencies in several communities have taken the lead in establishing camps and in bringing to the attention of their communities the significance and importance of Jewish camping. The Boston Hebrew Teachers College established Camp Yavneh as a study camp in the early

107/ (cont'd.) Jewish Education XX, No. 3, p. 61-69.

107a/ In the first two or three years at Godeffroy, Dr. Benderly embarked on large projects in agriculture in which the campers participated. He had in mind the idea of combining camping, Jewish living, working in the fields.

108/ Camps Massad sponsored by the Histadruth Ivrit and the Ramah Camps sponsored by the United Synagogue, have experimented successfully with Hebrew speaking camps. See S. Shulzinger, "Hebrew Camping - Five Years of Massad", Jewish Education XVII, No. 3 (1946) p. 16-23.
40's and has attracted children from Boston and other communities throughout the country. Its successful integrated program of study, camping and Jewish living has stimulated similar experiments in other parts of the country. 108a/

The Chicago Board of Jewish Education initiated a unique camp program when it established Camp Avodah during the war to provide young people with the opportunity of working on the farm and also Jewish living. The Board of Jewish Education also pioneered in the establishment of Camp Sharon for training Hebrew teachers.

The Cincinnati Bureau of Jewish Education conducts Camp Maccabee for children of Cincinnati and surrounding communities.

The Cleveland Bureau of Jewish Education established Camp Galil in 1944 and its success is attested to by the increased registration from year to year and by the interest in the camp by the community leadership.

The Maine Committee on Jewish Education established Camp Loun and this camp, too, has been a successful experiment in Jewish study, camping and Jewish living.

Other community educational agencies contemplate the opening of camps. 109/


Many educational agencies have made available full or partial scholarships to the educational camps and have expressed satisfaction with the educational results achieved. 110/

The Jewish educational camp has significant potentialities for Jewish education.

"Jewish cultural camping," writes A. P. Schoolman, "can become an effective method of Jewish education that is indigenous to the American environment. It is in harmony with the educational psychology and the social milieu of the American Jewish child, it avoids conflict with the main currents of child life in America, and uses fully all the available time, energy and innate interests of the child." 111/

The central educational agencies are aware of its importance, have taken steps to interest community leadership in the establishment of camps, and look to Jewish camping as an important factor in the intensification of Jewish education and Jewish life in America.

110/ E.g. the agencies in Baltimore, Boston, Buffalo, Chicago, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Miami, Newark, New Haven, New York, Philadelphia have sent scholarship students to Massad, Ramah, Galil, Sharon, Yavneh, Amal, etc.

111/ Schoolman, "The Jewish Educational Summer Camp", p. 15.
B. ADULT EDUCATION

The central educational agencies engage in many activities designed to reach the adults, and to extend Jewish educational opportunities to adults. Budgetary allotments, however, for adult education are very limited.\textsuperscript{112} The activities in the area of adult education are formal as well as informal in character.

Colleges and Institutes of Jewish Studies represent the formal and systematic effort in adult Jewish education conducted by the central educational agencies.

The Chicago College of Jewish Studies developed an elaborate systematic approach to adult Jewish education, and its work is unique among the institutions sponsored by central educational agencies.\textsuperscript{113} The initiative in adult Jewish education came from the Israel Friedlaender Classes\textsuperscript{114} of the Jewish Theological Seminary after which the Department of General Jewish Studies at Chicago was modelled.

\textsuperscript{112} Information Bulletins 16 and 17 (A. A. J. E. 1950)


\textsuperscript{114} Dr. Israel S. Chipkin was one of the leading founders and its educational advisor and guide for many years. He is now the Dean Emeritus of the Seminary College of Jewish Studies (formerly known as the Israel Friedlaender Classes).
The Department of General Studies of the College affords adults opportunities of systematic study in the fields of Judaism and Hebraica ranging all the way from elementary Hebrew to the study of philosophy and the Talmud. A more unique contribution to adult Jewish education has been the persistent policy of the College, introduced by Dr. Leo L. Honor, of working out a co-operative relationship with adult organisations in the development of joint courses of study on a sustained basis. Sustained study on a high academic level in contrast to the short term popular courses given by Centers and Synagogues has been a significant contribution to adult Jewish education. In Chicago, the Board of Jewish Education, through its College of Jewish Studies, took a leading role in making this a tradition in the community.

To a limited degree, Boston and Baltimore Hebrew Teachers Colleges, too, have developed departments of general Jewish studies. In Philadelphia, the Council on 114a/ E.g. Hadassah, National Council of Jewish Women, the Conference of Women's Organizations, the Zionist Organization and others.

When Dr. Honor served as the Acting Dean of Gratz College (1944), he initiated a series of courses in cooperation with several organizations. The project was not continued after a year or two.
Jewish education has worked very closely with Gratz College in the development of the Extension Department which at present offers beginners, intermediate, and advanced Hebrew courses. In the main, the objective of these three institutions is to train Hebrew teachers.

Many central educational agencies report that they conduct Institutes of Jewish Studies whether under their own auspices or jointly with congregations, adult organizations, Y's and Centers. Unfortunately, no criteria have been set up for an Institute of Jewish Studies in terms of length of time, nature of the course of study, personnel and sustained effort. Be that as it may, the central educational agencies conduct courses in Bible, History, Hebrew, Holidays and Customs, Religion, Literature, Israel and others. In some communities, the courses are conducted on a sustained basis, but in the main, the courses are of short duration organized from year to year for three to ten week periods.

In informal Jewish education for adults, the central educational agencies engage in many activities. In many communities this work is done in conjunction and cooperation with Y's, Centers and Synagogues. Some of these activities are

115/ E.g. Atlanta, Buffalo, Camden, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Des Moines, Detroit, Louisville, Miami, New Haven, Omaha, Portland, Rochester, Schenectady, Southern Illinois, St. Paul, Syracuse.


117/ E.g. Buffalo, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Miami.

118/ E.g. Buffalo, Cincinnati, Miami, Rochester, St. Paul,
the following: Organizing and conducting study groups and lectures; active participation in Jewish Book and Music Months; conducting programs for Yiddish Culture Councils; sponsoring art groups; assisting organizations in programming and providing them with educational materials (films, recordings, projectors) to enable them to conduct their programs more effectively.

Of particular significance are the Jewish libraries maintained by the educational agency. While the agency is primarily concerned with providing the teachers of the community with necessary reference and pedagogic materials, the library in many communities has gradually developed into a community Jewish library containing Jewish books of general interest to adults. The Jewish library is used extensively and serves as an important agency of educational influence. To stimulate interest and focus attention on Jewish books, a number of central educational agencies have opened Book and Gift shops, thereby rendering an invaluable educational service.


119/ E.g. Cincinnati, Rochester.

120/ The Cincinnati Bureau sponsors Choral and Dramatics Groups. The Cleveland Bureau and the Philadelphia Council and the Chicago Board of Jewish Education sponsor community Choruses.

121/ The director in small and middle-sized communities report tremendous requests and demands for service to adult organizations. Atlanta, Buffalo, Cleveland, Cincinnati,
In the organisation and stimulation of P.T.A's the central educational agencies have taken an active role from the time Benderly made an attempt to organize parents associations in New York to the present. The Jewish Education Committee of New York has, for many years, sponsored a city-wide united parents association, has published special materials in this field and has employed personnel to direct the work on a year-round basis. The Jewish Education Association of Essex County and the Los Angeles Bureau of Jewish Education publish special bulletins for parents.122/

An interesting and valuable instrument for reaching parents has been the Holiday Institutes for parents. The Bureaus of Jewish Education of Buffalo have conducted Hanukkah, Passover and Sabbath Institutes successfully for several years. At these institutes the parents are given an opportunity to learn the story and meaning, the songs, the traditions, the customs and even the special food recipes appropriate for the holidays. Participation by the parents in the preparation and execution of the programs is encouraged, and the central educational agency makes available specially prepared guides and bulletins to help make


122/ The Jewish Child and Home and School respectively.
the institutes an effective medium for parent education. The Women's League of the United Synagogue has recognized the potential of these institutes for parents and has taken steps to publish materials and to conduct them in many communities throughout the country.

Admittedly, adult Jewish education in America is largely in a disorganized state at present. It is not adequately financed and not conducted systematically. Adult education at present is largely peripheral to the main activities of the central educational agencies. Nevertheless, despite the lack of adequate financing and difficulties inherent in Jewish communal organizations, the central educational agencies are lending every effort in support of more adequate education for adults, have made attempts to coordinate the work and to set up standards for adult studies on a sustained basis.

122a/ Many institutions and organizations are engaged in adult education: Bnai Brith, Hadassah, Zionist Organization (of the various types), Synagogues, Y's and Centers, and others. The United Synagogue of America has established an Institute of Adult Jewish Studies, has prepared materials for adult study, and has taken steps to encourage certification of those who pursue study in Judaism.

123/ Communal or Congregational adult Jewish education is one of the problems in many communities. Several directors of agencies report that it is difficult to set up a city-wide Institute of Jewish Studies because congregations set up their own and refuse to coordinate their programs. In Miami, the Bureau and several congregations and the Y established a joint institute. On Miami Beach this could not be accomplished. Each congregation conducted its own.

125a/ In the winter of 1948 the Jerusalem Examination was given in about a half dozen communities. Sponsored by the World Union for Jewish Education and the Hebrew University, the Jerusalem Examination is aimed at encouraging adults to
V. FINANCIAL AID TO SCHOOLS

The central educational agencies serve as the educational and fiscal agents of the central community organizations. As fiscal agents it is their responsibility to determine which of the local schools or systems of schools shall receive financial aid, and how much it shall be and for what purpose the money shall be used. In some respects, the central educational agencies are the "watch dogs" of the community in regard to expenditures for Jewish education, and in some, the pleaders to the central fund in behalf of the schools.

To receive the educational services of the central educational agency as well as to be entitled to financial assistance, the schools or systems are required to become affiliated with the central educational agency.

When a central agency is organized, all the schools in the community are generally invited to become affiliated, or even before the agency is established, the schools may have decided to participate in its work. The only requirement usually made is that the curriculum of the school shall be rooted in the historic, cultural and religious traditions of the Jewish people.

More definitive requirements for affiliation are evolved.
as the agency develops. These requirements include standards such as building facilities and administration, curriculum, size of school, qualifications of teachers, record keeping and reporting. Upon the adoption of these requirements, they become the minimum requirements for school affiliation and for eligibility to receive financial assistance. In those communities where schools or systems of schools received funds from the community before the establishment of the educational agency, it may take a much longer period to adopt the minimum requirements than in communities which did not make funds available to schools until the educational agency was organized. In the latter case, requirements may be set and more rigidly followed, before funds are allocated. Thus while many agencies have adopted minimum requirements, they are likely to be kept, strictly or loosely, in accordance with the traditions, experiences and prevailing conditions in the community.

What role does the central educational agency play in processing and determining requests for subventions? A recent study made by the American Association for Jewish Education reveals that in most communities budgets and requests for subventions are submitted first to the central agency for study and analysis and for recommendation to the Welfare Fund. For example, in Baltimore, the congregational

124/Information Bulletin No. 18, Appendices A to G.
requests submitted to the Board of Jewish Education are acted upon after a budget hearing between the congregational schools and the finance committee of the Board of Jewish Education. In Chicago, schools submit their request in writing to the Board of Jewish Education. The supervisor of the particular school makes his recommendations on the basis of his intimate knowledge of the needs of the school. His recommendations are reviewed by the person or committee responsible for drawing up the budget of the school. The subsidy for the school is determined by the Budget Committee of the Board of Jewish Education. The amount is included in the budget of the Board which is then submitted for final action to the Welfare Fund of Chicago.

In Los Angeles, budget requests are submitted to the Budget Allocations Committee of the Bureau of Jewish Education. On the basis of the hearings, the Budget Committee determines the tentative sum needed for school subventions. This sum is incorporated into the Bureau budget and submitted to the Allocations Committee of the Jewish Community Council. The latter committee passes on the total budget of the Bureau. Thereafter, the Bureau decides how much shall go for the operation of the Bureau and how much for subventions. The final subventions to schools are determined on the basis of the average enrollment and attendance during the entire school year. 125/

125/ Ibid.
In several communities, the Welfare Fund has year-round standing Committees on Education which include representatives of the Welfare Fund and the educational agency. These committees study the requests for allocations and make their recommendations to a special educational budget committee which in turn makes final recommendations to the Board of Directors of the Welfare Fund, or the Education Committee makes its recommendations directly to the Welfare Fund. The director of the educational agency is usually consulted in the budgetary deliberations.

What is the extent to which agencies are responsible for financing schools under their supervision?

The extent and basis of financial aid varies from community to community, ranging from complete maintenance to provision for scholarships only.

A study made of the budgeting of 37 central educational agencies for the school year 1948-49, indicates that out of an aggregate budget of $3,189,179, a sum of $1,473,556 or 46.1% was used as part to schools; $286,690 or 9% for youth, adult education and teacher training, and $935,963 or 30.8% for direction and supervision, including office expenses.

126/ Camden, Philadelphia, St. Louis.

127/ Philadelphia.

128/ Camden.

129/ In Philadelphia, the director of the Council on Jewish Education is the consultant to the Educational Budget Committee of the Allied Jewish Appeal.

130/ Information Bulletin No. 16, "Budgeting and Financing of
In communities where schools are part of one school system (United or Associated Hebrew Schools), all of them are maintained out of one budget. The agencies whose beginnings revolved around a Talmud Torah, but which have expanded their scope to include other types of schools or systems of schools, continue to give substantial support to the Talmud Torahs.

Complete maintenance of some schools and subsidies to others is the case in some communities.

In some communities the subvention is computed on the basis of the difference between the budget of the school and the anticipated income from tuition fees, donations, membership dues and other sources. The subventions are granted to schools conducted by the agencies and to schools affiliated with the agencies. These include nurseries, kindergartens, elementary schools, high schools, Release Time classes and Colleges.

In a number of communities, the agencies stipulate

130/ (cont'd.) of Central Agencies for Jewish Education, 1948" (AAJE, 1949); also U. Z. Engelman, "Jewish Education in Facts and Figures," op. cit, p. 46.

131/ Detroit, Indianapolis, Milwaukee, Minneapolis, Portland, Toledo. The study referred to in note 130/, shows that the total budget of United or Associated Schools Agencies was $491,192 for 1949-49. Of this sum, $293,115 were spent on subventions to their schools and the remainder, $198,072 for operating expenses.

132/ Akron, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Schenectady, St. Paul, Syracuse. In Philadelphia, out of a total allocation of $261,000 to Jewish education for 1950-51, the United Hebrew Schools and Yeshivas received $115,000 (more than 40% of the total allocation).

133/ E.g. Baltimore, Chicago (Central Hebrew High School,
specific uses to which the subsidies shall be put. For example, the purpose of the subventions given by the Los Angeles Bureau is to engage qualified teachers to assure the maintenance of high standards. The Board of Jewish Education subsidizes schools on the basis of 70% of teachers' salaries, the arts program up to 50% of instructors' salaries up to a maximum of $300 per year; 50% of cost of administration and supervision; and makes grants to kindergartens and high school classes by special agreement. 135/

Tuition fee scholarships up to a maximum of $50 are provided by the Bureau of Miami for children of parents unaffiliated with congregations who are unable to pay the standard tuition fee rate of $50 per annum. The Bureau also provides transportation for children living at a distance from schools. The Bureau pays the difference between the cost of transportation and the amount underwritten by the schools which the children attend.

133/ (cont'd.) College of Jewish Studies).
134/ Information Bulletin No. 18, p. 26-33
The Jewish Education Association of Essex County specifies that subsidies to schools will be made available for either one or all of the following purposes: full or semi-scholarships for indigents, incentive grants (improvement of physical surroundings, special classes), experimentation or model classes.\textsuperscript{136/}

The Jewish Education Council of New York makes available funds for the following: scholarship grants for deserving pupils who cannot pay tuition fees, incentive grants for the introduction and development of specific activities, such as experimenting with new procedures, introduction of the arts (e.g. up to a maximum of $250 is made available if a music instructor is engaged by a school), improvement of physical appearance of school buildings,\textsuperscript{137/} special experiments such as the Beth Hayesled and the educational experiments with delinquent children at Hawthorne and Cedar Knolls.\textsuperscript{138/}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{136/}Ibid. Appendix C., p. 43.
\end{flushleft}

137/ The J.E.A. of N.Y. (merged with J.E.C. in 1941) maintained a Repair Fund and gave assistance to schools to enable them to meet the building, safety and sanitary requirements for scholarship grants from the Association. Schools also called upon the Association for aid in planning and financing building construction, and for loans out of a revolving fund on first and second mortgages at a low rate of interest. See Chipkin, "The Jewish Education Association of New York", \textit{op. cit.}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{138/} A. M. Dushkin, \textit{The Jewish Education Committee of New York}; To the knowledge of the writer, in addition to the Jewish Education Committee which has done pioneering work in providing Jewish education in these institutions, the Miami Bureau of Jewish Education has carried on a successful experiment at the National Children's Cardiac Home, and the Hebrew Sunday School Society of Phila., an affiliate of the Council on Jewish Education, has made provision for religious education for Jewish children in the Home for the Blind, the Home of the Deaf, and in one or two reformatory.
As already noted, in some communities funds have been available for camp scholarships and for the operation of camps. 139/

In addition to providing partial or complete financial aid, the agencies attempt to assist schools in the collection of tuition fees. 140/Collection of fees has been centralized in Chicago, Cincinnati, Detroit, Philadelphia. In Baltimore, records of all payments are kept at the Board of Jewish Education office, although the schools collect them on their own either by mail or through a home canvasser. In New York, the Board of Jewish Education and the Jewish Education Association during the many years of their existence extended assistance to schools in organizing their tuition fee collections.

139/ E.g. Boston, Buffalo, Chicago, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Miami, New Haven, New York.

140/ The Board of Jewish Education of New York did pioneering work in systematizing tuition fee collection. It organized a tuition fee department for a few of the larger Talmud Torahs. The Chicago Board of Jewish Education also established a department for tuition fee collection. The departments were not only successful in raising tuition fees, but helped eliminate unsavory practices of collecting fees and also set up standards for tuition fee rates.
What has financial assistance done for the schools?

1. Financial assistance has helped give the schools stability. By relieving schools, partially or completely, of their financial worries, it has become possible for schools to concentrate their efforts on educational work. The present situation of the Talmud Torahs in New York is precarious since no communal funds are set aside for their support. For close to thirty years, the larger Talmud Torahs were dependent on funds allocated by Federation. When the funds were not allocated any more and the Talmud Torahs had to look to their own resources, they found themselves in difficult straits. Allowing themselves to become almost entirely dependent on community funds is not a practice to be condoned, nevertheless, it seems to be a natural development, and when the funds are not made available, the Talmud Torahs are in danger of closing their doors. The communal Talmud Torahs in many other communities would be in such a position if the community did not allocate funds for their support.

It is undoubtedly true that financial aid granted to the Yiddish Schools has given them stability. In Philadelphia, the Yiddish Schools now receiving approximately 50% of their budgets from the community, would find it extremely difficult to function without community funds. This is true of other communities as well. The Yiddish
schools throughout the country have benefitted substantially by being incorporated into the community system of Jewish education.

2. The granting of financial assistance to schools has helped maintain and raise the standards of Jewish education. The employment of better teachers, improvement in housing facilities, the introduction of a more standardized curriculum, better texts and extra-curricular activities, improvement of the teacher's status, and better prepared pupils— all these may be ascribed in part, if not in full, to the financial aid given by the community.

Granted that more funds have been made available to Jewish education in the last ten years, they are still inadequate. Larger funds will be required to effectuate better standards and achievements. While it is true that minimum requirements have to be met in order for schools to be entitled to financial aid, there is still much to be done in the enforcement of these requirements. Increased funds for Jewish education would probably alleviate the situation.

141/ Information Bulletin No. 16
VI. INFORMATION AND INTERPRETATION

The gathering of information and a year-round program of interpretation are characteristic of all central educational agencies. The major objectives of this program are greater public awareness of the value of Jewish education and assistance in the development of high standards in Jewish education.

Fact gathering on the size of the Jewish child population, on the number, size, distribution and types of Jewish schools, their enrollment and finances, has been an important activity of the agencies.\(^{142}\) Community surveys and studies of Jewish education have been undertaken in many communities.\(^{143}\)

Record forms and a methodical approach to educational problems have been elaborated especially by the agencies in the larger communities.

\(^{142}\) Special departments for gathering statistics were established by the J.E.A. and now by the J.E.C. of N.Y., the Chicago Board of Jewish Education, the Baltimore Board of Jewish Education, the Los Angeles Bureau of Jewish Education.

\(^{143}\) The first comprehensive survey was made in 1909 in N.Y. by M. M. Kaplan and B. Cronson. Dr. J. H. Greenstone of Phila. made surveys of Baltimore and Pittsburgh in 1907 and 1908, but they were limited in scope. In 1912, under the aegis of the Phila. Mahillah, Dr. Greenstone made a more comprehensive study of Jewish education in Phila. Dr. Benderly made a comprehensive study of Jewish school financing in N.Y. in 1911. This was the first study of its kind. Almost all the studies and surveys have been conducted by the professional leaders of the central agencies for Jewish education: I. B. Berken, I. S. Chipkin, A. M. Dushkin, U. Z. Engelman, L. L. Honor, L. Hurwich, B. Rosen. An increasing number of surveys have been made since the establishment of the A.A.J.E. in 1939 (more than 25 surveys in the last dozen years).
To interpret the value of Jewish education, the agencies use a variety of media, including the following: dissemination of information by the publication of periodic and annual reports, publicity and special supplements on Jewish education in the local Anglo-Jewish press; distribution of circulars and bulletins through the mail; radio programs, addresses at meetings of Jewish organizations; neighborhood meetings and rallies, sermons by rabbis.

Jewish Education Week and Month sponsored nationally by the A.A.J.E. and taking place annually at the beginning of the school year in September, serves in most communities as the focal point of the year's propaganda activities. It is during this period that an intensive effort is made to use the media mentioned above on an intensive scale.

Annual meetings and dinners, community-wide holiday celebrations and graduations, public hearings before the Welford Fund, the maintenance of a speakers' bureau; the publication of enrollment bulletins — all of these serve as occasions and means for heightening public interest in Jewish education.
VII. COORDINATION AND COOPERATION

Efforts to bring about the amalgamation of small units for greater efficiency and for the elimination of unnecessary duplication of facilities, as well as, of program, have been made by central educational agencies. As a matter of fact, the central idea and basis for the establishment of Bureaus of Jewish Education in smaller communities was that of uniting educational efforts in the community for an improved program in cooperation with all educational institutions. 144/

Assisting neighborhoods and regions to coordinate their programs and organizing ideological groups for the improvement of their work, 145/ as well as taking the initiative in stimulating joint efforts of groups in establishment of new schools in new neighborhoods, 146/ are significant activities of the central educational agencies.

144/ E.g. Akron, Columbus, Peoria, Schenectady, St. Paul, Syracuse, 145/ In Cleveland, efforts were made to combine small units. The direction of the Talmud Torahs and the Council of Religious Schools has been united under one head and coordination of programs worked out. See A. Eisenberg, "Jewish Education in Cleveland 1945", op. cit., p. 55. In Phila., a merger was brought about in 1945 between the Yeshivos and the Associated Talmud Torahs (now known as the United Hebrew Schools and Yeshivos). In 1950, Yeshivah Chel Moshe, an independent institution for many years, was merged with the United Hebrew Schools and Yeshivos.

The plan of the Jewish Education Ass'n, of Essex County calls for the merger of smaller units into larger units and the establishment of seven school districts with better housing facilities and a more effective educational program. See Jewish Education in Essex County, (Part III of Survey Committee on Education, Group Work, and Population, 1946).

In St. Louis, the Board of Jewish Education has made efforts to consolidate schools in accordance with the recommendations made by L.L. Honor, in 1939 and 1945. See L.L. Honor, Preliminary Report on Associated Hebrew Schools, St. Louis, Mo. (1939); Associated Hebrew Schools of St. Louis, Mo. (1943)
Cooperation and joint activities with Y's and Centers in elementary, youth and adult education may be cited as examples of efforts at coordination and cooperation.

A Conference on Jewish Education and Jewish Center Work was convened in November 1946. Sixty-three persons from twenty-three cities attended, including Jewish Center executives, staff members of the J. W. B. and the A.A.J.E., and Bureau of Jewish Education executives.

The main purpose of the Conference was to canvass the actual experiences in cooperation and integration between the two fields in youth and adult education, in individual

145/ (cont'd.) (Supplementary Statement to Survey Report of 1939)

In New York, Jewish education has been organized on regional basis. Thus there are Councils of Jewish Education for Brooklyn, Queens, Bronx and Manhattan. The Councils are concerned with local problems, and attempt to assist in enrollment campaigns, inter-school affairs, teacher conferences, etc. Recently, the J.E.C. appointed a director for the Talmud Torahs of New York, not only to assist them in their fund raising campaigns, but to help them work out a unified program.

In 1950, the Council on Jewish Education of Phila. took steps to organize an education committee of the Orthodox Congregational Schools in the attempt to improve their work. In several communities, the Mittershuln of the Yiddish groups have been united successfully.

Los Angeles, Detroit, Chicago; In Phila. several meetings have been held with representatives of the Workmen Circle Schools and the Folkshuln to explore the possibility of conducting a joint Yiddish High School.

146/ In 1950, The United Hebrew Schools of Detroit set in motion a plan to open schools in new neighborhoods. In Miami, the B.J.E. organized study groups, provided transportation and brought together five different organizations in one area to establish a united school. The Bureau provided part of the funds needed for the operation of the school, and conducted the school for two years until the local groups were in a position to assume full responsibility for the school. See A.P. Jannes, Bureau of Jewish Education of Miami, (Fourth and Fifth Annual Reports, 1947-48,
institutions as well as joint activities on a community level, and to take further steps toward common effort. The stories told at the Conference by Jewish educators and group workers bore witness to the fact that many efforts had been made to plan together and that further joint planning and cooperation was imperative.

The result of the Conference was a "Proposed Statement on Common Objectives and Areas of Cooperation in the Fields of Jewish Education and Jewish Center Work". The statement stresses the need for a "maximum of continuous coordination and cooperation in the local community and on a national level". Among the areas of cooperation are included the following: youth and adult education, community-wide celebrations, such as Jewish Education Month, Book and Music Months, etc.; joint community studies; home and country camping; preparation of materials and training leadership.

---

146/ 1948-49) In Philadelphia, the Council on Jewish Education has taken cognizance of newly developed neighborhoods and has cooperated with affiliated agencies in determining the need for schools and their establishment. The Self-Study of Jewish Education in Philadelphia has taken into consideration the problem of housing and schooling of children in new neighborhoods.

The work of regional agencies (Illinois, Maine, Western Region of the A.A.J.E.) has been significant. An elaborate program was projected and executed for bringing Jewish education to small rural communities. See Z. Slesinger, Survey of Jewish Education in Southern Illinois (1945); also S. J. Ginsburgh, "Three Years in Rural Jewish Education", Jewish Education XVIII, No. 5, (1947) p. 27-31.
In December, 1947 and more recently in January, 1951, joint committee meetings of the A.A.J.E. and the J.W.B. were held to continue discussions on the implementation of the Proposed Statement of Common Objectives and Areas of Cooperation.

From the reports presented at the 1946 Conference and the information gathered by the writer, there is evidence of a desire on the part of educators and group workers to cooperate, and many cooperative programs have been undertaken.150/


150/ Rabbi Philip Goodman reported that in answer to a question relative to cooperation between Centers and Bureaus, thirty-one replies were received from Center executives. Only two indicated the existence of friction. Seven enjoyed no cooperation with local Bureaus. Twenty-two indicated the existence of cooperation. Fifteen reported excellent cooperation, three reported a fair degree of cooperation and four reported limited cooperation. The writer sent a questionnaire to the Bureau executives and received twenty replies. Only one reports no relationship. The others report a variety of cooperative efforts involving conducting Center schools jointly (Los Angeles, Syracuse, Schenectady), joint programming, community-wide activities in youth and adult education, forums, celebration of Book and Music Months, home camping, leadership training, etc. In several communities (Schenectady, and St. Paul) unique plans have been worked out whereby all the child's needs (educational, social, religious, recreational) are cared for by joint planning. In Miami, and Buffalo, elaborate plans were laid for joint activities and planning. Other communities have made considerable progress in cooperating
Other joint and cooperative activities conducted by
the central agencies are: inter-school affairs, rallies
and contests; Keren Ani projects and conferences; inter-school pageants; inter-school arts events such as inter-school choirs, inter-school music festivals, art exhibitions, dramatic events; radio programs; the publication of children's magazines; inter-school affairs in connection with annual community fund raising campaigns.

150/ (cont'd.) with the Y's and Centers (Akron, Atlanta, Cincinnati, Newark, New Haven, Los Angeles, Rochester, Syracuse and others). It is interesting to note that one of the first successful efforts to work out an integrated program was made at the Central Jewish Institute. See I. B. Berkson, Theories of Americanization, op. cit., Section on the Central Jewish Institute. The J. E. C. of New York was a participant in the experiment conducted at the Jacob R. Schiff Jewish Center in New York. See E. Pichney and B. Edidin, "Developing an Integrated Center Program", Jewish Education, XV, No. 3 (1944), p. 155-161.

151/ Chicago has conducted an outstanding program. Phila., too, has continued to sponsor this type of program. Cincinnati publishes a Keren Ani News Letter. Materials have been prepared by Chicago, New York, Cincinnati, Cleveland and others.

152/ Chicago, New York particularly.

153/ The Bureau of New York was the pioneer in this area, too. They published the Jewish Child in English and Seharith in Hebrew. Chicago published the Jewish Child for a number of years; the Phila. Associated Talmud Torahs published Jewish Current Events; the J.E.C. of N.Y. now publishes World Over which has a circulation of over 40,000 throughout the country.

154/ Cleveland, Cincinnati, Chicago, Phila., Miami, Buffalo and others have prepared educational materials designed to interpret the educational values of the Welfare Funds in terms of participation in community life.
Every educational group or institution is usually represented on the boards of the agencies. Participation in the work of the central educational agencies, gives the representatives an opportunity to exchange ideas and opinions, to understand each other's problems, to learn to respect each other's views, to plan for common action for the benefit of their own individual school or schools as well as to view and plan for Jewish education from the total community viewpoint, K'hal Yisroel.
In accordance with the underlying conception of the central educational agencies, namely that of "unity in diversity", inter-group relationships have been encouraged through inter-group conferences of teachers, principals and directors,\textsuperscript{155} inter-group conferences of lay leaders of education (school committees and local boards of education);\textsuperscript{156} annual meetings, the establishment of lay organizations;\textsuperscript{157} uniting the efforts of P.T.A's; joint activities in the fields of youth and adult education.

The very structure and organization of the central agencies make for cooperation and coordination.

\textsuperscript{155} Conferences on common elements in Jewish education were conducted by the agencies in New York, Los Angeles and Chicago and common elements agreed upon in principle in the three cities.

\textsuperscript{156} In Chicago, New York, Los Angeles, conferences of local lay boards of education have been conducted. See Dirin, "Los Angeles, Three Years After Dushkin", \textit{op. cit.}

\textsuperscript{157} In Los Angeles, the Israelites and the Los Angeles Association of Jewish Education are laymen's organizations whose main purpose is to broaden the base for understanding and cooperation in the Jewish educational endeavor. The Allied School Board of Chicago is an instrument for cooperative efforts. The organization of Landsmanschaften for Jewish education by the J.E.C. of N.Y. was not only for raising funds, but for the purpose of disseminating information about Jewish education. Ivriah, organized by the J.E.A. in the 20's continues in existence under the J.E.C's sponsorship.
PART B - ACHIEVEMENTS

How effective has been the work of the central educational agencies? In the light of the many activities, what can be pointed out as definite achievements?

In the attempt to assess the achievements of the central educational agencies, a number of problems are encountered:

1. The variety of central educational agencies creates a special problem. Some control large numbers of schools and influence a majority of children in the community program; others are set up for a comprehensive community program; some are an outgrowth of a single institution or group of institutions; some confine their activity to specific types of schooling. Achievements have to be evaluated in terms of the objectives and functions of particular agencies.

2. The age of the agency: Many agencies came into existence in the last fifteen years. Generally speaking, forty years in education is a short period of time, and even the older agencies cannot easily be evaluated, let alone the more recently established ones.

3. The origin of ideas is not easily traceable; and even if they could be traced to their beginnings, the subsequent influence in terms of emulation, imitation and adoption is difficult to prove.

4. The degree to which the curriculum, the teaching process and the educational program of the schools affiliated with the central educational agencies have been improved cannot
be stated with certainty. The paucity of controlled experiments, the lack of frequent reports and analyses of work done, add to the difficulty of evaluating achievements.

5. The degree to which the retention power of the schools has been increased due to the influence and activities of the central educational agencies, has not been determined. 158/

6. A study of enrollment in Jewish Schools throughout the country seems to indicate that in communities where there are central educational agencies, there is a larger enrollment in the schools. This is especially true in the middle-sized communities. Annual reports of agencies seem to reveal the same increased registration. 160/

However, it is not easy to determine what other factors play a role in stimulating increased enrollment in Jewish schools. The most that can be stated with certainty is

158/ The professional leaders of the agencies have emphasized in their writings the greater importance of retaining those children already enrolled in the schools and doing a more effective educational job with them, than worrying about those who are not in the schools. What effect this point of view has had on the educational process is hard to say.

159/ U.Z.Engelman, "Enrollment in Jewish Schools", Jewish Education, XIX, No. 5 (1947). In describing the registration in communities (50,000 to 150,000 Jews) Dr. Engelman points out that the proportion of enrollment to Jewish population is considerably higher than in the preceding group of smaller communities of 25,000 to 50,000. The larger ratio of enrollment is probably explained by the fact that it includes Jewish communities in which the principle of community organization has been operative for a relatively larger time than in the other communities..... The sustained influence of the central agencies for Jewish education in these communities seems to show up in a readier acceptance of Jewish education by larger
that the central educational agency through its propaganda for education may have been one of the factors resulting in the improved enrollment in the schools.

7. A serious accusation has been levelled against the central educational agency, namely, that they have been a force for diminishing the intensity of Hebraic education. 161/

It is true that in the last twenty-five years there have been changes in Jewish education and a marked decline in intensive Hebrew education. Is this related to the work of the central educational agencies, however? Was the decline due to the rise and influence of the agencies? Or did social and economic conditions in Jewish life bring about the changes and decline in Jewish education?

Undeniably, the changes may be ascribed to a variety of factors: the changes in the Jewish home; decreasing immigration and the Americanization of the Jews; shifting Jewish

169/ (cont'd.) segments of their Jewish population", p. 57.
The study contains 17 communities (5000 to 15,000 Jewish population) four of which have central educational agencies and 13 do not. Ratio of Jewish school enrollment to total Jewish population is 10% and 6.5% respectively. In the group of 15,000 to 25,000 there were 8 communities, three of which had agencies and five did not. The enrollment ratio was 7.4% to 5.2% respectively, p. 57.

160/ E.g. Los Angeles, Miami, New Haven, Omaha, Rochester, Schenectady.

161/ Professor E. Scharfstein has been the consistent protagonist of this point of view. See the following articles by him: "Al Hamashber," Hadar XVI, 16, (Feb. 19, 1938); "B'Hasdey Nidive"; Hadar XIII, No. 10 (Jan. 20, 1933); "Hamishim Sh'nit Himah Yehudi B'America", Ezer Hayovel, p. 155, "Hatziot Shel Amerikaniut U'Progressiviut Nahimah Ha-Avri B'Artsot Habrit", Sheviley Nahimah III (1941). The entire issue of Sheviley Nahimah XIII, No. 1 (1928) is devoted to the subject of "Hamutav W'Hamrubeh Nahimah Ha-Avri B'America."
population, the economic stabilization of American Jews, and others. Undeniably, the work of the central educational agencies have brought changes in Jewish education. It is more likely, however, that the central education agencies with their emphasis on higher standards, better organized curricula, supervision, qualified personnel, better texts, improved administrative practices, may have served as a counter force stemming the tide. Perhaps, without the restraining influence of the central educational agencies, the forces for diminution would have been more potent and more harmful to Jewish education. The interest of the central educational agencies in the establishment of Hebrew High Schools, in continuation, in teacher training, and in Jewish studies on a sustained basis, may have led to an intensification program in Jewish education.

However, it may be stated that there are too many

---

162/ A. M. Dushkin and L. L. Honor have been the defenders of the central educational agencies. See Sheviley HaHinah III, No. 1 (1938).
factors at play and the evidence on both sides of the argument is inconclusive.

Admittedly, the achievements of the central educational agencies cannot be measured accurately. No one can deny, however, that there have been achievements. The very initiation of certain activities is an accomplishment and achievement. For greater clarity, the achievements are divided into two general categories: I. Tangible Achievements, and, II. Intangible Achievements.

I. Tangible Achievements

In discussing the activities of the central educational agencies, the achievements have been indicated in connection with each one of them. This section, therefore, will serve as a general summary.

1. Increasing Support for Jewish Education

In all cities, with few exceptions, the Federations and Welfare Funds are making larger appropriations for Jewish education. Increasing financial support may not necessarily be related to the educational achievements of the central educational agencies. It is an achievement of a different kind, nevertheless. One of the reasons for the increasing financial support has been the persistent advocacy by the leadership of the central educational agencies of community responsibility for Jewish education and the importance of Jewish education to Jewish life in America. In so far as the communities have recognized their responsibilities
and see the need for a systematic approach to Jewish education, we may call it a significant achievement. The amount of money allocated to Jewish education has increased proportionately faster than the amount allocated to other local needs.\textsuperscript{163} This has some relation to the efforts and work of the central educational agencies.

\textsuperscript{163} U. Z. Engelman, "Jewish Education in Facts and Figures", p. 16: "In 1936, only 29 cities reported Federation allocations for Jewish schools. In 1950, over 60 communities reported such allocations. In 1956, 29 communities received $825,749 for Jewish education from community funds, and in 1949, 60 communities received $2,362,053 for Jewish education. For the 1948-49 school year, 37 communities with central educational agencies, reported a budget of $5,189,179. The major part of their income was received from community funds ($2,469,058 or 77.1%). See Table I in Information Bulletin #17, "Budgeting and Financing of Central Agencies for Jewish Education, 1948"," Part II, Financing (A.A.J.E. 1950)"
2. Setting Up of Standards

A. Buildings, Administration, Graduation, etc.

To a large degree, the central educational agencies have succeeded in improving the standards where the educational process takes place. By establishing and insisting upon standards of safety and sanitation and the aesthetic appearance of the Jewish school, the agencies have focused attention on the importance of the physical environment in the total educational process. Today, when congregations and other institutions are constructing magnificent school buildings, the problem of safety and sanitation may not be serious. However, when the first central educational agencies were established, the housing facilities were deplorable. By diligent work, the central agencies were able to eliminate these hazards in their affiliated schools and have continued to do so whenever necessary in every community.

The agencies have succeeded in introducing standard administrative practices in their affiliated schools, including permanent records, report cards, tuition fees standards, school calendars (fixed dates for opening and closing of schools). It may very well be that improved administrative practices may have something to do with the increased registration reported by community agencies.

Graduation from elementary school, regulations for Bar Mitzvah and Confirmation, are increasingly being accepted as traditions, as a result of the efforts of the
of the agencies, in most instances in cooperation with other interested agencies, groups and institutions in their communities.

B. Personnel and Teaching Training

The achievements in this area are three-fold: the establishment of standards for qualified American Jewish teachers, the improvement of the economic and educational status of the teachers and the steps taken in the direction of establishing a Jewish education profession. The impetus to the latter was given by the first two. No matter how inadequate it may still be after forty years, professionalization of Jewish teaching is, in a large measure, the result of the persistent efforts of the central educational agencies and their professional leaders.

The characteristics of a profession are adequate training, a group mind, and scientific study: Through the assistance given to teacher training institutions, in some instances, and through the establishment of teacher training institutions, in other cases, the agencies have focused attention on the need for American-trained Jewish teachers and have taken a significant role in providing for adequate training.

If there is a large number of American-trained Jewish teachers, much credit is due the central educational agencies. Even the attempt to put Sunday School teaching on a semi-professional basis may be credited to the efforts of the central educational agencies, particularly in the middle sized
and smaller communities.

It is true that full recognition has not been given to the Jewish teaching profession, but it must be admitted that by raising the educational requirements for employment in Jewish schools and by stressing the fact that the Jewish teacher is a member of a profession rather than a teacher in a single isolated institution, the central educational agencies have given added dignity and status to the Jewish teacher. A contribution of great significance will be made when further steps are taken in the direction of expanding the curriculum of teacher training with a view of integrating teaching with group work preparation.

By taking the leadership in the founding of the National Council of Jewish Education, the men influenced by Dr. Benderly, and the heads of the central educational agencies created a platform for Jewish education in America. By gathering data and information about all aspects of the Jewish educational process, by conducting numerous surveys and studies, by the dissemination of pertinent information, by the development of a body of literature (standard texts and materials used in Jewish schools), the central educational agencies have given added stimulation to professionalization, and have created the term 'Jewish Education' and have given it dignity. 164/

164/ The founding of the National Council on Jewish Education and the development of a body of literature (such as the texts and articles written by Berkson, Chipkin, Dinin, Dushkin, Camoran, Golub, Honor, Rosen; the Jewish Education Magazine, Shvilei Mahimuh, etc.) may be personal achievements of individuals. However, the writer feels that this
The "science of Jewish Education", if the phrase may be used, has had its beginnings due to the efforts of the central educational agencies.

C. Improvement in Curriculum and Method

To what extent has the work of the central educational agencies influenced the improvement of standards of curriculum and the methods of teaching? It is difficult to say with certainty. The Bureau of Jewish Education of New York had as one of its purposes the development of an educational program in consonance with Jewish and American tradition and life. To bring such a development about it emphasized educational research and experimentation. The text books and materials produced by the Bureau were landmarks in American Jewish education.165/ The efforts of the Bureau to standardize the curriculum of the Talmud Torahs met with success.166/

164/ (cont'd.) work cannot be divorced from the work of the central educational agencies. The literature relates itself to the activities of the central educational agencies in the broader sense and lays the foundation for an American Jewish education under community guidance and support.

165/ The B.J.E. had planned to publish a graded series of 28 text books, four books for each of the seven years of the elementary Jewish school curriculum. By 1918, sixteen had been published. See Dushkin, Jewish Education in New York City, op.-cit., p. 107. The Bureau did pioneering work in preparing materials for young children (Jewish Home Institute), recordings, cut-outs, games, stereoptican slides.

166/ Cf. Berkson, 1936 New York Study: "Although the reorientation of the course of study in the direction of the needs of American Jewish life is not adequate, nevertheless, during the last 25 years, there has been a definite improvement in the courses, methods of teaching and achievement in the typical Talmud Torah. The best Talmud Torahs today are well organized schools with little resemblance to the Heder-like institution of the same name which prevailed in
The men who directed the work of the agencies in the larger cities followed the pattern set in New York, proposed new approaches to Jewish education and its implementation through appropriate methods. Accordingly, under their guidance, curricular materials and texts were prepared, new methods adopted, new subjects and educational measurements introduced, and new experiments conducted.

Dr. I. B. Berkson has called the twenty-five year period from 1910 to 1935 the "creative period" in Jewish education. It is during these twenty-five years that the leading ideas

166/ (cont'd.) N.Y.C. 25 years ago." The central educational agency cannot be credited with all this, but undoubtedly it played a role in it.

166a/ The Chicago Board of Jewish Education was the first to establish a publication fund for the purpose of publishing new materials and texts. Phila., too, established a publications fund and produced valuable materials. Other cities prepared material, too (e.g. A. H. Friedland of Cleveland prepared Hebrew reading materials).

The J. E. C. of N.Y., the Chicago B.J.E., the Los Angeles B.J.E. have prepared curricula for the daily afternoon schools and Sunday schools.

167/ E.g. The Haimithamed Series produced by the Chicago Board of Jewish Education was widely used throughout the country; the laboratory method and the supervised study method were used in many schools. These were worked out in Chicago.

168/ Reference to the experimental work has been made above. An outstanding successful experiment is the Beth Hayeled, conducted first by the J.E.A. and now by the J.E.C., has been in existence for 15 years. This has been a successful attempt to integrate general education and Jewish education, traditional training and scientific training, the American scene and the Jewish scene.
were proposed and materials prepared to implement them.

Music, art craft, dramatics, are accepted as an integral part of the curriculum in most Jewish schools. The central agencies took the lead in introducing them and have continued to prepare appropriate materials and to provide services to make them possible.

Intelligent participation in Jewish community life through the Keren Amd program in many Jewish schools in the country is a direct achievement of the central educational agencies' activities.

5. Achievements in New Areas

Distinct achievements may be pointed out in neglected areas of educational endeavor, i.e. in educational work not usually undertaken by other agencies or institutions in the community. The initiation of these activities, trail blazing, so to speak, may be considered an achievement. To educate girls;[169/ to provide for continuation of education beyond the elementary level, to reach the unschooled children and adolescent youth, to service youth clubs, to extend education to adults — all of which was in keeping with the outlook of the central educational agencies that education was a life long

[169/ At the beginning of the 20th century, the tradition of women teachers in Jewish schools was unknown. Few girls attended Jewish schools. Benderly established experimental schools for girls and prepared girls for the Teachers Institute. The importance of a Jewish education was stressed. The statistics for 1950 indicate that girls formed 43.5% and boys 56.5% of Jewish children in the weekday afternoon and Sunday schools. The Sunday Schools had a larger proportion of girls 54.2%; in the weekday afternoon school, their proportion was 29.3%. The Yiddish Schools have the largest proportion of girls in their schools, about 60%. See Engelman,
process which includes both sexes of all ages — the central agencies succeeded in establishing Hebrew High Schools, High Schools of Jewish Studies, adult institutes, and have rendered a variety of services to adult organizations in order to improve the educational character of their programs. In this work, cooperation with other agencies, such as the Y's and Centers, has been the practice wherever possible.

In the area of utilizing the summer months for educational purposes, the central agencies, or the educators associated with them, made a significant contribution. They have demonstrated that the summer months are not any more a liability, but an important potential asset for formal studies and Jewish living.

169/ (cont'd.) "Jewish Education in Facts and Figures", op. cit. p. 33. To what extent the central educational agencies were influential in bringing about the trend, no one can say. Suffice it to say that all along the central educational agencies laid continuous stress on the need for education for the Jewish girl and through the teacher training institutions prepared women teachers to take their place alongside men teachers.
II. INTANGIBLE ACHIEVEMENTS

1. Focusing Attention Upon Jewish Education As a Community Responsibility

If the community has, to some degree, recognized the principle of community responsibility for Jewish education, it is largely due to the relentless advocacy of this principle by the central educational agencies and their lay and professional leaders. It has already been pointed out that a manifestation of this recognition is the increasing number of agencies established in the last fifteen years and the larger funds allocated to Jewish education by the Federations and Welfare Funds.

The struggle for full recognition is not yet finally won, nor are the funds adequate. There is still the prevailing concept of providing funds for the education of the poor rather than that of a program of Jewish education under the guidance of the community for the enrichment of Jewish life in America. The most that can be said at this time is that the lay and professional community leadership have taken serious cognizance of Jewish education and are more

169a/ Cf. A. M. Dushkin, "The Role of the Professional Worker in Jewish Education", Jewish Education V, No. 1 (1933) p. 8: "Perhaps the most important contribution of the educational profession to American Jewish education has been the insistence upon an integrated community approach. Important as have been the achievements in attracting personnel, in the better training of teachers, in the writing of new text books and the introduction of new methods, in the founding of new institutions and the initiation of new educational activities, even more important has been the creation of school systems supported by the community....."
sympathetic to the role it should play in the future of the Jewish community.

Product of organic community thinking, the central educational agency is the first agency of its kind created by the Jews of America to deal with the problems of Jewish education in a comprehensive, non-partisan way. During its forty years of existence, it has made it possible for diverse elements to sit around a table together, to cooperate, to plan jointly, to exchange ideas and to coordinate their efforts in Jewish education. It is an attempt to put into practice the idea of Klal Yisroel in the midst of strong trends and tendencies in the direction of fragmentation and denomination. As a non-partisan agency, it is attempting to create, a unity, a concensus within the diversity of Jewish life.
8. Optimism, Faith and Vision

Taking the lead and inspiration from Dr. Benderley, the men heading the central educational agencies have built their work with the utmost faith in the future of American Jewish education. \(^{170/}\) They have set the pattern for the central educational agencies to follow.

In accordance with this optimistic outlook, emphasis has been laid on modernizing Jewish education and building it in consonance with conditions in America. \(^{171/}\)

Dissatisfaction with the present status of Jewish education and emphasizing that complacency is dangerous to Jewish education are characteristic of the alert central educational agency. Setting the pace and tempo for Jewish education, always in the forefront of developing new ideas,

---

170/Cf. Benderley's note of optimism about the future of American Jewish education. "There is a feeling among Jews that all is not well with our Jewish life in this country. We are losing our children. Some of our less merciful critics diagnose our case as being "sick unto death" prognosticating a speedy and fatal end. I am not of this opinion. American Jewry is not sick. . . . I fail to see disease in American Jewry. I would put it differently. The growth of American Jewish life has not been in proper proportion. Hence, American Jewry lacks that beauty which comes from harmonious development. . . . Compare the high standards of living in the Jewish home, materially speaking, with the paucity of Jewish life and ideas in the home. Nor are the proportions better in education. In secular education, the Jew has made great progress. . . . but how vast is their ignorance of the language, literature, history and ideals of the Jewish people. . . ." Benderley goes on to say this is no reason to feel that the situation cannot be rectified and a system of Jewish education worked out to raise the cultural level of American Jews to the material level and bring about harmonious development. See"Summary of Proceedings, Fourth Annual Conference of the National Council for Jewish Education", Jewish Education, I, No. 3, (1929), p. 192.
stimulating all elements to do more effective work, pro-
viding guidance and direction whenever possible, are
manifestations of a determined faith and confidence of the
possibilities of Jewish education in terms of American life.

3. Systematizing Jewish Education

The voluntary conditions in Jewish education make a
system similar to the public school system virtually impos-
sible. The agencies have attempted and to some degree
succeeded in bringing together a variety of schools and
agencies into a respectable educational system, and have
brought order into many phases of Jewish education. A
Jewish educational system is in the making and the central
educational agencies are largely responsible for it.

171/ Cf. Berkoen, 1936 New York Study, op.-cit., p. 32: "It
may be said that all the leading ideas now prevailing in
the United States designed to reconstruct the Jewish
educational work in line with American conceptions and
conditions — while keeping it true to the Hebraic
tradition — have emanated from the Board of Jewish Edu-
cation of New York.... the work of the Bureau opened a
new epoch in Jewish education in the United States.
As a matter of fact, it created the term 'Jewish Education!'"
4. Creating a Platform for Jewish Education

The agencies, through propaganda, interpretation, promotion, surveys and studies, have helped create an awareness of the problems and needs of Jewish education, the need to explore new ideas and the need to develop a system of education. In the effort to bring the problem of Jewish education into the limelight, the central educational agencies have become the "address and clearing house" for Jewish education in most of the communities; cultural and educational interests revolve around the agencies. Generally speaking, the agencies have been the testing ground for almost all new ideas in Jewish education, and have given others the courage to embark on new experiments in the field.
CONCLUSION ON ACHIEVEMENTS: UNSOLVED PROBLEMS

The achievements of the past have significance for the future. The continued existence of the central educational agencies gives rise to the hope that the many unsolved and vexing problems in Jewish education may be solved satisfactorily. A brief outline of these problems follow:

a. Reaching the unschooled and retention.

Jewish schools still reach a small proportion of the Jewish child population. It is estimated that at one time or another seventy to seventy-five per cent of Jewish children attend a Jewish school. However, most of them stay in a Jewish school two years or less. Reaching the unschooled and retaining those already enrolled is a constant challenge to Jewish education.

b. The Program: How can the Jewish school meet the problem of reduced hours given to Jewish education and yet maintain the quality and intensity of Jewish education? How can courses of study be worked out that will relate the Jewish school activity with the best in the democratic way of life, as manifested in the public school activities? How can formal and informal Jewish education be related and integrated? To achieve any or all of these, a great deal of experimentation will be required and there will be need
for new texts and materials to meet the needs, and new approaches to American Jewish education.

c. **The Home:** The home has little Jewishness today. Without the Jewish home, Jewish education cannot have its fullest meaning for the Jewish child. Ways must be sought to strengthen Judaism in the home and to make the home once more the environment for Jewish values, ideals and the tradition of Jewish learning. This is one of the most crucial problems facing the educational endeavor in America.

d. **Education for the pre-school child, the adolescent, and the adult is its beginnings.** Jewish education is far from the continuous process from early childhood to adulthood. It is virtually territory for all educational agencies and institutions, particularly the central educational agencies.

e. **Personnel:** The status of the teacher needs further improvement in the areas of licensing, salary scale and tenure. There is a crying need for trained teachers, educational directors, supervisors and executives. How to attract the youth to the Jewish education profession will remain a challenge to Jewish educators for many decades.

f. **Progress has been made in developing a community program and a systematic approach to Jewish education,** but the Central educational agencies still have great difficul-
ties in coordinating the various types of schools and obtaining their effective cooperation. Even in the better organized communities, there are institutions which prefer to remain outside the central school system, while those within it do not live in complete accord with each other. As we shall see in the next chapter, the problem of the ideological groups on a local and national level is one of the most serious problems confronting the central educational agency.

g. Community Responsibility: Despite the growing community interest in, and responsibility for, Jewish education, it is a far cry from a true awareness of the place of Jewish education in community life and the need for stronger organization, direction and coordination. As yet, financing of Jewish education is inadequate.

All these problems and their ramifications are communal in character for they have relevance for every educational group. To find a satisfactory solution, the cooperation of all educational agencies and institutions is imperative. The place and role of the central educational agency as the coordinating body and as the representative of the total community in the educational effort takes on added significance and importance.
CHAPTER III - STRUCTURE AND ORGANIZATION, FINANCES AND PROBLEMS OF THE CENTRAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES

PART I - STRUCTURE AND ORGANIZATION 1/

Central educational agencies are organized as a) representative boards, b) boards of representatives, c) membership associations.

a. Representative Boards

A representative board consists of a fairly small group of men and women who are selected and elected by the central educational agencies on the basis of their interest in Jewish education, and who reflect and represent a cross section of the various points of view prevailing in Jewish education and Jewish life. As far as possible leaders in the community are chosen, but they are not designated by organizations, institutions or ideological groupings. This type of board is the usual form of organizational setup in the larger cities. 2/

1/ This discussion is based on an examination of the constitutions and by-laws of twenty-three educational agencies, and twenty-five answers by directors of agencies to the questionnaire sent out by the writer.

2/ Boston, Chicago, Los Angeles and New York may be given as illustration. The Board of the Boston Bureau consists of 29 members selected for their interest in Jewish education. The Chicago Board of Jewish Education has a representative board reflecting all the educational interests. It also has associated with it the Allied School Board, which represents the interests of the congregational schools. It should be added that the Chicago Board now has a membership organization and perhaps now belongs in the membership association group.

The Los Angeles Bureau is the educational arm and committee of the Los Angeles Jewish Community Council, and its board of twenty-five, representing all views in the community, is appointed by the Community Council.

The Board of the Jewish Education Committee of New York is composed of 54 men and women representing a cross section of all groups in the community interested in Jewish education. The J.E.C. board is now undergoing revision.
The representative board makes for an effective working group: Business can be transacted expeditiously and efficiently. Interpretation of the agency's work may be more easily achieved with a small well-knit board. Leadership can be developed more readily. The representative board is more likely to act as a community board in matters dealing with all forms of Jewish education for children, youth and adults.

The representative type of board is in line with the trend in general education. During recent years the size of public school boards has been decreasing. Throughout the country there is a strong preference for boards consisting of seven members. 3/

The representative board of Jewish education is far from being small as compared to the public school board but it is analogous in the sense that it aims to include on its roster a cross section of public spirited citizens interested in the development of Jewish education.

However, the representative board has some weaknesses. Selection of membership has to be exceedingly careful to assure adequate and competent representation of all points of view. The nature of the central educational agency calls for constant and continuous interpretation of the needs of Jewish education to the community at large. While, a small representative board makes self education possible, it may fail to reach many individuals in the community. There is also the danger that such a board, which is not elected by representative organizations or institutions, may become self perpetuating, or may have tendencies in that direction. With proper safeguards, however, these shortcomings can be overcome.

b) Boards of Representatives

This type of board is composed of representatives selected by synagogues, institutions, the community-at-large, the Federation or Welfare fund. Rabbis of affiliated schools are usually members of this type of board, which often includes presidents of congregations, chairman of local school committees, representatives of ladies auxiliaries and Parent-teacher associations. The trend also seems to be to include representatives appointed by adult organizations interested in Jewish education. The board is usually large with a membership in excess of 50. Boards of representatives are the general rule with a majority of the central educational agencies.

Boards of representatives have several advantages: The agencies or institutions which select representatives to serve on the central educational agency may become more interested in the agency’s activities. Their representatives are likely to report to them important decisions and events of direct concern to them. Broadening the base for greater interest and participation in Jewish education is made possible by large boards of representatives. Representation by adult organizations gives the central educational agency added strength and status, and what is most important, gives the agency an opportunity to help the organizations in their understanding of Jewish life and in their programming.

Due to their size, however, boards of representatives are cumbersome and unwieldy. Attendance at meetings is irregular. Different members appear at different meetings, making continuity of planning, interpretation, and action difficult. Responsibility tends to become diffused. Representatives elected by schools, organisations, agencies tend to consider themselves spokesmen for those groups and their outlook may be sectarian. The community point of view in Jewish education may be thwarted. Conflict may arise among
the groups, especially at budget time. Each one may have an "axe to grind" for his own group. A large board organizes itself into many committees and too many committees take away many precious hours from the director's time. Since most of the agencies are "one-man" agencies, the director is hard pressed to take care of all his responsibilities.

c) Membership Association

Membership in the central educational agency is open to all individuals in the community who contribute a specified sum to the central educational agency or to the Federation or Welfare Fund, or to affiliated agencies. The total membership at an annual meeting elects a Board of Directors or Trustees to conduct the business of the agency during the course of the year. The usual size of this type of board is close to fifty. Few central educational agencies today are membership association agencies. This is probably due to the fact that the Welfare Funds would consider the effort to develop a large membership a duplication of fund raising efforts which might be injurious to its own campaign.

The membership association has all the advantages of the board of representatives with one additional source of strength: Those who make a financial contribution—no matter how small—may take a deeper interest in the activities of the agency. In time of crisis, a show of strength on the part of the members in contributing funds and in supporting the agency, can have tremendous influence on community thinking.

The membership association, too, has most of the weaknesses of the board of representatives type of agency, but it has two important additional difficulties: The agency may be constantly worried about raising funds and thus deflect from the educational work to be done. The director of the agency may be called upon to give a great deal of his time to increasing membership and follow-up of membership, taking him away from his educational responsibility. Secondly, a membership association may not include a representative cross section of the community. If it is an agency aiming to embrace all the educational elements in the community, the membership agency may fail to speak in behalf of the total educational effort.

How The Agencies Function

The term of office of the three types of boards is one to three years with overlapping terms to assure stability and continuous leadership. 5/

Most of the boards meet once monthly during the school year, September to June inclusive. Some meet quarterly or bi-monthly.

5/ In public education long terms rather than short terms of office are advocated. See Mort, p 285 f.

6/ Judging from the reports of the directors, at least one fourth of the meetings are given over to building an understanding of all the aspects of Jewish education.
Most of the agencies are housed in office buildings. Several have their own educational buildings (Chicago, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Miami, Minneapolis, Pittsburgh); several are housed in Jewish Centers and several have their headquarters in buildings owned by the Federations and Welfare Funds.

Generally speaking, the boards aim to perform three major functions: a) formulating and adopting educational policies in accordance with the needs and wishes of their constituents. b) Interpreting the Jewish educational needs to the community. c) Assisting the executive and his professional staff in the execution of the policies adopted.

In nearly all agencies board functions are divided among a number of committees. Problems of budgets, finances, allocations, curriculum, supervision, youth, extension and adult education, building maintenance and repairs are vested in standing committees, or in committees appointed as the need arises. Several agencies report Teacher Board of Review and Certification Committees. Other committees are responsible for publicity, admissions, public relations, publications, scholarships, prizes, group insurance for teachers, promotion and propaganda, tuition fees, membership, library, coordination, personnel 6/.

Functions are also reflected in the departmental setup of the larger agencies. The work of the Chicago Board of Jewish Education, for instance, is organized around several departments: Central Office Administration, Supervision, Home Visiting and Collection, Secondary Schools, Youth Education, Extension Education and Camps, Publications, College of Jewish Studies.

6/ The Los Angeles Bureau, for example, has eleven functioning committees: Audio-Visual Aids and Publications, Board of Review and Certification, Budget and Allocations, Center-School, Curriculum and Implementation, Finance and Office, Program, Planning and Scope, Public Relations and Registration, Yiddish Mittenhule, Youth and Adult Education.
Standing committees are generally in disrepute in public school education. There seems to be agreement that there should be no standing committees, although there is no objection to the appointment of special committees for specific purposes, which are to be discharged as soon as the project is completed. 7/ The main disadvantage of committee organization is that committees very often forget that they are advisory and undertake legislative and executive functions. 8/

In Jewish education, committee work is difficult since too many committees keep the director needlessly busy. Most agencies are understaffed and committee meetings without the proper professional leadership may become perfunctory and ineffective.

Yet the effectiveness of the agency in the community may depend largely on the broad participation of board members in the work of the various committees. In Jewish education, more than efficiency is needed. Interpretation, understanding, good will, appreciation of the task facing the Jewish community in the effort to educate its children, are important aspects of the central educational agency's work. The involvement of members in many activities may be cumbersome and tedious, but it may lead to a greater appreciation and understanding of the needs of Jewish education. Committee work is imperative, but care must be taken that it should not become routine and that it should not hinder the main task of the agency which is educational in character.

**Conclusion**

Undoubtedly the structure and organization of the central educational agencies need tightening up, further study, investigation and experimentation.

7/ Reed, p.100-101; Mort, p. 288

8/ See *Ibid* for a full discussion on the disadvantages of standing committees.
A way must be found whereby boards would be large enough to provide balanced judgment but small enough to be an effective working group, large enough to be representative of the cross section of the various outlooks and points of view in Jewish life and education and yet small enough to act efficiently and effectively on behalf of the total community. A cross between the representative board and the membership association would seem, to this writer, to be the most effective form of organization.
PART II - FINANCES

A. Source of Income

The fifteen year period (1936-1950) shows increasing participation of communities through the Federations and Welfare Funds in underwriting the cost of Jewish education. In 1936, twenty-nine cities reported allocations of $523,249 by the Federations and Welfare Funds for Jewish schools. In 1945, sixty cities reported a total allocation to Jewish education of $2,362,053. 10/

Of particular interest to this paper is the increasing allocation to central educational agencies by the Federation and Welfare Funds. 11/

---

9/ This section is based on the data gathered and analyzed by the Research Department of the American Association for Jewish Education under the guidance of Dr. Uriah Z. Engel. Highlights of the financing and budgeting of the central educational agencies are presented here. Full analysis will be found in the Information Bulletins Nos. 8, 14, 16, 17, published by the A.A.J.E. in 1946, 1947, 1949 and 1950 respectively. A brief summary may be found in the article by Dr. Engel, "Jewish Education in Facts and Figures", Jewish Education Register and Directory (1951) op.cit.

10/ See Table XIII, p. 50 in Engel's article, "Jewish Education in Facts and Figures".

11/ The Research Department of the A.A.J.E. has complete information on the budgets of 17 central educational agencies for the four year period (1945-48). The allocations from the Federations and Welfare Funds were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Allocation in Dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>$964,410.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>$930,647.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>$1,155,876.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>$1,505,617.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over the four year period the total budget of the 17 agencies increased more than half (56.1%). When the 56.1% increase, however, is deflated in terms of 1945 dollar value, the increase is much smaller (17.4%). Two illustrations of increases to agencies are given:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>1946</th>
<th>1947</th>
<th>1948</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miami Bureau</td>
<td>$11,329</td>
<td>$17,930</td>
<td>$30,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis Board of Education</td>
<td>$35,000.00</td>
<td>$39,768.77</td>
<td>$50,649.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The major source of the income of the central educational agencies today is the general community organization. In 1948-49, the combined income of 37 central educational agencies was $3,203,412.71 and the combined budget of the agencies was $3,199,179.42. The agencies received $2,469,038.57 or 77.1% from Federations and Welfare Funds.
TABLE I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE OF INCOME</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federation and Welfare Fund Allocations</td>
<td>$2,469,038.57</td>
<td>77.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition and Registration Fees</td>
<td>228,977.66</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Sources (Institutional Income)</td>
<td>505,396.48</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Combined Income                     | $3,203,412.57 | 100%|
| Combined Budget                      | $3,199,179.42 |

Income from tuition fees and other sources represented 22.9%. While the organized community is gradually assuming a larger share of its financial responsibility, the local groups and the parents were carrying less of a financial share in the conduct of central educational agencies. Jewish education cannot look to complete support by the community. The responsibility must be borne in proper proportion by the community, the parents, and the local group. Too little participation by local groups and parents may lead to dependence on the community entirely, to loss of interest in the development of Jewish education, and to serious results in times of crisis when community funds are not easily available.

12/ Table I in Information Bulletin 117

12a/ This includes income from appeals and donations, endowments, rentals, membership dues, books, supplies, scholarships and miscellaneous.
To avoid the development of such a situation, and to provide for educational work not presently provided for in the community allocations, greater responsibility and participation on the part of local groups and parents is imperative.

Further analysis of the income of the central educational agencies shows variation from community to community. In the A.A.J.E. study, the thirty seven agencies are arranged in three groupings: (a) 25 coordinating agencies with subventions to schools (b) 3 coordinating regional agencies and (c) 9 United and Associated Schools agencies. In accordance with this arrangement, the Federation and Welfare Fund allocations were 80.1%, 100% and 55.7% respectively. A further analysis shows additional variations from community to community: 11 agencies derived 100% of their income from Federations and Welfare Funds, 13/ 9 agencies 90% and over. 14/ 7 agencies 70 to 85%; 15/ 6 agencies 50 to 65%; 16/ 3 agencies less than 50%; 17/ 1 did not receive any funds from the community. Thus, thirty-three agencies received more than 50% of their income from the community.

The central educational agencies, in accordance with the rules and

13/ Camden, Los Angeles, Louisville, New Haven, Peoria, Rochester, Winnipeg, Toledo, East St. Louis, Newark, Maine.

14/ Atlanta, Boston, Buffalo, Cleveland, Des Moines, Miami, Milwaukee, Omaha, Philadelphia.

15/ Baltimore, Cincinnati, New York, San Francisco, Syracuse, Indianapolis, Portland.

16/ Chicago, Columbus, Detroit, Minneapolis, St. Paul, Schenectady.

17/ Akron, St. Louis, Pittsburgh.

18/ Dallas.
regulations of the Federations and Welfare Funds, are not permitted to conduct campaigns to raise funds. Several central educational agencies, however, have conducted appeals or campaigns for funds (Chicago, Dallas; Detroit, New York, San Francisco, St. Louis). 19/

The Jewish Education Committee of New York was permitted by the Federation to raise its own funds to maintain its program of guidance and supervision and coordination. The arrangement was discontinued when it was felt that separate campaigns by the central educational agency would be detrimental to the Federation campaigns. 20/

The Chicago Board of Jewish Education by special arrangement with the Chicago Jewish Charities and the Welfare Fund raises a substantial part of its budget by an annual campaign. 21/

The success of the New York and Chicago agencies to raise substantial funds primarily for purposes of supervision, guidance and central direction of Jewish education, would seem to indicate that Jewish education, on its own merits, still has great appeal to American Jews, and that it does not necessarily have

19/ Dallas raised its entire income (40,000) by a special campaign; Detroit (United Hebrew Schools) received $93,295 (50.2%) from the Welfare Fund. From Appeals and Donations, the agency raised $6,850 (4.3%), and the rest from tuition fees (40,000 or 25.4%) and from various other sources, $17,350 (11.1%). San Francisco raised $4800 (17.7%) from appeals and donations. St. Louis received $50,649 (42.4%) from the Welfare Fund and the rest from tuition fees $48,300 (26.2%) and from an appeal $29,250 (24.5%) and $1125 (6.8%) from transportation and rentals. It is to be noted that these agencies are associations of Talmud Torahs and Hebrew Schools and it is to be expected that their funds shall not be entirely derived from the community organizations.

20/ Before the establishment of the J.E.C., the Jewish Education Association raised funds annually. However, the J.E.A. was an independent agency, did not receive funds from the Federation, and hence was not obligated to abide by its regulations.

The J.E.C. budget (1948-49) was $608,629 of which $480,595 (78.9%) was received from the Federation, $54,774 (9%) from endowments and $73,500 (12.1%) from income and investments, subscriptions, sale of publications and educational materials, J.E.C. Theatre, etc.

21/ The Chicago Board of Jewish Education budget (1948-49) was $355,144 of which $193,000 (54.3%) was received from Welfare Fund (this included $30,000 from the Jewish Charities as per 1945 agreement), $16,158 (4.5%) from tuition and registration fees $35,555 (10%) from rentals and $110,000 (31.1%) from campaign pledges.
to be attached as a "rider" to the general campaign for overseas needs and local needs other than education.

B. Expenditures

The budget of the thirty-seven agencies for the year 1948–49 was $3,199,179.42. Of this sum, $1,473,358.29 (46.1%) was allocated to schools; $286,609.53 (9%) for youth and adult education and teacher training; $635,475.33 (20%) for direction and supervision; $346,387.70 (10.8%) for office expenses; and the remainder $451,348.57 (14.1%) for building operations, transportation, insurance, educational materials, community projects, and miscellaneous. (See TABLE II).
### TABLE II

**BUDGETS OF 37 CENTRAL COMMUNITY AGENCIES FOR JEWISH EDUCATION (1948-49)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budgetary Items</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>$346,387.70</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance, Retirement</td>
<td>44,157.73</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction, Supervision</td>
<td>639,475.33</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Material</td>
<td>76,280.96</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subventions for Schools</td>
<td>473,358.29</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth, adult, Teacher Training</td>
<td>288,609.53</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Projects</td>
<td>35,254.77</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, Luncheon</td>
<td>48,178.56</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Operation</td>
<td>199,551.94</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>47,924.61</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Budget of Agencies</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,192,179.42</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Broken down, however, in terms of three groupings (coordinating agencies, coordinating regional agencies and United and Associated Schools agencies) the budgeting was as follows:

---

22/ Table II is Table XIV in Engleman's article "Jewish Education, in Facts and Figures", op.cit. p 50.
### TABLE III

Analysis of Budgets of the Three Types of Central Agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Military Items</th>
<th>Group 1 25 Coordinating Agencies</th>
<th>Group 2 3 Regional Agencies</th>
<th>Group 3 9 United &amp; Assoc. Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Budget</td>
<td>$2,572,318.13</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>$125,662.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>302,312.64</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>9,631.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health, Retirement</td>
<td>37,318.85</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, Supervision</td>
<td>559,917.00</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>31,455.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Material</td>
<td>68,594.03</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1,090.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventories for Unarmed Schools</td>
<td>242,361.32</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventories for Milted Schools</td>
<td>870,189.88</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>73,693.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In., Adult Enr. Training</td>
<td>277,714.53</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>2,325.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency Projects</td>
<td>31,019.51</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2,425.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Access</td>
<td>25,648.80</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aidling Operation</td>
<td>139,039.05</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>2,184.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>25,002.92</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5,655.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information Bulletin No. 16, Table V.
Table III indicates among other things the following:

1. There is a trend in the country for more schools to be affiliated with central educational agencies than to be conducted by them. The expenditure for affiliated schools exceeds the expenditures for schools conducted by the agencies. Out of 37 central educational agencies, nine were associated or United Schools agencies. The development of coordinating agencies is the trend. The agencies established in the last fifteen years are in the main coordinating agencies. The associated or United Schools agencies are a carry over from the concept of the function of the central educational agencies prevailing in the 20's.

2. The coordinating agencies expend more than 20% of their budget on supervision and direction and more than 10% on youth and adult education, and teacher training. These figures are averages. Generally speaking, not enough funds are expended on supervision and guidance in most of the communities as an analysis of the expenditures of agencies in ten larger cities will indicate. (See Table IV below).

Since most of the central educational agencies were set up for the purpose of raising standards, the improvement of education, and to explore untouched areas (e.g. youth and adult education), it would seem that additional funds are needed for these purposes to make the central educational agencies more meaningful and effective. The agencies in the smaller communities are even more handicapped in the areas of supervision and youth education, since they are essentially "one man agencies".

---

24/ Expenditures for affiliated schools - $870,189.88
Expenditures for conducted schools - 529,474.66
(Those of coordinating agencies, and of United and Associated Schools)
See Table V. Information Bulletin P16


Table IV indicates the following:

1. The larger cities show highest rates of expenditures for supervision and subventions.

Philadelphia, among the four largest cities, shows the least expenditure for supervision (10.3%) and New York the highest (39.9%). This is to be understood in terms of the circumstances that brought the agencies into being. In the case of Philadelphia, the Council on Jewish Education was established to coordinate the existing systems of schools, recipients of substantial funds from the Allied Jewish Appeal. Only a small sum was allocated to the Council for supervision and direction. In New York, there were no systems of schools in existence and small sums were allocated to the Bureau of Jewish Education and the larger Talmud Torahs, at the time the J. E. C. was organized. The pattern established by the J. E. C. laid emphasis on service and guidance, with some funds for grants-in-aid. Close to forty per cent of the budget is expended on supervision and direction. Such an expenditure on supervision gives the New York agency a much better opportunity than before to provide a supervisory program needed in a city the size of New York. Yet a supervisory program without schools which are stable financially
cannot be entirely successful. The larger Talmud Torahs, for example, are not any more the recipients of community funds formerly allocated by the federation and have found themselves in financial difficulties."

In Philadelphia, substantial sums are allocated directly to the school systems and that is significant for the continued effectiveness of education under communal auspices. However, the Council on Jewish Education, with limited funds for supervision and direction, can render a limited service to the development of Jewish education in the city. In both communities a proper balance is necessary.

The range in allocations to schools (1948-49) was 22.3% to 84.9%. New York and Chicago, the two largest cities expanded the least percentage-wise in this area. Philadelphia expanded 84.9% of its total budget on subventions, this is to be explained in terms of the prevailing conditions at the time the agency was established. This condition, as pointed above, should be corrected if the agency's work is to be effective.

2. Baltimore, Boston, Chicago, Philadelphia show substantial expenditures for teacher training. Cooperatively speaking, Philadelphia spent the least in this area. It is to be noted that in the three other cities, the teacher training institutions are directly conducted by the central educational agencies, while in Philadelphia, the teacher training institutions is an autonomous agency, an affiliate of the Council on Jewish Education. It is only within recent years that the Gratz College has been receiving larger funds from the community.

3. Only three cities show a fair expenditure on insurance and retirement.

27/ In the last few years the J. W. C. has taken steps to organize the Talmud Torahs and to give them assistance in coordinating their program and in raising needed funds.
ANALYSIS OF AMOUNTS BUDGETED FOR "SCHOOLS AND OTHER EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS"

The thirty-seven agencies allocated to schools and other educational programs a total sum of $1,806,792.87. This is exclusive of supervision and direction of the schools. The breakdown of this sum is the following:

Elementary Schools ($1,324,540.52) 73.3%
High Schools (115,977.16) 6.4%
Colleges and Teacher Training (190,079.00) 10.5%
Nursery School and Kindergarten (21,852.77) 1.2%
Camps (56,895.00) 3.1%
Adult and Youth Activities (39,742.87) 2.2%
Release Time (16,401.68) .9%

See Table II, Information Bulletin #16, p.10.

In 7 cities the total allocation was devoted to elementary schools (Akron, Dallas, Indianapolis, Louisville, Milwaukee, Portland, San Francisco); in 10 cities over 90% of the allocation was devoted to elementary education (Atlanta, Cleveland DeWolfe, East St. Louis, Los Angeles, Minneapolis, Newark, Omaha, Toledo, Winnipeg); in 6 cities it was between 80 and 90% (Camden, Cincinnati, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Schenectady, St. Louis); in two cities it was 70 to 80% (New Haven and Rochester); in the other cities less was devoted to elementary education. In Boston only 6.2% was spent on subventing elementary schools. Up to 1950 (from 1930 on) The F.J.E. of Boston had no funds for subventing. Recently (1950-51 school year) a small allocation was made by the Welfare Fund of Boston for subvention to schools.

A breakdown of these percentages reveals variations. For instance, Chicago allowed 25.7% on elementary schools and 26.8% on high schools out of the total amount budgeted for "schools and other educational programs", in New York the percentage was 63.6% on elementary schools and 33.7% in high schools; in Buffalo it was 63.6% on elementary schools and 12.4% in high schools; in Miami, it was 55.2% on elementary schools and 35.6% in high schools.

See Table VI Information Bulletin #16.

This is a recent development. It is an indication of the increasing emphasis on the use of the summer months for Jewish education.
CONCLUSION

The increasing interest in Jewish education and the larger allocations by Federations and Welfare Funds have been noted. The outlay runs into millions. Thirty-seven central educational agencies spent over three million dollars in 1948-49. It has also been noted that 46.1% was expended for allocations to schools and 20% spent on supervision and coordination. Is it possible that Federations and Welfare Funds will make large funds available for an expanded program of youth and adult education, teacher training, experimentation, supervision and coordination and at the same time increase allocations for grants in aid to schools? Statistics show that in 1946 Federations and Welfare Funds allocated 9.06% for Jewish education of the total budgeted for all local needs.

This was a high percent in comparison with the practice in the past, but not with an evaluation of community needs from the standpoint of sound planning for the future. Furthermore, in terms of the deflated dollar the percent increase to Jewish education is considerably less.

Is it to be expected that parents and local groups will learn to bear a greater share of the financial responsibility, thereby releasing more funds for purposes of overall planning, direction and guidance?

Educators have advocated a partnership between the parents, the local groups and the community at large. Emphasis has been placed on the community's responsibility to defray the entire cost of organization, supervision and coordination. 32/

32/ In 1947, the Welfare Funds allocated 8.79% to Jewish education and in 1948, 7.34%.

Expansion of Jewish education—especially in areas of experimentation—will need larger funds. Should central educational agencies be entirely dependent upon Federations and Welfare Funds? Or shall it be the policy of the central educational agencies to engage in money raising activities for the double purpose of obtaining additional funds and for keeping in close contact with the laity?

Dr. Beilenson has been an advocate of setting up separate machinery for obtaining larger funds in the Jewish community in order to avoid dependence on the Federations and Welfare Funds and to supplement the inadequate funds allowed for the growth and development of Jewish education. He admits that the sums allocated by Federations and Welfare Funds have helped stabilize the finances of educational institutions and have indirectly or directly served to improve their work. He contends, however, that basically, the leadership of Federations and Welfare Funds is not sincerely interested in Jewish education. Their outlook is philanthropic in the main. Funds have been obtained mainly through pressures on the part of individuals and groups. In his opinion the basic principle of the Jewish Education Association of New York at the time of its organization in 1921 was sound. The J.E.A. was organized when it was realized that the Federation would not take active measures for the energetic promotion of Jewish educational work, and it began with the theory that public support for Jewish education ought to come from that element in the community which favored it.

The supporting membership of the J.E.A. was chosen in accordance with this idea.

34/ Beilenson, 1936 New York Study p. 34: "When the schools of N.Y. were admitted, they hoped that Federation would take an increasing interest in the educational work. This has not eventuated. While individual members of Federation may be interested in educational problems, the controlling forces in Federation have not been convinced that the general support of schools is one of their valid functions."
The experience of the Chicago Board of Jewish Education and the Jewish Education Committee of New York in raising funds has significance for Jewish education and particularly for the central educational agencies.

In 1939, an arrangement was entered into between the Chicago Charities and the Board of Jewish education whereby after a period of five years, the Board would raise its own funds. During the five year period the Board would receive decreasing sums each year from the Charities. The challenge was thrown out to the Board of Jewish Education that if its significance was recognized in the community, it should be able to raise the forty or fifty thousand dollars needed to supplement the allocation made by the Charities. The Board took up the challenge and the funds it raised surpassed the expectations of the Charities' leadership. Not only were the needs of the budget met but provision was made for the development of other activities long advocated by the Board, but not allowed heretofore by the Charities. By 1945, the Board of Jewish Education had demonstrated its strength in the community. Its budget had been increased tremendously and its program considerably expanded. In 1945, the Board was completely on its own and succeeded in raising over $200,000 in the community. It was a further dramatic demonstration of the interest in Jewish education. Had the Board continued to receive its funds from the Charities, its budget probably would have been increased gradually. But it is doubtful whether the Charities would have seen fit to allocate four or five times the amount allocated in 1940. It is also doubtful whether the purchase of a $250,000 educational building would have been possible under the old arrangement. The success of the Board of Jewish Education to raise its own funds led to a reconsideration by the Welfare Fund of the inclusion of Jewish education. Now the Board receives a substantial percentage of its budget from the Welfare Fund.
(54th in 1948-49), but is allowed to continue its quiet membership campaign to supplement the Welfare Fund allocation. 35/

In New York, when a critical relationship developed between the Jewish Education Committee and the Federation, arrangements were made for the J.E.C. to raise its own funds. The campaigns proved successful. The show of strength on the part of those interested in Jewish education made a strong impression on community leadership and the J.E.C. is now included in the Federation, and does not raise separate funds in the community. 36/

35/ See note 21.
36/ See note 20.
Federation and Welfare professionals, too, have recognized that funds made available to Jewish education are not adequate to care for the expanded needs of Jewish education. In a recent paper 37, Samuel A. Goldsmith of Chicago states that three steps have to be taken for the further growth of the central educational agency: 1) There is need for establishing in the larger communities special large scholarship funds for the training of Jewish educational personnel. 2) Separate central funds should be established for Jewish education: "This runs counter, of course, to the trend which from time to time, has asserted itself in every large community, of including the Board of Jewish Education in the Jewish Welfare Fund or Jewish Federation. Having in mind the tremendous funds that are needed for the establishment of proper educational facilities and activities, and the necessary attainment of a high level of performance beyond anything now established; having in mind the tremendous needs that will continue to face communities both at home and abroad; having in mind the pervasive character of the activities included in Jewish education, the future should demand large, separate and integrated funds for Jewish educational purposes only." 3) In the face of denominational growth and development, coordination by a central agency is still possible, provided there are sufficient funds. Without the funds, the possibility of a central board, conducting directly the religious educational activities is bound to prove a vainglorious dream.

In such a program for Jewish education, the Federation should give its full assistance, but cannot by itself do it, since it does not have the means to do it.

Thus, there is recognition by educators and Federation leadership that

for an expanded program of Jewish education, additional large funds will be needed. It is within the realm of possibility that Federations and Welfare funds which are committing themselves more and more to an all inclusive program of social service and are placing less emphasis on the philanthropic aspect of their work, may recognize the primary position of Jewish education, and allocate larger funds. Should such a situation develop, it would have two important advantages: Firstly, the agencies would engage primarily in those activities for which they were established, namely raising the standards and developing a systematic approach to Jewish education. Secondly, the community would not be plagued with multiple drives for funds and the community organization would not be fragmentized.

However, the prospects for the ideal situation may not be in the offing in view of the continuing needs abroad. The central educational agencies, in the larger cities particularly, will need to give greater consideration to the supplementation of the funds allocated by the community organization, if they are to assume greater responsibility for filling the expanded needs in all aspects of Jewish education.

38/ This seems more possible in smaller communities. Statistics show an increased allocation percentage-wise for Jewish education in relation to all local needs. For example: Miami—an average of 15% (1947-1949) of all funds for local needs; New Haven 58.6% (1947), 64% (1948) 61.6% (1949); Des Moines 33.6% (1947), 31.2% (1948), 31.3% (1949); Minneapolis 44.7% (1947) 37.3% (1948), 34.1% (1949); St. Paul 24.6% (1947), 32.9% (1948), 31.8% (1949); Toledo 22.9% (1947) 25.3% (1948) 19.1% (1949) See Engelman, "Jewish Education in Facts and Figures", p.43.
PART III - PROBLEMS

The central educational agencies engage in many activities some of which are functional, and others are direct and indirect services rendered to affiliated schools. Although considerable progress has been made, as pointed out in a previous chapter, much "unfinished business" remains in almost every aspect of Jewish education: in raising the standards, in attracting and training qualified personnel, in reaching the unschooled, in retaining those already enrolled, in obtaining moral and material support, etc. The communal agencies for Jewish education have tremendous tasks and challenges which they will have to meet forthrightly and courageously, if Jewish education is to achieve the quality so urgently needed on the American scene. These problems, educationally speaking, are primary and upon their solution will depend the quality and intensiveness of Jewish education and life.

In addition to these challenges, there are several problems broad in scope which constitute the essence and core of the effective functioning of the central educational agencies, and are perhaps basic to the whole idea of a systematic, community approach to Jewish education. The problems are four fold:

1. How large must a Jewish community be to warrant the establishment of a central educational agency?

2. In the light of a differentiated Jewish life can real affiliation with the central educational agency be achieved? What are the conditions in Jewish life and Jewish education which make affiliation and coordination difficult?

3. In view of the differentiated Jewish educational programs, what should be the main emphasis of the central educational agency in developing a community system of Jewish education?
4. How shall professional leadership be trained to conduct the program of the central educational agencies?

For convenience, the problems will be discussed under the headings: 1 - The Size of the Jewish Community. 2 - Affiliation and Coordination. 3 - Emphasis in Program. 4 - Professional Leadership.

1. The Size of the Jewish Community

Is a central educational agency needed in a small community where the total Jewish school registration may not exceed 200 or 300 or even 700? What should be the criteria for the establishment of a central educational agency in the small community? Can the agency function effectively in the small community? If an agency is established what should be its plan of operation?

The surveys conducted in small communities under independent auspices or under the Aegis of the A.A.J.E. show the low level of achievement in Jewish education and indicate the urgent need for the establishment of an agency or committee to deal with the situation. As a matter of fact, the A.A.J.E. is usually invited to make the survey because of the dissatisfaction that exists in the community.

The urgent need of an agency to cope with Jewish education in the small community is based on the following prevailing conditions:

39/ Camden B.J.E. works with schools which have a total registration of 725; Syracuse 725; St. Paul works directly with 500 and 450 are not under its direct jurisdiction; Schenectady has 320 children in its community sponsored program; Portland 550; Omaha 650, Des Moines 200; Louisville 1000.

40/ See the following surveys: J. Pilch (Hartford, 1945); L.L. Leviner (Columbus, 0.1940); L.L. Leviner (Denver 1938) L.L. Kaplan, (Canton, Ohio 1944); L. Rudavsky (Trenton, 1944); A. Kesser (Peoria, Ill. 1946); U.Z. Engelman (Wilmington, Del. 1946); Chipkin (Schenectady, 1946).
a. Small school units: The small school unit presents a most serious problem in the organization of Jewish educational work from the point of view of effectiveness of instruction as well as from the point of view of efficiency and economy of administration. This problem, as serious as it is in the large community, is even more aggravated in the small community, due to the small number of children and due to the difficulty of attracting qualified teaching personnel to the small community.

b. The personnel engaged in teaching is hardly qualified to do an effective job and very often serve in other capacities as religious functionaries. The Sunday School teachers are for the most part volunteers with little or no Jewish educational background.

c. The curriculum is poorly organized with little or no supervision.

d. Often there is conflict and competition in the community making for a less effective educational program.

e. Little or no provision is made for any form of extension education for the unschooled or any formal and informal education for youth and adult. Since national organizations do not have sufficient staff to service local chapters, they are left to their own resources.

f. Interpretation, promotion and participation in Jewish education by members of the community at large is inadequate.

The surveyors, in every instance, see the need in the small community, where there are several schools, of an organized group, a central committee or agency responsible for all the educational needs of the community on every age level. In the small community, where it is comparatively easy to reach every Jewish family, it should be possible to give greater expression to the

cultural and educational aspects of Jewish community life. It is on that
basis that the establishment of an agency is urged under professional
direction and charged with responsibility of planning and directing the
educational work.

The surveys envisage the work of the central educational agency in the
small community as being broad in scope, including in its program formal and
informal education for children, youth and adults. Allowance is made for
ideological differences and the rabbis representing the various viewpoints
in the community are invited to participate in the development of the
program, and a service agency similar to the one in the larger cities is
recommended and established. Where numbers and schools are small, mergers
and community schools are recommended. The most unique plan recommended
and implemented has been the "Schenectady Plan." The Bureau of Jewish Ed-
ucation, under this plan, is to be the all inclusive, functional, administra-
tive and service agency providing education for children, youth and adults.
The idea central to this approach is to utilize every force in the community
for the operation of a united, coordinated educational program for all age
levels, avoiding duplication, competition, and seeking the development of a
cooperative and coordinated program involving the Community Council, the
Community School, the Synagogue, the Center, the home, group workers,
educators, rabbis and parents.

The constitution of the Schenectady Bureau states the following in the
preamble: "That there shall be an all inclusive program embracing all age
groups, all ideological groups, all functional groups and the program should
provide education at all levels. The curriculum will include provision for

42/ I. S. Chipkin, Memorandum on Visits to Schenectady, N.Y.; "The Jewish
Education of a Child under the Schenectady Plan" issued by the Bureau of
Hebrew School, Sunday School, club activities, synagogue services and the teachings of each particular synagogue and parental instructions by Rabbis and teachers for the observance of holidays and festivals and Jewish family programs in the home...that the School, Synagogue, Center, Council and Home are institutions essential to the plan."

The educational agency in the small community becomes the sole resource agency for all kinds of educational activities. The library, for example, has a pedagogic purpose as well as a general purpose since it is the only one of its kind in the community—and provides books, films and program material for adults and youth in the community.

Whereas the agency in the larger city specializes primarily with education on an elementary level because there may be other agencies responsible for youth and adult education, the smaller agency is much more embracing and participates in every educational and cultural activity. The educational agency's director becomes a veritable "educational jack-of-all-trades since he is called upon to perform many responsibilities which in a larger agency would be more specialized.

43/ Constitution of the Schenectady Bureau of Jewish Education.

44/ Cf. A.P. Cannaes, "The Executive's Job", Jewish Education, XVIII No. 3 p. 49.

Annual Reports of various agencies reveal the multitude of responsibilities carried by the directors. In Akron, Ohio, the director envisaged his responsibilities to include the organization of a Community Council, a Council of Congregations and a variety of other projects in the Jewish community. Sec I. Levitats, "First Annual Report of the Akron E.J.E." (1944) also Levitats, "An Experiment in Communal Education", op.cit. In the opinion of this writer, the director of this bureau was overstepping the bounds; he interpreted Jewish education too broadly.
The experiences in the smaller communities have proved that the existence of the central educational agency has stimulated greater interest in Jewish education, has increased registration, has given valuable services to youth and adults, has helped improve the economic and educational status of the teachers, and has stimulated community thinking and planning.

While there has been considerable conflict due to ideological and other differences, and the achievement has not been uniform in all small communities, the influence has been positive for the improvement of Jewish education.

If a number of agencies are not functioning adequately, it is not due to the size of the community but to other factors: the inability to find qualified personnel, the conflicts which prevail in the community and the lack of desire on the part of many individuals and groups to cooperate in the development of a community system of Jewish education.

On the basis of the surveys conducted in the smaller communities, the reports issued by the professional directors in charge and conversations with laymen, who recognize that well organized and properly administered schools can be established on a community wide basis and can function effectively despite the divergent religious views, the writer has come to the conclusion that size is not a primary criterion for the establishment of a central educational agency. The establishment of the agency should be based on a careful analysis of the needs in the particular community and on the willingness of all those interested in Jewish education in a cooperative effort for the benefit of the total Jewish community. Wherever possible the

45/ See below for discussion on affiliation and coordination.

46/ The Bureau of Jewish Education of Canton, Akron, Omaha, Winnipeg, are either defunct or not functioning actively. In the opinion of this writer, the Bureau of Omaha and Akron were making progress in raising standards and alerting the Jewish community to the needs of Jewish education. It is unfortunate that the conflicts in Akron have almost caused the complete dissolution of the B.J.E. and that a new director of the Omaha bureau has not been engaged to carry on its work.
agency in a near larger community should be used as a resource agency, and in areas where there are several agencies, joint planning and joint conferences arranged for the exchange of ideas and experiences.

2. Affiliation and Coordination

Affiliation of individual schools or systems of schools constitutes the basic form of organization of most of the central educational agencies. What is the extent of the affiliation? What are the difficulties encountered in bringing about affiliation? How are the difficulties being met?

School affiliation with the central educational agencies is remarkably high in all communities. In the small and middle sized communities, affiliation is usually 100%, and even in the larger communities, it is unusually high. Not only are the communal and congregational schools affiliated, but wherever there are Yiddish schools (workmen circle, Sholem Aleichem and Jewish National Workers Alliance—Polishulen) they too are included in the agencies' orbit.

In one community the schools of the Jewish People's Fraternal Order were included in the program of the central educational agency for several years.

Conservative Congregational School affiliates are in the majority in most of the communities.

47/ Akron, Atlanta, Buffalo, Camden, Chicago, Cleveland, Los Angeles, Miami, Milwaukee, New Haven, New York, Newark, Philadelphia, Rochester, Syracuse.

48/ In Los Angeles, the J.P.F.O. Schools were included on a trial basis for a two year period during which time it was to be determined whether they conform to the standards of the Bureau of Jewish Education, particularly in the area of the curriculum and its content. The arrangement was discontinued after two years.

At the time of the organization of the Philadelphia Council for Jewish Education, the J.P.F.O. Schools applied for affiliation. The request was rejected on the basis that they do not reflect a positive attitude to Jewish life.
All Day Schools, generally speaking, are not affiliates although some receive funds for their Hebrew departments from the Federations and Welfare funds in several communities.

The Orthodox and Reform religious schools are affiliated in most communities where the central educational agencies are coordinating in character.

What are the requirements for affiliation? It was pointed out above that educational agencies have attempted to set up standards with reference to housing, administrative practices, school auspices and direction, curriculum and employment of teachers which are the basis for affiliation either at the time when the agency is established, or at a later time when the affiliated schools have agreed upon definite standards to be fulfilled within a reasonable time.

Affiliation is conceived as a two way reciprocal process: On the one hand, the affiliate must reflect a positive attitude towards Jewish religious and spiritual values and an active interest in the welfare of the Jewish group; must strive to fulfill the requirements and maintain the standards of the central educational agencies; accept the services made available; render periodic reports; participate and cooperate in the activities conducted by the agencies for the benefit of Jewish education generally in the community.

49/ In 1948, six Federations made allocations to 11 day schools. (Los Angeles, New Haven, Detroit, Newark, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Philadelphia). In Los Angeles, New Haven, Newark and Cleveland the subvention was given through the central educational agency. In Philadelphia, the United Hebrew Schools and Yeshivos an affiliate of the council on Jewish Education received specific sums from the Allied Jewish Appeal earmarked for the Hebrew Department of the Aikin Hebrew Academy. There are eighteen cities with central educational agencies in which there are one or more day schools, and only in seven do the day schools cooperate in some way with the local central educational agencies. For full analysis of the schools see Information Bulletin #15, "All Day Schools in the United States 1948-49" (A.A.J.E. March 1949).
On the other hand, the agency commits itself to non-interference with the autonomy and ideology of the affiliate, does its best to provide the services needed; cooperates in every way with the affiliate, educationally and financially, in the achievement of its maximum and optimum program, and acts on behalf of Jewish education vis-a-vis the total Jewish community.

Considering the voluntary nature of the Jewish educational system in America, a high degree of cooperation and understanding has been achieved.

The degree of cooperation, however, varies from complete cooperation and acceptance of all the services (including financial aid) of the central educational agencies to mere participation in some inter-school affair, complete lack of cooperation, disaffection and persistent efforts to undermine the central educational agencies. Several examples will be cited below.

Lack of cooperation has created disharmony and bitter conflict and hindered the educational process: It has interfered with the establishment of joint high schools, the setting up of minimum age and scholastic requirements for Confirmation and Bar Mitzvah, the acceptance of a Board of License and code of practice for teachers, the recruitment and training of teachers, an effective program of supervision, the development of an extension program for youth and adults, united efforts to interpret Jewish education to the community, and the efforts to obtain more adequate funds for Jewish education.

What are the reasons for lack of or limited cooperation? What makes affiliation and coordination difficult? It stems from two major developments in American Jewish life:

a) The divergence of opinion in regard to the objectives of Jewish education in America.

b) The emergence and growth of denominational and ideological groups.

1. The Divergence of Opinion in Regard to Objectives in Jewish Education

The divergence of opinion in the Jewish community regarding the objectives
of Jewish education in America, as reflected in the several types of Jewish
schools and educational activities, represents differing religious and
social philosophies of Jewish life and Judaism. Through the medium of the
school, the different groups are endeavoring to emphasize, nurture and pre-
serve those cultural and religious values which they consider the core of
Jewish life.

The Sunday School of the Reform with its emphasis on ethical precepts
and history given once or twice a week, differs from the weekday school
conducted under Orthodox and Conservative auspices which emphasize the study
of the Hebrew language, the Bible, the Prayer Book, the story of Israel and
the traditional observances, given three or more times a week. The Hebrew
weekday schools differ among themselves considerably. On the one hand is
the communal Talmud Torah, orthodox in orientation, with its emphasis on a
more intensive Hebraic education given five days a week, and on the other,
is the Orthodox or Conservative Synagogue school, meeting three days a week
for a maximum of six hours, and emphasizing the study of the Prayer Book and
observances mainly in the vernacular.

50/ I.B. Beckson considers the variety of Jewish schools transplantations
in the main of ideas and a way of life brought to these shores from Europe,
with some orientation in the American tradition. See Beckson, "Jewish
Education - Achievements and Needs", op.cit; also Beckson, 1936 New York
Study p. 12 f.

I.S. Chipkin thinks that they "represent the variety of religious and
cultural adjustment of the last two generations of immigrant and native
born Jews to the American environment". See Jewish Schools in America
(A.A.J.E.) p.5.

For a discussion of the different types of schools see S. Dinin,
Judaism in a Changing Civilization, Chapter 1, S. Yaffrokin, "Yiddish
Secular Schools in the United States", The Jewish People, Past and
Present II: Jewish Schools in America (A.A.J.E.)
The All Day School with its prime desire to promote the Jewish tradition, Jewish learning, and a pious attitude to life, differs from the other types in its attempt to achieve its aims in a setting where the secular education is relegated to a secondary position, or where Jewish education is given equal status with secular education. Here too, there is difference of opinion and different types. The progressive All Day School representing an effort to integrate Jewish and general education and utilizing the most modern methods, differs from the traditional type which conducts the curriculum along traditional lines stressing a knowledge of the Talmud and using Yiddish as the medium of instruction.

Differing from the three other types—the Sunday School, the Hebrew Week Day School, and the All Day School—is the Yiddist type. The Yiddist school, conducted usually under labor auspices, departs from the Jewish educational traditions in fundamentals. It is non-religious and secular in character, although the Bible is taught as literature, and some of the Jewish holidays are observed for their cultural, social, and national values. In the effort to achieve a socialist-Jewish cultural synthesis, the Yiddist school includes in its program the study of the Yiddish language and literature, Jewish history, Jewish problems, and the arts. The Yiddish language from their point of view is the language of the masses and is Folkstümlich. Hebrew is relegated to a secondary position. The Yiddist type, too, has its divisions and has three types which, of course, are not pure. Just as in the other types, they have influenced each other and have been subject to common ideas.

Diversity in outlook, content, and approach is the rule rather than the exception in Jewish education, posing a complex problem for the planning and coordinating agency to keep the groups together, to coordinate their activities, the central educational agency must use the utmost tact and be above suspicion.
to interfere

that it is in any way attempting/with ideological and religious differences.

B. The Emergence and Growth of Denominational and Ideological Groups

A factor which has further complicated the efforts at affiliation and coordination is the growth and development of the denominational form of organization on a local and national level. 51/

The national religious organizations have education departments and professional directors. They prepare texts and curricula which are widely distributed among their affiliates. 52/

The Yiddish groups too have their national organizations with education departments which prepare curricula, texts and materials. The national bodies set policies for the country as a whole.

National policies sometimes or often interfere with local actions

51/ The Union of American Hebrew Congregations has a membership of 325 temples and the Central Conference of American Rabbis a membership of 475. The United Synagogue has 350 affiliated congregations and the Rabbinical Assembly a membership of 360. The Union of Orthodox Rabbis and the Rabbinical Council have memberships of 500 and 300 respectively. Some 3000 odd Orthodox congregations are not affiliated with any central body. This is indicative of a trend in American Jewish life in the direction of three strongly organized denominational groups.

52/ The Commission on Jewish Education of the Reform movement has arranged courses of study and in the last twenty-five years under the professional leadership of Dr. Emanuel Gamov, has made an outstanding contribution in the preparation of a series of text books and teacher materials for use in the Sunday Schools primarily, but which have found their way into almost every type of Jewish school in the country.

The Commission on Jewish Education of the United Synagogue has been very active in the last ten years. It has conducted educational conferences, has prepared curricula and texts, and has encouraged conservative congregations to establish their own schools under the Aegis of the synagogue.

The Orthodox group do not have a commission on education similar to the other religious denominations. However, the Mizrachi sponsored Vat Haharedi is the unofficial representative of the Orthodox group. It too prepares curricula, texts, a children's magazine, guides for teachers, audio-visual aid materials for use in the Orthodox congregational or communal schools.
necessary in a particular community. As a result grave differences in points of view and serious conflicts have arisen in many communities. "Community vs. congregation" is an apt phrase which describes the basis for the conflict.

What are the main contentions of those who hold to the view of the congregational form of Jewish education and have reservations about a community program for Jewish education as represented in the communal school and the communal central educational agency?

a) Congregationalism is the trend throughout the country. Although the All Day School movement has grown and the secular Yiddish schools seem to be holding their own for the time being, enrollment in the Jewish Schools proves that Jewish education in America has become the main responsibility of the synagogue 53 and it devolves upon the synagogue leadership to develop the congregational school. 54

53/ 1950 statistics gathered by the A.A.F.R. show that 82.7% of all the children enrolled in Jewish schools attend congregational schools, and only 17.3% attend non-congregational schools. Of the total recorded congregational Sunday School enrollment reported by 100 communities, the division was as follows: Conservative 51.3%, Reform 38.9%, Orthodox 9.1%, inter-congregational 0.7%. Of the total enrollment in the congregational week day school, the Conservative had 62.2% of the enrollment, the Orthodox 24.8%, Reform 11.6%, and inter-congregational 1.4%.

The enrollment in the All Day School for 1950 was 21,404. In 1908, there were only 2 schools in one community. In 1950 there were 128 in 46 different communities. See Engelman, "Jewish Education in Facts and Figures", Op. Cit.

In 1946, the Workmen Circle Schools had an enrollment of 8,000 in 127 schools; the Jewish National Workers Alliance had an enrollment of 5,000 in 71 schools, the Sholem Aleichem Folks Institute 3,000 in 19 schools, and the Jewish People's Fraternal Order (formerly known as the International Workers Organization) had an enrollment of 6,000 in 94 schools. The total enrollment in the Yiddish schools throughout the country was 20,000. See Yefrokin, "Yiddish Secular Schools in the United States", Op. Cit., p. 150.

b) The organization of Jewish education along congregational lines has intrinsic values and advantages. The child attending the congregational school is in an institution which provides for the religious, cultural and educational needs of the entire family. The child becomes part of a process of social integration which affects every member of his family. He grows up in an atmosphere of affiliation and in an environment of religious, social and cultural activities which will have meaning for the growing child. After the elementary schooling provisions are made for his growth into the synagogue community through synagogue attendance and worship and a multitude of other activities. Ultimately it makes for loyalty to the synagogue. The rabbi can have a personal and direct influence on the child affecting his Jewish development.

In the congregational setting the child is likely to be taught the kind of Judaism in which his father believes making for greater harmony in family life. Furthermore, since the congregation is the recognized form of organized Jewish life, it enjoys social prestige which can be capitalized to the advantage of the school. A still further advantage is the ability of the

55/ Cf. J. H. Greenstone wrote the following in the Jewish Exponent of Phila., on March 1, 1929: "The ideal condition in American Jewish life would be for all Jews to be members of congregations and all children to be members of congregational schools. The synagogue should be the unit of Jewish life and religious education should be centered in it, whereby the nature of the education will be assured and the affiliation of the child with the religious activities of the synagogue will be greatly aided. It is, therefore, most encouraging to see the trend of the growth of the congregational school." Quoted by A. M. Dushkin, "Congregation and Community in Jewish Education", Jewish Education I, no. 2 (1929) p. 75.

school to depend on the congregation for financial support.

C. Communal organization of Jewish education has dangers and this advantage: less emphasis is laid upon synagogue affiliation. It has secular, nationalist and Hebraic tendencies which de-emphasize the study of the Prayer Book, religious observance and synagogue attendance. It is not related to family affiliation with organized Jewish religious life and is therefore in isolation, and since education is an extension of family life, the communal approach hinders the educational process. Communal organization may bring with it an imposed curriculum, interference with the conduct and ideology of the school, and deprives the rabbi of personal contact with the children and the opportunity to influence the Jewish development of the children, thereby undermining his responsibility and prestige. 57 Communal organization implies the acceptance of financial assistance from the community. The congregation does not want "charity" from the Federation and Welfare Fund whose orientation is secular and which may lead to control. The congregation can take care of its financial needs. Financial assistance and supervision by the community may weaken the synagogues' influence in the community and strengthen the secularist elements.

Jewish educators have recognized the strength of the congregational setup and have pointed out that there is no intrinsic opposition between congregational and communal schools. They have pointed out that it is necessary to preserve


the strength inherent in the congregational school and at the same time guard
against the dangers and weakness to which it is subject. Emphasis should be
put on community and congregation, rather than community as congregation.
Specifically Jewish educators have pointed out the following weakness of the
congregational school:

a. In the congregational setup, the school plays a secondary role: The
main interest is the synagogue which is adult centered.

b. Small schools and inadequate financing make for low standards in
curriculum and personnel. 59/ A merger of small units leads to improvement
in administration and education. The argument that the congregational school
can be self-supporting or depend on the synagogue for its support is fallacious.
This point of view is influenced by the more affluent congregations. A degree
of local support is an absolute necessity, but on closer analysis, it will be
found that the maintenance of high standards of instruction is not possible
without communal supervision as well as communal support for the average con-
grational school.

59/ In Canton, Ohio, when the Bureau was organized the basic idea was to
avoid small schools and to improve educational standards and achievement.
The "Schenectady Plan" calls for a community school setup in which all
educational institutions participate.

60/ Cf. Berkson, 1936 New York Study p. 25
The education in the non-congregational school seems to be more intensive.
Of all the children enrolled in the non-congregational schools (1950), 33.5
were in the Sunday School and 66.5% in the week-day schools. In the congrega-
tional schools 68.5% were in the Sunday School and 31.5% in the week-day school.
The Conservative Congregational schools, however, showed an enrollment of
64.1% in the week-day school and 35.9% in the Sunday School. The Orthodox
congregational schools had an enrollment of 44.4% in the Sunday School and
55.6% in the week-day school. See Engelman, " Jewish Education in Facts and
Figures", p. 35.
c. The rabbis are too busy with congregational duties and are not adequately trained to develop the educational program. They need the active assistance of the community agency in curriculum construction, supervision and the training of personnel.

d. Many congregations do not take care of the children of unaffiliated, i.e., those who are unable to pay the membership and tuition fees. This is gradually being corrected. But the congregational school cannot fill the need of those who do not wish to be affiliated with a synagogue for ideological reasons.

e. The congregational school stresses the local synagogue rather than the "Congregation of Israel" (Klal Yisroel). Such an emphasis will lead to division in Jewish life and the development of a series of communities along ideological lines rather than one community. The congregational unit should strive, therefore, to become more communal in outlook and program, and not restrict its activities to the intensification of purely local synagogue loyalties.

The interest of Klal Yisroel transcends that of individual groups, congregations or associations. The central educational agency symbolizes the principle of Klal Yisroel and one of its important functions is to focus attention on the danger of fragmentation as well as to bring together the various educational elements for a united educational program.


62/ Cf. I.S. Chipkin, Twenty Five Years of Jewish Education: "The Congregational organization is needed to influence Jewish life, but problems and activities which affect all Jews, regardless of congregational affiliation, call for community organization and responsibility. The synagogue becomes the local chapter of the community and the training ground for child, youth and adult in his responsibilities to the totality of the Jewish group life, traditional local and international. The socialization of the individual into Jewish group life thus becomes the next step towards his more active socialization into the civic and natural life of the country as a whole" p.92.

Cf. S. Benderly, The Jewish Teacher 1, no.1 (Jan. 1917): "The future of Judaism in America belongs to no one party, and the problem of Jewish education will not be solved along party lines."
1. The argument that communal education leads to alienation from the synagogue is fallacious. The communal approach is to teach and prepare the children for synagogue affiliation rather than for affiliation with a particular synagogue. Similarly the central educational agencies respect the ideological differences and attempt to help each group attain the highest possible standards in accordance with sound pedagogic principles and methods.

2. National and local organizations do not have the staff to help in individual schools or groupings of schools to carry out their programs. It is within the realm of possibility that national organizations will employ a professional staff large enough to fill the educational needs of their affiliates on a local level; and under present conditions, no one can deny them the right to employ staff, if they had the means to do so. For the time, however, the local communities through the central educational agencies must provide professional supervision and technical assistance without which the individual schools may be conditioned to mediocrity or failure.

Educators and congregational school leadership have long recognized that a working relationship between the congregational school and the central agency for Jewish education is central to the task of raising the standards of Jewish education in all communities. 62n/ To this end, on a local and national level, central educational agencies and congregational groups have taken steps to establish mutual understanding and cooperative relationships. While success has not been uniform, there is recognition that much can be gained through cooperative effort.

In Baltimore, Chicago, Cleveland, New York and Philadelphia, an acceptable arrangement has been reached with the Reform educational group and special consultants appointed to work directly with the individual schools and Reform Religious School Committees. In New York, the J.E.C. and the Commission on Jewish Education of the Reform Movement have conducted successful joint experiments in curriculum development. In other communities, too, the relationship between the Reform Religious Schools and the central educational agencies is good. Confirmation standards, courses of study have been suggested and implemented, and joint activities are conducted in the training of teachers and steps have been taken to license Sunday School teachers.

The Orthodox Congregational Schools are not organized formally on a local or national level. By and large they are affiliated with the central educational agencies and cooperate fully or partially in the program.

In Chicago, the Orthodox Talmud Torahs were a part of the Board of Jewish Education when it was first organized. Suspicions of the modern methods and pedagogic principles introduced by the Board of Jewish Education, the Talmud Torahs seceded in 1926 and in 1936 formed their own organization, the Associated Talmud Torahs of Chicago.

The secession of the Talmud Torahs from the Chicago Board of Jewish Education is an illustration of the misunderstanding of the central educational agency's functions and the difficulties encountered by the central educational agency in the effort to introduce sound educational principles into the educational process.

---

63/ The agency is recognized by the Chicago Welfare Fund and receives a substantial allocation. In 1949, the A.T.T. received $81,606.46 from the Welfare Fund representing 69.8% of its budget.

64/ The attempt by the Board of Jewish Education to influence the Orthodox Talmud Torahs to use improved methods and to organize the course of study in accordance with principles of educational psychology was interpreted as an infringement upon the ideological convictions of Orthodox Jewry. See C.L. Mishkin, "The Talmud Torahs", The Chicago Sentinel (August 1948) p.49.
In the main, the problem has been the relationship between the Conservative congregational schools and the central educational agencies.

In New York, the Jewish Education Committee works in close cooperation with the conservative schools organized by the Metropolitan Council of New York City of the United Synagogue. The Board of Education of the Metropolitan Council is affiliated with the United Synagogue Commission on Jewish Education and with the Jewish Education Committee. To the former, it looks for ideological orientation and formulation of goals and objectives. To the J.E.C. it looks for pedagogic consultation, supervision and for general planning and carrying out of their objectives. A special educational consultant has been assigned to help the Board in its administrative direction, in the formulation of its curricular aims, content and policies, and in the guidance of the local school boards and teaching staffs.

In Chicago, the conservative schools have no central school board. The Board of Jewish Education works with the conservative schools on an individual basis. The Board negotiates with each school separately on the basis of individual agreements, and on these depends the extent and type of service the Board offers. There is in Chicago, however, a Council of the United Synagogue. The Council was organized to take up all matters pertaining to conservative synagogues including those bearing on Jewish education. Recently an agreement was reached between the Council and the Board of Jewish Education in which the Board agrees to the recommendation of the Chicago Council of the United Synagogue "that the Chicago Council establish an "Educational Council

65/ In 1948, the American Association for Jewish Education prepared a statement on the experience in sixteen communities. The statement, entitled "The Inter-relationship between Central Agencies for Jewish Education and the Conservative Congregational Schools", was not published.

66/ May 9, 1951 "Agreement Between the Chicago Council - United Synagogue of America and the Board of Jewish Education."
of the United Synagogue of Chicago affiliated with the Board of Jewish Education and that the Education Council of the United Synagogue shall be concerned with problems that are distinctive to the conservative movement and its ideology. The Board of Jewish Education further agrees to "designate, with the approval of the Chicago Council - United Synagogue of Chicago, a staff member who shall participate in the supervision and aid in the furthering of the aims of the Education Council of United Synagogue. He shall act as liaison between the Commission on Jewish Education of the United Synagogue of America, the Chicago Council and the Board of Jewish Education. He shall also maintain records and statistics of the Education Council of the United Synagogue of Chicago. It is understood that all contacts between the Education Council and the individual conservative schools will be carried through the designated liaison staff member of the Board of Jewish Education". It was also agreed "that the conservative schools will be individually affiliated with the Board of Jewish Education; that they will continue to be active participants in the allied Jewish School Board 67/ and continue to abide by its practices. Similarly the conservative schools will continue to abide by the administrative procedures of the Board of Jewish Education embodied in the code of Administrative and Personnel Practices."

In Philadelphia the conservative schools are organized into one system and are affiliated with the Board of Jewish Education of the Philadelphia Branch of the United Synagogue. The Board has its own director and attempts to service its

67/ The Board organized some years ago, the Allied Jewish School Board which consists mainly of conservative schools. It is a voluntary association but has had considerable influence in the development of the schools, and in carrying out inter-school projects and plans. It adopted a salary scale for teachers, Bar Mitzvah regulations, arranged inter-school affairs, and worked out a code of personnel practices. All matters of policy are decided by the Allied School Board. Their decisions are not mandatory. They are referred in each case to the Schools. When a majority of the schools adopts the policy, it becomes binding upon all schools.
on schools. The Board of Jewish Education is an affiliate of the Philadelphia Council on Jewish Education. The Council does not have individual school affiliation and works through the organised systems of schools. In accordance with this policy, conservative congregational schools are not affiliated on an individual basis, and the Council works through the Board of Jewish Education.

The relationship between the Council and the Board has not been a happy one. The Board cannot provide its own supervisory service and very reluctantly accepts the services made available by the Council; some of the congregational schools need financial assistance but the Board discourages them from requesting it from the community; the attempt to license teachers and to work out professional practices for teachers have been thwarted; the Board is jealous of its autonomy and has fear and distrust of the Council; it considers itself a parallel agency, rather than an integral part of the Council on Jewish Education.

The lack of understanding and cooperation on the part of the Board of Jewish Education has hindered the progress of Jewish education considerably.

On a national level, the American Association for Jewish Education and the Commission of Jewish Education of the United Synagogue of America have held several meetings, and on the basis of the experiences in large and small communities, have issued a joint statement of principles for the guidance of congregational schools and central educational agencies in their relationship to each other.

The statement calls for:

a) Acceptance by the congregational schools of the central educational agencies "as the community instrument for educational coordination and consultation in terms of improving standards of achievement and progress".

b) Recognition

---

and acceptance by the central educational agencies of the congregational schools as a logical concomitant of American Jewish life and in consonance with their philosophy of encouraging, promoting and extending the program of all educational agencies and segments in the community, the central agencies should cooperate with the congregational schools or their groupings in carrying out their programs as effectively as possible...and shall recognize the autonomy and ideological integrity of the congregational schools. c) Cooperative efforts on the pre-school elementary and high school levels.

Meaningful and willing affiliation of all educational segments is the very core of an effective central educational agency. The recognition of this by congregational school leadership and Jewish educators, the working arrangements in several communities, the clarification of issues and the delineation of areas of interest and activity are paving the way for the ultimate resolution of the vexing problem of affiliation. The further " communalization" of the synagogue, the availability of more community funds for congregational schools, and the acceptance of mutual interest and confidence in the development of a more intensive qualitative Jewish education may eventually lead to a full measure of success in terms of affiliation and to an improved system of Jewish education.
EMPHASIS IN PROGRAM

Should the central educational agencies be coordinating agencies in the main, or should their primary function be experimentation and the proposal of a new program for American Jewish education? Recognizing the existence of division of opinion and practice in Jewish life, should the main function of the central educational agencies be to foster the maximum and optimum development of denominational groups, or should they stress common elements in the Jewish heritage? Is it possible, on the one hand to follow the policy of encouraging denominational loyalties and at the same time experiment with new ideas and programs? These questions are all part of the large problem: what shall be the emphasis in the program of the central educational agencies?

In a previous chapter, the conceptions of Beckson, Dushkin and Honor were discussed. Beckson contends that it is the main function of the central educational agency and its leadership to propose (not impose) a pattern of education consisting of minimum and maximum essentials for American Jews without reference to the "issues" prevailing in Jewish life. Such a program must be in consonance with the American way of life and the tradition of Torah. Emphasis must be laid primarily in the "unity" of the common tradition. Within the common heritage there is room for diversity. This is in agreement with American democracy which begins with common accepted ideals and ideas—a consensus within which there is room for diversity.

Honor contends that it is the job of the central educational agency to help each divergent group to develop its optimum and maximum program. In the strengthened diversity lies the vitality of Jewish life in America. There is an underlying unity which calls for understanding each other's problems, tolerating each other and cooperation with each other, but the accent is on diversity as a

---

69/ See Chapter I Part II.
source of a dynamic Judaism which is in agreement with the concept of cultural
pluralism.

Dushkin recognizes the divergencies and accepts them where they are dynamic
and desirable. Like Honor, he sees the need for strengthening them and considers
it the obligation of the community educational agency to work with each group.
However, he has attempted to point up the common elements in the various types
of schools. 70/

The American Association for Jewish Education, the National Coordinating
educational agency, works on the principles outlined by Dr. Honor. Dr. Chipkin,
who helped formulate the guiding principles of the A.A.J.E. is in complete
agreement with the view held by Honor, and in his capacity as director of the
agency, recommended the blueprints for the establishment and functions of central
educational agencies in many communities.

By and large, the community educational agencies have accepted the principle
of "unity in diversity" as proposed by Chipkin, Dushkin and Honor. Yet the
problem of emphasis in program remains a serious one. Are the diversities real?
Do they reflect vital, dynamic differences in Jewish life? Are they reflections
of organizational diversities fostered by vested interests? How can the community
agencies for Jewish education, within the framework of a more or less fixed budget
consisting of designated allocations to the various types of schools, find the
funds to conduct experiments for the emergence of new patterns of American Jewish
education? Should the agencies take the initiative and leadership in promoting
new approaches?

These are the questions for which the central educational agencies must find
satisfactory answers.

70/ A. M. Dushkin, "Common Elements in Jewish Education".
In seeking the answers much more experimentation and research will have to be done. This is not to deny the creative and experimental work conducted successfully by the agencies. As pointed out in the last chapter, the new text and curricular materials, the new methods, the creative supervisory service, the aids for teachers, etc., constitute creative achievements of the central educational agencies. In the neglected areas—pre-school education, high school education, youth and adult education, camping, cooperative activities with group work agencies, etc.—the central educational agencies have taken the lead and have demonstrated the possibilities of new approaches to Jewish education. Admittedly not enough research and experimentation have been conducted. In the future greater emphasis should be laid on this phase of the work (see next chapter).

Naturally, this will depend on the moral and financial support given to the agencies, the professional leadership available to conduct this program and the evolving conditions in Jewish community organization and Jewish life.

4. Professional Leadership.

To conduct a community agency for Jewish education successfully, trained executives and educational specialists are needed. The recruitment and training of personnel for Jewish educational leadership are challenging tasks and problems.

The requirements for such leadership are exceedingly high: Candidates must have advanced university standing, advanced Jewish training, intensive training in pedagogy and religious education. In addition, they must possess personality, executive ability, a sense of dedication and devotion to Jewish life, an understanding of the forces in Jewish life. Under the present conditions in Jewish community organization for Jewish education, they must have the ability to show respect for the divergent views of Judaism, and be ready to help the various groups advance their standards of education. Above all, they must have the conviction and courage to take the leadership in educational work.
These are not easy qualifications to meet under normal circumstances let alone under conditions prevailing in Jewish education.

Dr. Benderly realized from the very start that educational leaders must be trained if American Jewish education was to be developed. As already pointed out above, he took energetic steps to recruit and train young men for leadership. It is doubtful whether Jewish education from the community standpoint would have developed to the degree that it did, had it not been for the group of men trained directly or indirectly for that purpose. The existence of the Bureau of Jewish Education of New York and the reservoir of a small group of American trained Jewish educators had a significant influence on the establishment of the central educational agencies, the development of their programs, and the evolving concept of community responsibility for Jewish education. Benderly continued through the years to emphasize the importance of training for leadership and made numerous efforts to find, influence and train young men and women. Among his many continuing efforts in the late 20's and early 30's, the Kvutzah experiment was the most extensive. Although the plan as conceived by Benderly was not carried out completely, some of the men continued their interest in Jewish education and took positions of leadership.

Unfortunately nothing similar to Benderly's attempts to train leaders was done anywhere in the country. Little was done in the way of training administrators, educational directors, supervisors and consultants, and executives. When in the late 30's and early 40's communal educational agencies were established in quick succession, the American Association for Jewish Education, which played a leading role in the establishment, was faced with the serious dilemma of appoint-
ing qualified executives. Men were placed in positions without training and experience in community leadership, and with little or no theoretic understanding of the basic principles underlying the central educational agencies.

If some of the men succeeded, it was mainly through trial and error method.

In last six years several efforts have been made to meet the situation.

The American Association for Jewish Education has initiated and sponsors annual workshops for the executives of the agencies and affords them opportunities to exchange opinions, ideas and experiences. Through its country-wide contacts the American Association has also been able to recruit some personnel and to encourage teachers, principals and others to prepare themselves for leadership.

The Dropsie College took a most important step forward when it established a School of Education which provides courses leading to a Masters, Doctor of Philosophy and Doctor of Jewish Education, in Jewish education for those already in service and for those planning to make Jewish education their profession. In cooperation with the American Association for Jewish Education, The Dropsie College has made available two fellowships to encourage promising young men to pursue intensive studies in Jewish education.

Yahivah University and the Jewish Theological Seminary have also taken cognizance of the need for trained administrators and supervisory personnel and have established departments for such training.

The problem is far from being solved satisfactorily as yet. Only beginnings have been made. Finding promising young men and guiding through the long process of academic and practical training is no light undertaking. The American Association for Jewish Education, the Dropsie College, and the other educational institutions, will succeed in their efforts when the community begins to recognize that the ultimate success of the central educational agencies and of the systematic approach to the problem of Jewish education will be largely dependent upon the calibre of the professional leadership.
CHAPTER IV - A PROGRAM FOR A COMMUNITY SYSTEM OF JEWISH

EDUCATION

A community system of Jewish education is more than organizational in character, although it must be in context with Jewish community life in its organized form. An ideal system of education must deal with the character of Jewish life, its problems and ideals, both in the past and in the present. It must be rooted in the traditions of the past, but must also reckon with emerging patterns and values; it must look to the future without abandoning the realities of the present.

In proposing a program for a community system of Jewish education, it is, therefore, well to consider:

1. Conditions prevailing in Jewish community organization and in Jewish education.
2. The principles underlying such a system in keeping with these conditions.

1. Conditions Prevailing in Jewish Community Organization and in Jewish Education

a. Community Organization

Organized Jewish life today consists of a multitude and variety of organizations and institutions.\(^1\) Attempts at

---

unity through the establishment of a permanent American Jewish Conference have failed. As pointed out in the first part of this study, in the last fifty years a pattern for overall community in America has been sought, and thus far several forms have been experimented with and have evolved, namely, the premature Kehillah, the Federation, the Welfare Fund and the Jewish Community Council.

What will be the form of American Jewish organizational life in the future? Will the Community Council, which is more democratic in program and objective, become the prevailing form of community organization? Will an organic community be established as proposed by the Reconstructionists? Will community life be organized along religious lines with control by the synagogue over the social service, welfare and recreational activities now conducted independently? It is not the intention of this writer to attempt to answer these questions nor to enter into a full discussion on the subject of community organization of the future. The questions are posed because they have significant implications for organized Jewish education, since Jewish education would inevitably reflect the pattern of community organization.

For the present, the central educational agency is part of the Federation, Welfare Fund or Community Council and is patterned organizationally after one or the other
Is there a Jewish community in the larger sense as defined by Dewey? Does the Jewish community have common aspirations, ideals and hopes for Jewish life in America? Does more efficient organization for fund raising, for philanthropy, for civic protection and the like represent a society, a community?

Certainly there is an abundance of Jewish organizations and institutions but they hardly form one united Jewish community. Perhaps it can be said that the Jewish community consists of many "communities" which are torn by ideological and organizational controversies and rivalries. How real are the apparent differences, it is difficult to say. Some may have originally represented differences which have been substantially modified with the passing of time and may have only historical significance. The preponderant majority of native born Jews, the little or no immigration, may, in the long run, lead to greater homogeneity and the drawing closer together of Jews in America. However, only time alone can tell what the future will bring, and only time will tell whether American Judaism will be an amalgam of past differences, or whether it will reflect everchanging diversities in a democratic Jewish community which has a common past and a common destiny.

Be that as it may, the present rivalries and ideological differences affect the program of the community agency
for Jewish education as of today. Parenthetically, it should be stated that considering the conflicts, disagreements and inability to achieve unity in Jewish community life, it is nothing less than miraculous that central educational agencies have been established and that they have been able to function as well as they do. To be sure, the beginnings of the central educational agencies were related in the main, to providing a Jewish education for the poor, in line with the accepted sanctions of Jewish community organization. But the fact remains that the central educational agencies continued to operate more or less successfully in the field of differentiated Jewish community life in America. Dushkin has called the central educational agency a "social invention." In the light of a differentiated Jewish community life, the limitations of the central educational agencies — both as to structure and function — can be readily understood. The multi-group character of the Jewish population is an actual or potential factor in all efforts at central

4/ In a recent statement Dr. M. M. Kaplan pointed out that the establishment and continuous work of the central educational agencies has illustrated the possibilities of an organic community in an important phase of Jewish life. Quoted in the National Jewish Post.

community organization for Jewish education. A community system for Jewish education must give due consideration to the many conflicting forces and ideological differences that exist in Jewish life and be guided by the underlying principles which brought the central educational agencies into being. However, the differences and conflicts should not be used as a screen for lack of cooperation and lack of effectiveness in the performance of the main function of the central educational agency, namely, the development of a more effective Jewish educational program in America.\footnote{Cf. Berkson, "Jewish Education Achievements and Needs". Dr. Berkson points out that a blank adaptation to existing conditions in education will lead to stagnancy and decline. Combatting complacency is one of the chief functions of the central educational agencies.}
b. Conditions in Jewish Education

A knowledge of the trends in Jewish education is essential to the development of a sound educational system. The highlights of the trends and conditions are presented below.

The Talmud Torah which at one time was looked upon by Jewish educators as the Jewish school, supplementary to the public school, and which was conducted on a five day-a-week schedule, has seen its heyday, has declined in numbers and influence, and it is doubtful whether it can ever regain its former status.

On the other hand, the All-Day School which was considered by Jewish educators as a temporary phenomenon in Jewish education, and as an undesirable development in the framework of America, has shown extraordinary growth. The Yiddishist type of school, at present, has about 5% of the total Jewish school enrollment. The future of these schools is not too hopeful.

The congregational schools have shown the most rapid growth and development. Today more than 82% of the children enrolled in Jewish schools are found in congregational


6/ Dushkin, Jewish Education in New York City, p. 382.

schools. If the present trends continue, and there is no reason to feel that they will not, it is not unlikely that twenty-five years hence will see the congregational school as the preponderant type of Jewish school in America.\(^8\)

The congregational schools for the most part are small in size. The largest schools are Sunday Schools, not weekday schools. The large weekday school with an enrollment of over 200 pupils is the exception rather than the rule.\(^9\)

The large enrollment in the one-day-a-week schools (32.2% of the 286,609 children in the schools in 1950) bears witness to the fact that the majority of Jewish parents considers the one-day-a-week program sufficient for their children. However, despite the availability of the Sunday School with its abbreviated schedules and programs, there is still a very large percentage of Jewish children who receive little or no Jewish education.

It is to be noted that the Hebraic Nursery and Kindergarten, called the Foundation School, is an interesting and

\(^8\) Engelman, "Jewish Education in Facts and Figures", p. 35.

\(^9\) Even in New York, there are few schools with an enrollment of more than 500 pupils. A generation ago, the large school (the Talmud Torah type) was the rule.
and significant educational development. The pioneer school, the Beth Hayeled, was founded in 1939 by the Ivriah, the women's Division of the J.E.A. of New York. Its program is bi-cultural in character and children are admitted at the age of three and remain until the age of eight or nine when they enter the public schools and supplementary Jewish week-day schools. While the Beth Hayeled is the only one of its kind in the country, other communities have shown increasing interest in its development and have established nurseries and kindergartens either as independent units, or part of the all-day schools, or part of the congregational school program. Few central educational agencies conduct nurseries under their own auspices. 10/ If the present trends continue, however, the Foundation School is likely to become an integral part of the weekday school program.

A great potential for Jewish education is the growth and development of Jewish camping. Whereas for many years, the summer months were almost a total loss to Jewish education, the experiments in Jewish camping have proved so successful that they have opened up new vistas for Jewish living and Jewish education.

10/e.g. Camden Bureau conducts a Nursery School directed by the Bureau. The Associated or United Hebrew School agencies conduct Nursery and Kindergarten programs. e.g. Detroit, Minneapolis, Indianapolis.
In the field of secondary education the enrollment in the high schools established in many cities is only about 4% of that in the elementary schools. 11/ Considering the importance of adolescent education, this is a serious state of affairs. It is encouraging to note, 12/ however, that with the development of central educational agencies, greater emphasis has been put on adolescent education and the enrollment is growing slowly.

Institutes and Colleges of Jewish Studies are growing in number and provision, although inadequate, is being made for adult education. In the light of the dearth of informed lay and professional leadership, and the many who are Jewish illiterates, adult Jewish education takes on important significance. 12a/ It is a challenge to the Jewish community and particularly to the central educational agency.

The teacher training program in America is inadequate from the point of view of program and from the view of supplying the increasing demands for qualified personnel. 13/

12/ See Supra discussion on high schools.
12a/ Cf. M. W. Kaplan, The Future of the American Jew: "Jewish Education must be primarily adult education".
13/ L. Hurwich, "The Hebrew Teacher Training Schools."
The status of the Jewish teaching profession, despite the many strides forward, is not established firmly. We have hardly been able to obtain for the Jewish teacher those elements of security and permanence without which it is impossible to attract the right kind of young men and women into the profession. This, by far, is the most serious condition in Jewish education today and calls for radical measures.14/

It is likely that the Jewish Center will become more concerned with Jewish content and Jewish values. At least, the emphasis upon Jewish content was recommended in the Janowsky J.W.E. Survey of 1948 and the recommendation was adopted by the lay and professional leadership of the J.W.E. A broad view of Jewish education and group work will help eliminate the line of demarcation between formal class work and the Jewish activities in informal club work, and should lead to important developments in both fields.

In the area of curriculum construction and methodology much has been done, but no agreement has been reached as to the minimum essentials required in the training of American Jews. No central goal in Jewish education has been accepted. New ideas, new subjects, new methods have been introduced.

14/ I bid. Mr. Hurwisch suggests the establishment of teacher training schools on the same basis as the All-Day schools where prospective teachers would receive an integrated secular and Jewish training in preparation for teaching.
but they do not represent a complete philosophy of Jewish life and Jewish education in consonance with conditions in America. 15/ Drs. Berkson and Kaplan have proposed programs for an American Jewish education based on their outlook in Jewish life, but these await acceptance and implementation. Common elements in Jewish education have been proposed by Dushkin16/ and they have been the subject of discussion by professionals in several cities, but no definitive programs have been worked out as yet. Admittedly, what is happening in Jewish education is a reflection of the larger problems of Jewish life in America — and the lack of agreement as to minimum essentials may be viewed in that light. But this very fact may be all the more reason why the Jewish educator — alert to conditions and trends — should take the lead in evolving an educational program which looks to the future development and reconstruc-

15/ Cf. Horace Kallen, "Critical Problems in Jewish Education", Jewish Education XIX, no. 3: In discussing the central educational agency, Dr. Kallen says that it represents a positive step forward in the direction of service: "It is, however, a step taken rather more in the course of blind adjustment to the exigencies of time and place, than a step taken in the fulfillment of an educational program based on a thorough-going analysis of the problems presented by the struggle of the American Jewish community to live, to grow and to make its own contribution to the life and culture of the nation." p. 16.

tion of Jewish life.\textsuperscript{17/}

A community system for Jewish education must give full consideration to the conditions briefly outlined above.

2. The Principles Underlying A Community System of Jewish Education

a. The principle of community responsibility

The Jewish community is responsible for Jewish education. In a sense all Jews are responsible for all Jewish children. More definitively, this principle means that Jewish education is a three way partnership between the parents, the local congregation or institution and the community. Without the third partner — the community — the other two cannot fulfill their obligations effectively and adequately.

Community responsibility is defined to mean: conducting and coordinating the work of the schools, maintaining and developing standards, improving the quality of instruction, publishing texts and materials, increasing and extending opportunities for Jewish education, experimenting with new approaches to Jewish education, conducting research, regulating the status of the teacher and providing for their training, engaging in the promotion and propaganda of Jewish

\textsuperscript{17/} Cf. I. B. Berkson, "Jewish Education, Achievements and Needs"; Dr. Berkson points out that we cannot wait for a "well digested philosophy of Jewish life. Jewish education must be in the forefront and help shape the philosophy of life;" See also M. M. Kaplan, The Future of the American Jew, p. 442. Educators should "dedicate themselves to the task of utilizing the very process of
of Jewish education.

Financially, it means that a good system of education cannot be achieved without the necessary support from central communal sources to carry on its work adequately and to render aid to schools for the maintenance of high standards. The Federation, or Welfare Fund or community Council must view the work and program of the central educational agency as much broader than a philanthropic enterprise. Jewish education must be looked upon as an integral part of the general Jewish community program of social services and must be included on the basis of priority; as a matter of right and not of nuisance value or toleration. This is based on the idea that without adequate provision for Jewish education there will be no Jewish community. Or there may be a Jewish community, without Judaism.

It is further held that a central communal agency for Jewish education is an absolute necessity in every community of reasonable size in order to fulfill the community's responsibility for Jewish education.

17/ (cont'd.) education for the purpose of developing an acceptable version of the Jewish tradition, and preparing the ground for Jewish communal work."


The need for the central educational agency becomes even more urgent in the light of a differentiated Jewish life. Dr. Honor has aptly called this the principle of Al Ahat Kamah V'Kamah: 17a/ The very conditions of Jewish life make a unifying force imperative. It is wrong to assume that because Jewish life and education is becoming increasingly denominational in character, the need for the central educational is lessened. On the contrary, there is the danger that increasing fragmentation will lead to misunderstandings and bitter controversies. There is the very serious danger of the possible development of separate and distinct communities instead of each group feeling itself part of a single community. The central educational agency is in a position and regards it as one of its obligations not only to help Jews of different opinions to understand and appreciate each other's views in education, but also to help them to tolerate and appreciate each other's views on Judaism and the future of Jewish life in America. Through the central educational agency, it can be impressed on the Jewish community that nobody can have a genuine complete education who has learned only the point of view and attitudes of one sect or group or faction. "To be complete", writes Dr. Horace Kallen, "education in the Jewish being must embrace

studying, knowing, understanding sympathetically and judging objectively not one set of values affirmed by one sect or party, but all the values of all the sects and all the parties and their interaction." 18/

Interaction between the different ideological groups is a cogent and sound reason for the principle of community responsibility in Jewish education.

b. Jewish Education is Supplementary to General Education

The Jewish school is to be viewed as supplementary to the public school in a double sense — in point of time and in the dynamic relationship and relevance to the principles of the public schools. 19/ Supplementary education means more than that it should not interfere with general education. "It implies," writes Dr. Berkson, "that the educational principles underlying the Jewish school must be in harmony with American education." 20/
The general purpose should be to interrelate the two systems of culture in the life of the growing child and to produce an enriched and unified personality. 21/


20/ Berkson, ibid.

21/ Cf. L. L. Honor, "The Function of a Community Agency for Jewish Education"; Dr. Honor points out that "that all types of Jewish education must reckon with the needs of American Jewish children and must prepare them to live
If Jewish education is supplementary to general education what is our position in regard to the All-Day Schools? In the 20's and 30's Jewish educators were opposed to the All-Day School type of Jewish education on principle and in practice and saw no possibility of its development in America. Educators still hold to the view that Jewish education is supplementary to the public schools, but the general attitude to the All-Day School has changed. The growth of the All-Day School has convinced most educators that this type of education is possible in America and that it is needed. No longer confined to the Orthodox group, and conducted by Yiddishists and Conservative synagogues as well, the growth of the All-Day School has been phenomenal. It is here to stay and will most likely continue to grow. This writer holds and defends the conviction that there is a need for a minority of our children to obtain a more intensive or more integrated type of Jewish training than is now possible under the present conditions of supplementary Jewish education.21/ 

21/ (cont'd.) intelligently as Jews and Americans." p.61. Cf. A. M. Dushkin, "Democracy and Jewish Education", Jewish Education, XIV, No. 2 (1942). Dr. Dushkin points out in former times Jewish education was related to the Haskalah and Nationalism. Cannot Jewish education be now in terms of democracy as the significant idea for Jewish education? "We can no longer satisfy ourselves with the implicit relationship which we know to exist between Torah and Democracy. We, too, are called upon to make the relationships explicit and thereby render the democratic vision clearer and dearer... Our educational task is to organise our teaching and refocus it so that everything we teach...will be pointed toward making explicit
The writer espouses the cause of the All-Day School in the conviction that it can serve a dual purpose in Jewish life. In the first place, it can serve as an important factor for intensification and as a reservoir for the cultural and professional leadership, who should receive an intensive Jewish education. Secondly, as a semi-private school it can afford a Jewish educational opportunity for those children who would ordinarily attend private schools, and whose parents seek an integrated program of Jewish and general studies, in preference to the program conducted in the so-called non-sectarian private schools which do not include any Jewish subjects.

The acceptance of the All-Day School as part of the community system of Jewish education does not in any way negate the fundamental principle that Jewish education is supplementary to the public school. The All-Day School is to be viewed as a minority type which must remain a minority type in light of our commitment to the public school as an important instrument of the democratic way of life.

Under the supervision of the community system of Jewish

21/ (cont'd.) for our children the identification of Torah with the Democratic Vision." p. 4.

education and with financial aid for its Hebrew department, the All-Day School can make an invaluable contribution to Jewish life.

c. The Principle of Integrated Unity

An American Jewish educational system must be viewed as a totality. This means that all phases of Jewish education deserve equal treatment, that all are interwoven and interdependent and that no one aspect should be singled out for support to the neglect of others.

While it is true that the foundation of the Jewish school system, organically the work of the elementary schools depends upon the other units of the educational system. Good work cannot be achieved in the elementary schools unless the children are taught by good teachers. But good teachers cannot be trained unless the teacher training institutions are "fed" by qualified young people from high schools in which graduates of elementary schools continue their education. It follows logically that from the beginners' grades in the elementary schools to the high schools to the teacher training institutions or to the College of General Jewish Studies there must be a continuous interrelated process of Jewish education. It is also clear that teachers in order to do a more effective job need economic security and need educational guidance and supervision and need a feeling of belonging to a larger group — a Jewish educational fellowship or profession.
It follows that supervision and effective teaching depend upon better texts, curricular materials and methods.

To help create a community of literate Jews, youth and adult education form an important link in the process of education, in the organic unity. Viewed from a large communal and broad outlook in American Jewish life, the principle of integrated unity implies the avoidance of creating a dualism between elementary and secondary education; between youth and adult education, between formal and informal education. In regard to formal and informal education, the principle of unity holds that they are part of the same Jewish educational process. It recognizes that the Jewish experiences and activities engaged in by the children in the Jewish Center have direct bearing upon the total personality of the child. A unified program seeks an integration and interrelation of the Jewish school and Jewish Center in time schedule, facilities, programs, methods and personnel.

A unified system of education is conditioned upon cooperation and integration among communally supported schools as well as those schools supported by congregations. It aims to integrate all ideological groupings in order to create a communal sense (Klal Yisroel) in Jewish education and in American Jewish life.
In fine, the principle of unity focuses attention upon the whole of the educational process rather than upon any single aspects of it, and upon the interrelation of educational work.

d. The Principle of School and Society

This principle holds that the intellectual, cultural and social aspects of life are integral parts of the same educative process taking into full consideration the individual and the natural tendencies with which he is endowed. It holds that the school loses its vitality and meaning to the child, if it is divorced from the stream of life.

John Dewey has pointed out that the communication of common ideas and common understanding cannot be achieved only by intellectual processes, by the transmission of abstract ideas and by the study of books and literature. Real social communication involves common experiences, engaging in meaningful common activities, in sharing and living together. It involves participation and cooperation in the life of the community. A unified system of Jewish education means not only an interrelation between the different aspects of Jewish education and the different types of schools, but also a close relation to Jewish

community life and the day to day experiences of the child and adult in conformity with life under American conditions. An organic system of education is built on the premise that the school, although an important agency, is only one of several instruments making for Jewish education. To be complete, a Jewish educational system must have reference to the effect on the child of the institutional life, of the home, of the synagogue, of the customs and folkways, of the Jewish people. "In using the term education", writes Dr. Berkson, "we must bear in mind that the school is part of the many-sided influences of society". 24/

e. The Principle of Experimentation

The diversities in Jewish life as reflected in the various types of schools should be recognized and accepted under the present conditions in American Jewish life. Recognizing and assisting each differentiated group in the attainment of its maximum and optimum program is a worthwhile and significant objective in a unified system of Jewish education. Strong units and links will make the total educational system strong. The "leverage" principle — establishing and maintaining standards — should play an important role in developing the programs of the various school types. However, such a program is not adequate.

A total community program of Jewish education should make provision for an experimental center where new methods, new formulations of curriculum, new texts and materials, and the program for the Jewish school of tomorrow can be worked out. Not only must services be rendered to the differentiated groups in accordance with their needs, but the community system of Jewish education must produce something of its own which represents the best conceptions in Jewish education. This program of experimentation should not and could not be imposed but it should be proposed.

f. The Principle of Educational Leadership

The Jewish educator must seek the assistance and cooperation of all those engaged in the task of Jewish education: rabbis, teachers, lay people. He must recognize the growing partnership between the Jewish educator, the group worker and social worker and must seek their cooperation and assistance too. Above all, it is his task to give leadership and see, initiate, and propose new ways of making the Jewish educational process more effective and more meaningful to American Jews.

A PROGRAM FOR A COMMUNITY SYSTEM OF

JEWISH EDUCATION

Taking into consideration the conditions in Jewish community organization and Jewish education, and keeping in mind the six principles enunciated above, the writer proposes a community system of Jewish education consisting of two interrelated parts:

A. Experimentation

B. 1. Administrative Activities and Services
   2. Financial Activities and Services
   3. Educational Activities and Services

A. Experimentation

There is general agreement among Jewish educators that experimentation must play a role in the program of the central educational agency. They do not agree on the procedures and the degree of emphasis to be placed upon it in the total program of the agency. Dushkin and Honor advocate experimentation within each organized ideological grouping "with a view of discovering more effective content, method, techniques and educational organization for the achievement of its aims".26/ Berkson and Dinin accept the idea of encouraging each group to conduct experiments, but stress the need for experimental schools sponsored and maintained by the central educational agency under its own

26/ Honor, "The Function of a Community Agency for Jewish Education", p. 60. Dr. Honor also states that "experimentation in completely new conceptions of Jewish education be stimulated."
auspices for the express purpose of working out suitable educational programs, curricula, methods of teaching, administrative methods, co-curricular activities, etc.27/

The writer accepts the principle of experimentation as proposed by Dushkin and Honor, but also subscribes to the plan proposed by Berkson and Dinin. Experimentation in the schools of the various groups has serious drawbacks: In the first place, proper conditions for experimental work may not exist due to the traditions of the particular school, problems of personnel, finances, possible interference by lay and professional leadership. Secondly, the experimental work in a particular group may have direct bearing upon its own program, but it may or may not have wider implications for the total program of Jewish education. The experimentation will, of necessity, be denominational in character and hence limited in scope. There is always the thought that working within an ideological group, one must not question the basis and objectives of the program lest it be construed as interference with ideological autonomy. Silence about fundamentals may lead to inferior education, and, as Dr. J. S. Golub has put it, encourage the schools to do those things which

---

should not be done at all. Thirdly, experimentation calls for freedom of action in choice of personnel, methods, administration, finances. An experimental school, to accomplish its objectives must be under direct community control, financially and educationally. This writer doubts whether the Beth Hayeled, sponsored by the Jewish Education Association of New York and later by the Jewish Education Committee could have succeeded as well as it did, if it had been conducted within the framework of one or the other ideological groups.

The program of experimentation on the elementary level would be two-fold:

1. The maintenance of an experimental school or schools by the central educational agency as an important part of its program.

2. Cooperation with existing schools in developing an experimental program, providing there exist the proper conditions for such a program. 28/

An experimental school, maintained by the community, would work out new educational patterns, experiment with and prepare new texts and materials, afford opportunities

---

28/ To cite an illustration: In 1950, Gratz College was invited by a congregational school to develop its curriculum, to supervise its teachers closely and to institute more progressive approaches to Jewish education. For four years, the Phila. Council on Jewish Education provided consultation service to a congregational school for the development of the unit approach in teaching. The weakness in this experimental work lay in the lack of control of type of personnel employed and the extent of the program. Despite these difficulties, however, some progress along this experimental line was being made. But
to the better teachers to do research and experimentation in new methods and approaches, provide opportunities for model lessons, serve as one of the important schools of observation and practice, and would publish teaching experiments. Such a school might also attempt to experiment with an integrated Jewish School–Jewish Center program similar to the pattern of the Central Jewish Institute of some thirty years ago, the Schiff Center experiment, and similar programs. The possibilities of "minimum essentials" for American Jews would be investigated.

Fear has been expressed that a program of experimentation conducted in a school or schools under the direct auspices of the community, would be contrary to the principle of working with all groups since it seems to imply the development of one pattern or type of Jewish education. Furthermore, since the central educational agency is committed to many groups, it should not be identified in the minds of the people with this or that school type.29/

28/ (cont'd.) the rabbi resigned, there was a complete shifting of personnel, the experiment was given up and the entire value of the experiment vitiated.

29/ Cf. A. M. Dushkin, "Next Decade of Jewish Education in New York City", Jewish Education, XII, No. 2, p. 69-71; Proceedings of the 16th Annual Conference of the National Council of Jewish Education", Jewish Education, XIII, No. 3 (1942) p. 220 f. In answer to Dr. Berkowitz's contention that the present policy of non-committal to a definite educational policy means permitting the present divisions to fester, Dr. Dushkin stated that one cannot carry on Jewish education without a viewpoint or philosophy which must of necessity represent a particular background and outlook. The educator who is engaged in directing the community program cannot have the same
This fear is unfounded. The central educational agency is not to devote itself exclusively to experimental work. However, experimentation must be recognized as an essential part of the agency’s work. Furthermore, it does not necessarily follow that only one curriculum or schedule must be developed. An experimental school should seek to work out different curricula and schedules and devise means of measuring their effectiveness and validity.30/

Experimentation implies a continuous process of discovering new ideas, new techniques, new approaches which may evolve into several types of school curricula. In addition, it must be emphasized that change would be effected only through the force of persuasion and public opinion and not

---

29/ (cont’d.) approach as the one who directs a particular school.
Cf. also L. L. Honor, "The Function of a Community Agency for Jewish Education", p. 61: "An agency working with all elements of the community and interested in encouraging all elements to work out their educational programs in accordance with their respective interpretations of Judaism, cannot place its approval upon any one particular curriculum". Dr. Honor makes it clear, however, that with the aid of the parents not satisfied with any of the existing curricula, the central educational agency can experiment with new forms and new approaches. Any approach, however, which has a specific ideological background cannot be put forth by the agency for all Jewish children.

30/ Berkson’s program of a common school would permit variations of interpretation. Each educational body, or school staff would work out its own conception and emphasis giving due consideration to the parents’ views.
by fiat. In short, without imposing any given program, through the experimentation progress, the central educational agency would be given an opportunity to propose a program for the Jewish school of tomorrow.\footnote{31/}

It may not be possible for every educational agency to conduct experimental schools, but certainly in the larger communities — Baltimore, Boston, Chicago, Los Angeles, Newark, New York, Philadelphia — it is within the realm of possibility.

In regard to experimental work within ideological groupings, the central educational agency should take the initiative to encourage individual schools or groups of schools to undertake experimental work and should provide financial assistance to make it possible.\footnote{32/}

\footnote{31/ Cf. B. Rosen, "Jewish Education - What Program Should the Community Support?" \textit{Jewish Education}, IX, No. 1 (1957).}

\footnote{32/ The Jewish Education Committee of New York has introduced such specialized experimental programs as Post Beth Hayeled classes at Anshe Chesed, an integrated Yeshivah curriculum at Ramah Academy, an integrated school-center program at Schiff Center, a program for a full-time Sunday School teacher, a week-end club program at the Downtown Talmud Torah, programs for foster home children and problem youth. See "Progress in Jewish Educational Endeavor in New York City Under the Auspices of the J.E.C." (1939-1949); also A. K. Dushkin, "Jewish Education Committee of New York, Outline of Activities and Projects" (1949).}
Experimentation on the elementary school level is only one aspect of this work. The central educational agency should conduct experiments in other areas. Three are given as illustrations:

1. The summer vacation program
2. Youth and adult education
3. Recruitment and training of personnel

1. The Summer Vacation Program

In most cities, Jewish schools are closed in the summer. It is doubtful whether it would be possible to keep the schools open twelve months and continue the regular year-round program during the summer, and it is also questionable whether under present conditions it would be desirable. The answer lies in the three-fold program of camp, home camps and summer informal educational programs in the schools. The camp education has great significance for Jewish living and Jewish study. In developing the camp, the central educational agency can do the following: conduct a camp under its own auspices, or provide scholarships to those camps which make definite provision for systematic Jewish studies, and lay emphasis on Jewish education through Jewish living.

In view of the fact that country camping is expensive and the average parent cannot afford to send his children,
country camps will, at best, take care of a minority of Jewish children. The home or day camp has a far greater potential. The costs are not prohibitive and most parents are able to pay the tuition fee. It is in these camps, sponsored by the central educational agencies, alone or in cooperation with the recreational agencies, that a large number of Jewish children could be accommodated and where an integrated program of formal and informal education could be conducted without the usual encumbrances encountered in the Jewish schools during the regular school year. The day camp can provide opportunities of Jewish group living for children already enrolled in Jewish schools and also give initial Jewish experiences to children as yet not enrolled in Jewish schools. The day camp can play an important role in building positive attitudes and in encouraging Jewish children to begin or continue their Jewish studies.

In addition to the day camps, some schools should be kept open for informal Jewish educational work such as library reading periods, Jewish clubs of various kinds, special assemblies (e.g. Bialik and Herzl anniversaries, Tish B'Ab), trips to historic places and museums.

The summer vacation program would provide teachers with sorely needed additional income.

Cooperation with the Jewish Center in the development of the day camps essential in several respects: the joint
operation of camps, joint training programs for counsellors, joint program planning and preparation of materials.

2. Youth and Adult Education

Youth and adult education is largely a neglected area in Jewish education. As pointed out above, a unified system of Jewish education will focus attention on the whole of the educational process rather than upon particular aspects of it. Due recognition will be given to youth and adult education. The central educational agency should experiment extensively with courses for adolescents who have had little or no schooling, and develop a broad program of adult Jewish education, especially for young men and women.

Coordination and supervision of youth groups should be included in the program of the central educational agency. Educational consultants should be provided for youth groups to help them intensify the Jewish content of their program. Experiments should be conducted in existing youth clubs and, if at all possible, the central educational agency should sponsor youth groups of its own (The Jewish Youth League of Chicago, the League of Jewish Youth of New York are examples of this kind of work). Special stipends and scholarships should be made available to young people who could be influenced to make a career of Jewish education or other Jewish communal professions.

As in camping, youth and adult education must be conducted in cooperation with the Jewish Center and other
communal agencies. In the past few years, there has been much discussion about the need for cooperative efforts, but too little has been done. The central educational agency and other communal agencies should embark upon an energetic exploration and implementation of areas of cooperation with the end of view of integrating and correlating their programs bearing upon the total development and growth of Jewish youth and adults. Such a program calls for a broad program of experimentation, the creation of materials and a new approach to the training of personnel.

3. Recruitment and Training of Personnel

In the area of recruiting and training personnel, radical and bold steps must be taken by the Jewish community, if a good system of Jewish education is to be built in America. The situation today is even more serious than it was in 1910. At that time, there was a recognition of the need for American trained teachers, but until they could be trained, there was a reservoir of Jewish teachers among the immigrants arriving in this country in large numbers. Undoubtedly many American Jewish teachers have been trained during the last forty years. The establishment of central educational agencies, the unification of schools, the improvement of teacher standards and status, the creation of a semblance of a system of Jewish education, have encouraged young men and women to make Jewish education their profession.
Nevertheless, the American Jewish Community is faced with a serious dearth of teachers generally, and the lack of qualified teachers, supervisors, administrators, principals, educational directors. This constitutes a serious challenge. It is a total community problem affecting all types of schools, and warrants the attention of all community forces in the effort to find a satisfactory solution. The central educational agency must take the lead in the development of a sound policy of recruiting personnel and in the transformation of the teacher training program. The following are the steps which should be taken:

a) To bring young people into the Jewish education profession, the Jewish community through the central educational agency must assure them a living wage, security and tenure.\[55/\]

Undoubtedly, as pointed out in the chapter on "Activities and Achievements", progress has been made in the last forty

\[55/\] At the 1951 National Conference on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, a twelve-point program was proposed for attracting and holding public school teachers. In the main, the program could apply to the Jewish teaching profession. It calls for: 1 - a beginning salary comparable to that paid college graduates in other professions; 2 - a maximum salary sufficient to maintain a family; 3 - salary schedules based on preparation and experience; 4 - illness and accident insurance; 5 - a retirement system; 6 - security in position with dismissal for cause only; 7 - freedom to a personal life subject to no more restraint than are applied to other good citizens; 8 - allowance for study, travel and relaxation; 9 - a sense of professional growth and a pride in the dignity and importance of teaching; 10 - a democratic, cooperative school administration; 11 - personnel procedures that are impersonal, considerate and just; 12 - an instrument through which the collective voice of the teachers may be heard. Benjamin Fine; "Education in Review", New York Times, Sunday, July 1, 1951.
years, but there are still just a few cities that recognize the principle of tenure and only a few have adopted a maximum salary scale above $4,000 per annum.

b) A strong licensing system is required to keep out the unqualified. Dinin suggests city or nation-wide examinations for graduates of teaching training institutions. The practice of accrediting the graduates of certain institutions automatically should not be continued, since it tends to put the stamp of approval on the weaknesses and deficiencies of teacher training institutions.\textsuperscript{34} The establishment of the National Board of License and the program which it is attempting to introduce for a stronger licensing system are steps in the direction of higher standards for teaching personnel.

c) The teacher training institutions do not graduate a sufficient number of teachers to fill the needs of the larger cities, let alone the growing needs for qualified personnel in the smaller communities. The educational agencies in the latter communities where there are no teacher training institutions will have to look to their own resources, and train their own teachers on a local or regional basis. If a regional training school cannot be established, the local agencies will have to provide training up to a certain point and then send the students to teacher training institutions on a scholarship basis.\textsuperscript{35}

\textsuperscript{34} Dinin, "Jewish Education Faces the Future", p. 16.
\textsuperscript{35} cf. A. Kessler, op. cit.
training institutions would have to encourage the outlying communities to prepare students, and would have to conduct courses during the summer, preferably at a summer camp especially designed for this purpose, for those who could not take courses during the normal school year.

4) A teacher training program in consonance with conditions today calls for a transformation of the existing teacher training schools. The reduction of the teaching schedule to fifteen, and ten hours per week, makes the inclusion of training for group work, adult education, early childhood education, camping, etc. imperative. It is the responsibility of the communal agency for Jewish education to point up the needed changes in the light of the existing conditions, and in those communities where it has a direct relationship to the teacher training institutions, take the initiative in making changes in the teacher training program.36/

8) The most crucial problem is to find promising young men and women and to bring them into the Jewish education profession. In this work the assistance of rabbis, social workers, lay leaders must be sought. As Benderly and Kaplan did in the first two decades, the college campuses must be combed for interested young people who can be

influenced to pursue a career in Jewish education or related Jewish professions. The cooperation of the Hillel Foundations whose membership runs into thousands should be enlisted. An effort should be made to work out special arrangements with the universities and colleges in the training program for Jewish teachers.\textsuperscript{37/}

The better and interested students in the Hebrew High Schools, in the teacher training institutions should be singled out for special attention, encouraged and advised of the opportunities in Jewish education. Experiments similar to the ones conducted successfully by Dr. Benderly should be undertaken.\textsuperscript{38/} The Leadership Training Fellowship program of the United Synagogue is an interesting pattern of training young people for leadership and the central educational agency should not only work with these groups, but should seek to devise other patterns of training youth for leadership with particular emphasis on Jewish education. The educational summer camps can very well serve as a reservoir for prospective candidates for the teaching profession. Special scholarships should be provided for them to help them continue their Jewish studies.


\textsuperscript{38/} A. P. Gannes and L. Schem, "The Kvutzah and Camp Ashvah", \textit{Jewish Education XX}, No. 3, p. 61; also D. Rudavsky, "The Bureau of Jewish Education after 1919".
Worthy young people can be found in every community who can be induced and encouraged to make a career of Jewish education. This must not be left to chance, but must be pursued with conviction and determination.

The section on recruitment and training of personnel has been included under experimentation because Jewish educators need to seek out, explore, and experiment with new ways and means of solving the problem upon which rests the future of Jewish education in America.

B. 1. Administrative Activities and Services

A united community system of Jewish education, which emphasizes the correlation and the interdependence of all aspects of Jewish education, can function effectively if the schools are administered and controlled by the central educational agency for the total community. Such a plan would be a compromise between the loosely organized system of Jewish education today and the completely controlled association of schools, known as the United or Associated Hebrew Schools.

The educational, philosophical or religious viewpoint would be determined by the local school or institution and would not be interfered with by the central educational administrative body. Ideological autonomy would be left intact and no attempt would be made to impose a set curriculum on the school. 30/

30/ In essence, this proposal agrees with Dinin's viewpoint. The subject of a community school system has been discussed publicly in Los Angeles and has been considered by the Bureau of Jewish Education and its affiliated schools. See S. Dinin, "A Community System of Jewish Schools", p. 3.
More definitely, it means that the local school, an affiliate of the central educational agency, would have to accept active participation by the central educational agency in the conduct of its school and in the maintenance of standards. 40/

Under present conditions and in view of the voluntary nature of Jewish education, the writer does not envisage the acceptance of the plan by fiat or compulsion. It will have to depend on the recognition by lay and professional leaders that such a plan will redound to the benefit of Jewish education in every local school and to the advancement of Klal Yisroel. Persuasion and public opinion will still play a significant role as they do today in Jewish education. But more than persuasion will be needed. The central educational agency will have to demonstrate the possibilities of the plan in the actual day to day work in those schools which have associated themselves with the integrated and unified Jewish educational system. The successful performance may be an incentive to others to join the plan. Furthermore, the plan is based on the assumption that community funds will be available for allocation to schools for the maintenance of standards.

40/ Cf. Dinin, "A Community System of Jewish Education". Dinin spells out a plan whereby board members of the central educational agency would serve on local school boards and committees and help them in determining administrative and financial policies.
Helping schools financially will be a further incentive to schools to join the overall plan for Jewish education, and to give the community educational agency certain administrative powers.

In high school and adult education, a community system of Jewish education would be functional and have administrative control. In other areas, too, such as conducting choral and dramatic groups, developing a general Jewish library for adults, conducting book and gift shops and in providing a Jewish education for children in special institutions, the central educational agency would be functional. In general, it would be the policy of the community educational agency to be functional in neglected areas of Jewish education.

It is suggested that the plan can function effectively in small and middle-sized Jewish communities. The problems in New York, Chicago and Philadelphia are complex and difficulties to overcome greater and more serious, but even in the large communities more administrative control could be effected in some schools, especially those which receive substantial funds from the community. Indirect administrative control might be enforced through the medium of more stringent requirements for affiliation.

The experiment in Schenectady might serve as a pattern for a unified system of Jewish schools in the smaller communities. Admittedly, the plan tried in Schenectady is in jeopardy because one recalcitrant rabbi is intent upon
destroying it.

This only proves that the obstacles are great. In the opinion of the writer, however, they are not insurmountable. If one experiment fails because of jealousies and vested interests, others will have to be tried until the community leadership is convinced that a community system of Jewish education is the most valid one for the enhancement of Jewish education and the concept of Klal Yisroel.

The following are the reasons for proposing a community system of Jewish education with administrative control:

1. The central educational agency as presently constituted follows a policy of "watchful waiting". In almost every city, new neighborhoods with considerable Jewish population are developing. The central educational agency has no authority or power or resources to plan the educational program in terms of facilities, the type of program needed to meet neighborhood conditions, and the overall direction of Jewish education. The central educational agency has no authority to close schools in declining neighborhoods, to transfer them to new neighborhoods, or to open schools there. In new neighborhoods it would be easier to establish greater authority than to get authority over existing schools. Yet the central educational agency
has not assumed such authority or has not asserted its authority.41/

In brief, the central educational agency's role in blueprinting for the expanding needs of Jewish education is negligible.42/

A central educational agency with administrative control of the total educational program would be able to make periodic surveys and studies of population and neighborhoods to determine what curriculum would best suit the needs and philosophy of the community, and would be able to plan the opening of new schools and even the construction of new buildings. Different schools, of course, would follow different ideological patterns if necessary. The difference between the surveys and studies conducted by

41/ In private conversations, Dr. Honor has pointed out again and again that one of the reasons why congregational schools may have developed in new neighborhoods, may be the lack of initiative of Hechal Torah Associations or other central educational agencies to open community schools in the new neighborhoods. In the opinion of this writer, it is also due to the fact that opening of new schools was not considered a function of the central educational agency.

42/ In Philadelphia it can be cited as an example. Several new neighborhoods have developed. The facilities for educating the thousands of Jewish children are few. The Council on Jewish Education has been practically helpless in the face of the tremendous challenge and has waited for the different school systems and local committees to make their plans. The competition among the school systems complicates the matter. The neighborhoods remain without adequate school facilities. Even when the local group turns to the central educational agency, the most it can get is advice. Furthermore, the local group "shops around" among other agencies and tries to get the most out of one or another agency. The experience in Philadelphia has been the experience in other cities. See B. Isaaco, "The History of the United Hebrew Schools of Detroit", Jewish Education, XVIII, No. 1, p. 80 f.; S. Fisch, "A Community Agency for Jewish Education", Jewish Education XVI, no. 2, p. 87;
the agencies as presently constituted and those conducted under the new plan would lie in the ability and authority of the central educational agencies to implement their findings and recommendations.

b. Small and competing schools create a difficult problem. Under present conditions, the merger of small schools, even of the same ideological outlook, cannot be achieved easily. Usually, the schools are poorly housed, employ unqualified teachers and provide little or no supervision. This makes for ineffective and inefficient education. 43/

Central administrative control would make possible the establishment of larger school units, 44/ and would eliminate competition and even make possible the housing of schools of different ideologies in one building. 45/

---


43 In describing the situation in Rochester, J. Pileh wrote: "Six out of nine schools were situated in a section of the city which was continually deteriorating. In an area of twelve square blocks there were five schools affiliated with the J.E.A., and three private Hadarim. There was competition among the schools.... The J.E.A. was helpless to change conditions. The schools could not be consolidated because four out of the five represented three different ideologies in Jewish education..... A merger did take place between the two Talmud Torahs and many children left the Talmud Torah and joined the private Heder" — J. Pileh, "A Community Agency for Jewish Education", p. 27. In Philadelphia, most of the Orthodox congregational schools are in difficult straits educationally, financially, and administratively. They exist side by side in some neighborhoods and conduct small schools or they have schools close to communally supported schools, but insist on conducting their own schools, although the schools are not far apart ideologically.
e. In view of the differentiated educational programs now prevailing in Jewish education, the writer accepts the principle of influence without control in philosophical and ideological matters. There is no reason, however, for the principle to apply in administrative matters. The prevailing loose system of administration makes for inefficient management, poor supervision, and unnecessary duplication — all of which have an injurious effect on the total educational program. Due to the lack of administrative control, no central educational agency has been able to coordinate, plan and make real provision for Jewish education in its totality for the entire community.

44/ The Essex County plan for Jewish education calls for the reorganization of the thirty-seven existing schools into several neighborhood school areas with one or two consolidated schools in each. This was proposed because "the multiplication of school units was accompanied by a diffusion and dissipation of community responsibility and support of Jewish education" Jewish Education in Essex County, Part III - Report of Survey Committee on Jewish Education, Group Work and Jewish Population, p. 7. The plan includes the raising of capital funds by the Jewish community Council of Essex County for the erection of school buildings for the consolidated schools. It also calls for the establishment of a community-directed and community-supervised system of Jewish education — to function through the Jewish Education Ass'n in conjunction with neighborhood school boards and a community advisory planning board.

45/ Several years ago, talks were begun between the United Hebrew Schools and Yeshives and the Folksbund of Phila. about the possibility of housing two of their schools in one building to eliminate administrative costs. The plan was not consummated, although both systems were in need of consolidated school facilities.
d. As already pointed out in several places, the Jewish teaching profession is in a precipitous state. Placing the teachers under community control including their training, licensing, placement, salary scale, and professional growth would redound to the benefit of the profession and to the greater effectiveness of Jewish education. It would enhance the standing of the teachers and might stimulate young people to go into the profession.

e. Administrative control would undoubtedly lead to improved and concentrated promotion and interpretation of Jewish education. Jewish education might gain greater acceptance by the parents who are accustomed to a smooth running efficient central public school system. In this respect, too, the Jewish school system would be supplementary to the public school system.

f. A school system with greater control would be in a position to make stronger financial demands on the Welfare Fund, would organize local groups for efficient fund raising campaigns, and would be enabled to distribute funds in accordance with the needs of schools.

g. Administrative control would make for better collection of tuition fees, an efficient uniform system of record keeping and the maintenance of standards and achievements.
2. Financial Activities and Services

In a unified community system of Jewish education all schools would receive some financial assistance. Even if education is completely organized on a congregational basis, it is not to be supposed that schools can be maintained on a self-supporting basis and that funds will no longer be needed to supplement self-support. Certainly the small congregations do not have funds and their resources are not to be measured by the same measuring rod as the larger and more affluent congregations.

It is likely that due to the greater responsibility assumed by the congregations, greater stress will be laid on supplementation and expenditure for supervision, but undoubtedly there would be increased demands from congregations for subsidies, if under a community system of education, they are required to maintain high standards.

Under the present conditions of Jewish community organization, funds for Jewish education will have to be derived from three sources: from tuition fees paid by parents, from local funds derived from membership and other local sources, from assistance provided by central sources. The latter will have to be large enough to make possible the conduct of schools in accordance with the approved standards of the community system of Jewish education.
The financial activities and services would be divided into several categories: a) Direct subsidies and grants-in-aid to schools: These would provide scholarships for those children whose parents are unable to pay tuition fees, and substantial grants-in-aid designed to pay the differential between what can be raised through tuition fees and local support and the sum needed to conduct and administer the school on approved standards — particularly the sum needed to pay the teachers' salaries in accordance with community standards. Special funds would be available for experimental work and special classes, and funds for the repair of school buildings in conjunction with the expenditures made by the local institution.

b) Funds for the conduct of those activities no congregation or group can undertake: the recruitment and training of personnel, in-service training courses, high school education, adult education, education for the unschooled, the conduct of home and country camps, the preparation of texts and materials.

c) Funds for the conduct of an experimental school or schools as outlined above.

In the proposed community system of Jewish education, not only would the central educational agency have direct control over the funds allocated by the community, but it would work closely with the schools in the preparation of their budgets and help them determine the percentage that could be raised from tuition fees, local support and the
percentage needed from the community.

5. **Educational Activities and Services**

In keeping with the principle of non-interference with the religious, ideological or educational viewpoint of any institution, the central educational agency would render a variety of services among which would be the following:

a. The maintenance of a staff of supervisors, consultants, critic teachers expert in Jewish school subjects and curriculum and well versed in the different ideologies.

b. The maintenance of specialty supervisors in music, dramatics, dance, artcraft, audio-visual aid.

c. Continuous educational research and experimentation in all aspects of Jewish education.

d. The preparation of texts, special bulletins and materials for children, teachers and parents.

e. Periodic publication of statistics and information dealing with all aspects of Jewish education.

f. The maintenance of a community Board of License and teachers' registry.

g. The maintenance of a first class library including up to date audio-visual aid materials, pedagogic literature, etc.

h. Conducting a year round program of propaganda and information to develop a better community understanding of Jewish education unrelated to the need for funds.
1. Conducting a program of parental education to improve enrollment and attendance and to keep the children in school longer, as well as to help the parents meet their responsibilities to their children through self education and through creating a home atmosphere that will provide opportunities for joyous Jewish living.

2. A broad program of teacher education including teacher education including teachers' bulletins, in-service courses, opportunities for research and professional growth.

In carrying out its responsibilities as outlined — administratively, financially, educationally — the facilities and services of the central educational agencies would be taxed and utilized to the maximum. The services would be more meaningful in the total program of Jewish education. The central educational agency would be the center from which would emanate the educational program — and would be looked upon as an educational agency somewhat analogous to the general board of education.
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## SURVEYS AND STUDIES OF JEWISH EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>By Whom</th>
<th>Where to be Found</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akron, Ohio</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>Mordecai Halevi</td>
<td>Akron, B.J.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta, Ga.</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>Israel S. Chipkin</td>
<td>A.A.J.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore, Md.</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>Julius E. Rosen</td>
<td>Dropsie College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore, Md.</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>Benjamin Schwartz</td>
<td>A.A.J.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore, Md.</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>Bureau of Jewish Social Research Federations &amp; Welfare Funds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergen County, N.J.</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>Samuel Deutch</td>
<td>A.A.J.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston, Mass.</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>L. Hurwisch &amp; E. Rosen</td>
<td>A.A.J.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston, Mass.</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>Leo L. Honor</td>
<td>A.A.J.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgeport, Conn.</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>B.M. Eidin</td>
<td>A.A.J.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo, N.Y.</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>Bureau of Jewish Social Research Federations &amp; Welfare Funds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden, N.J.</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>Louis L. Kaplan</td>
<td>A.A.J.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton, Ohio</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>Louis L. Kaplan</td>
<td>A.A.J.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, Ill.</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>L. Hurwisch</td>
<td>Dropsie College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, Ill.</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>L. Hurwisch</td>
<td>Dropsie College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, Ill.</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>H. Korey</td>
<td>Jewish Education, V, No. 1 (1924)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, Ill.</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>E. Bricker &amp; New York</td>
<td>Jewish Ed. Committee, S. Marxen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati, O.</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>E. Brickner</td>
<td>Jewish Education, VIII, No. 3 (1935)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati, O.</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>E. Perlowe</td>
<td>&quot;History of the Bureau, College, Univ. of Jewish Education&quot;... Cincinnati (M.A. Dissertation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland, O.</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>Bureau of Jewish Social Research Committee</td>
<td>Cleveland, Ohio; Dropsie College, Phila.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland, O.</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>I.E. Berken &amp; B. Rosen</td>
<td>A.A.J.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus, O.</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>L.J. Levinger</td>
<td>A.A.J.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas, Tex.</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>E. Gamoran</td>
<td>A.A.J.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit, Mich.</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>Bureau of Jewish Social Research Committee</td>
<td>Detroit, Mich.; Council of Jewish Social Research Federations &amp; Welfare Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit, Mich.</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Ben Rosen</td>
<td>A.A.J.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duluth, Minn.</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>L.L. Honor &amp; E. Pichon</td>
<td>A.A.J.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex County, N.J.</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>U.Z. Engelman</td>
<td>A.A.J.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartford, Conn.</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>A.J. Rich</td>
<td>A.A.J.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis, Ind.</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>L.L. Honor</td>
<td>A.A.J.E.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* * American Association for Jewish Education, N.Y.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>By Whom</th>
<th>Where to be Found</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akron, Ohio</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>Mordecai Halevi</td>
<td>Akron, B.J.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta, Ga.</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>Israel E. Chipkin</td>
<td>A.A.J.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore, Md.</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>Julius E. Greenstone</td>
<td>Dropsie College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore, Md.</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>Benjamin Schwartz</td>
<td>A.A.J.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore, Md.</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>Bureau of Jewish</td>
<td>Council of Jewish Social Research Federations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergen County, N.J.</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>Samuel Deutsch</td>
<td>A.A.J.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston, Mass.</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>L. Hurwitz &amp; E. Rosen</td>
<td>A.A.J.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston, Mass.</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>Leo L. Honor</td>
<td>A.A.J.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgeport, Conn.</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>B.K. Edidin</td>
<td>A.A.J.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo, N.Y.</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>Bureau of Jewish</td>
<td>Council of Jewish Social Research Federations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden, N.J.</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>Louis I. Kaplan</td>
<td>A.A.J.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton, Ohio</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>Louis I. Kaplan</td>
<td>A.A.J.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, Ill.</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>L. Hurwitz</td>
<td>Dropsie College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, Ill.</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>L. Hurwitz</td>
<td>Dropsie College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, Ill.</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>H. Korey</td>
<td>Jewish Education, V,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, Ill.</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>H. Bricker &amp; S. Marcuson</td>
<td>Jewish Education, VIII,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati, O.</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>E. Brickner</td>
<td>Jewish Education, VIII,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland, O.</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>Bureau of Jewish</td>
<td>Council of Jewish Social Research Committee, N.Y.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland, O.</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>I.B.Berkson &amp; E. Rosen</td>
<td>A.A.J.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus, O.</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>L. J. Levinger</td>
<td>A.A.J.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas, Tex.</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>E. Gamoran</td>
<td>A.A.J.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit, Mich.</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>Bureau of Jewish</td>
<td>Council of Jewish Social Research Federations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit, Mich.</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>Ben Rosen</td>
<td>A.A.J.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duluth, Minn.</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>L.L. Honor &amp; E. Picheny</td>
<td>A.A.J.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex County, N.J.</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>U.Z.Engelman</td>
<td>A.A.J.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartford, Conn.</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>J. Milen</td>
<td>A.A.J.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis, Ind.</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>L.L. Honor</td>
<td>A.A.J.E.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* American Association for Jewish Education, N.Y.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>By Whom</th>
<th>Where to be Found</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles, Calif</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>A. M. Dushkin</td>
<td>A.A.J.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles, Calif</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>I. Soref</td>
<td>&quot;History...College of Jewish Studies of in Los Angeles&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(M.A. Thesis)</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville, Ky.</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>E. Camorano</td>
<td>A.A.J.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine (State of)</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>Z. Slesinger</td>
<td>A.A.J.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami, Fla.</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>I. E. Chipkin</td>
<td>A.A.J.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee, Wis.</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>A. M. Dushkin</td>
<td>Council of Jewish Federations &amp; Welfare Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee, Wis.</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>I. B. Rappaport</td>
<td>A.A.J.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark, N.J.</td>
<td>(1922</td>
<td>Bureau of Jewish Council of Jewish Federations &amp; Welfare Funds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1928</td>
<td>Social Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Haven, Conn.</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>B. Eddin</td>
<td>A.A.J.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York, N.Y.</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>E. M. Kaplan &amp;</td>
<td>Jewish Education, IX, No. 3 (1949)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E. Cronson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>J. Benderly</td>
<td>Jewish Ed. Com.N.Y.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>B. Rosen</td>
<td>Jewish Education, T, No. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>I. E. Berkson</td>
<td>A.A.J.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omaha, Neb.</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>A. M. Dushkin</td>
<td>A.A.J.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omaha, Neb.</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>L. L. Honor</td>
<td>A.A.J.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passaic, N.J.</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>L. L. Honor</td>
<td>A.A.J.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paterson, N.J.</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>I. E. Chipkin</td>
<td>A.A.J.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth Amboy, N.J.</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>E. Furer</td>
<td>A.A.J.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peoria, Ill.</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>A. Kessler</td>
<td>A.A.J.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia, Pa.</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>J. E. Greenspoon</td>
<td>Jewish Education Committee, N.Y.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(M.A. Thesis)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>B. Rosen</td>
<td>Jewish Education, IX, No. 2 (1937)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>L. L. Honor &amp;</td>
<td>Phila. Council on Jewish Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W. Liebman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh, Pa.</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>J. E. Greenspoon</td>
<td>Dropsie College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>J. A. Abrams</td>
<td>Hebrew Institute of Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>L. S. Chipkin</td>
<td>A.A.J.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>L. Z. Engelman</td>
<td>A.A.J.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester, N.Y.</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>B. Rosen</td>
<td>Dropsie College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>L. L. Honor</td>
<td>A.A.J.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis, Mo.</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>L. L. Honor</td>
<td>A.A.J.E.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Surveys and Studies of Jewish Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>By Whom</th>
<th>Where to be Found</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis, Mo</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>L. L. Honor</td>
<td>A.A.J.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>M. Benathen</td>
<td>A.A.J.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul, Minn</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Bureau of Jewish Social Research</td>
<td>Council of Jewish Federations &amp; Welfare Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco, Calif.</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>L. L. Honor</td>
<td>A.A.J.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Illinois</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>Z. Biesinger</td>
<td>A.A.J.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse, N.Y.</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>B. Rosen</td>
<td>Jewish Education, XII, No. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>J. Pilch</td>
<td>A.A.J.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto, Canada</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>U.Z. Engelman</td>
<td>A.A.J.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trenton, N.J.</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>Bureau of Jewish Social Research</td>
<td>Council of Jewish Federations &amp; Welfare Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D. Rudavsky</td>
<td>A.A.J.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmington, Del</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>U. Z. Engelman</td>
<td>A.A.J.E.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### General Study

**Community Organization for Jewish Education**

(Prepared by the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, 1939)
BIBLIOGRAPHY


Abrams, I. , "The Hebrew Teachers Training School of the Hebrew Institute", Safer Hayovel, Shel Agudath Hamorim

Azneer, J. L., "Community Education and the Future of the Synagogue", Synagogue School VIII, No. 3 (Feb. 1950)

Baron, S. W., "An Historical Critique of the Jewish Community", Jewish Education VIII, No. 1, p.1

" " " , The Jewish Community, Jewish Publication Society, (Philadelphia 1942) 5 volumes

" " " , "The Jewish Community and Jewish Education", Jewish Education XIX, No. 2 (1948)

Benderly, S., "Aims and Activities of Bureau of Jewish Education of the Jewish Community of N.Y., 1912", reprinted in Jewish Education XX, No. 5 (1949) pp. 92-112

" " " , "Jewish Education in America", Jewish Exponent, Philadelphia, January 17, 1908.


" " " , "Jewish Education in the United States", Jewish Education VII, No. 1 (1935)

" " " , "Louis Marshall and Jewish Education", Jewish Education I, No. 5, p. 144

" " " , "The Next Decade in Jewish Education", Jewish Education IV, No. 1 (1932)

" " " , Purpose and Work of the Bureau of Jewish Education of New York (1936)

" " " , "The Schoolman's View Point", (1927), reprinted in Jewish Education, XX, No. 3

Berkson, I. B.,"Democracy and Jewish Culture", Jewish Education IX, No. 3 (1937)

Berkson, I. B., "Is There Intimiate Opposition Between Congregational and ), and Communal Schools?" Jewish Education XII, No.1, Rosen, B. ), (1940)


" " " , "Jewish Education in the Light of John Dewey's Philosophy" Sheviley Rabimah III, No. 5
Berkein, I. B., *Theories of Americanization* (Columbia University 1930)


" " " , "The College of Jewish Studies of Chicago," *Sefer Hayovel*, p. 292

" " " , "Scope and Content of Adult Jewish Education As a Foundation of a Jewish College", *Jewish Education* IX, No. 2 (1937)

" " " , "Some Aspects of Adult Education", *Jewish Education* X, No. 3 (1938)

" " " , "Twenty-Five Years of the Board of Jewish Education of Chicago", *Religious Education* (July-August 1948)

Bricker, E., *Jewish Education in Chicago* (1940)

Bricker, Barnett R., "History of Jewish Education in Cincinnati", *Jewish Education* VIII, No. 3 (1936)

Brilliant, E., "An Experiment in Community Planning", *Jewish Education* XXI, No. 5 (1950), pp. 48-50

"Bureau and Congregational School Relationships", *Synagogue School* VIII, No. 4 (April 1950)

Cedarbaum, D., "Extent and Cost of Jewish Education in the U.S.", *Jewish Education* I, No. 1 (1929)

Centra! Community Organization and Planning in Intermediate Communities (Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, 1950)

Central Community Organization in Large Cities (Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, 1949)

Chipkin, I. S., "The Jewish Education Association of New York", *Jewish Education* XII, No. 5 (1941)

" " " , "Jewish Education in the U.S. at the Mid-Century", *Jewish Education Register and Directory*, 1951

" " " , "Judaism and Social Welfare", *The Jews*, II

" " " , Memorandum on Visits to Schenectady, N. Y.

" " " , "Planning for American Jewish Education", *Jewish Education* XVII, No. 2 (1946)

" " " , "Proposals for the Study, Evaluation and Reconstruction of the Jewish Educational System", *Jewish Education* XVI, No. 2 (1945)
Chipkin, I. S., *Twenty-Five Years of Jewish Education in the U. S.*, (Reprint from the American Jewish Year Book (1956-57)


Dinin, S., "Community Jewish Education", *The Reconstructionist* XIII, Nos. 18 and 20

" " " A Five Year Plan for Jewish Education in Los Angeles" *Jewish Education* XXII, Nos. 1-2 (1950-51)

" " " The Future of the Profession of Jewish Education", *Jewish Education* XV, No. 2 (1944)

" " " Los Angeles, Three Years After Dushkin", *Jewish Education* XIX, No. 2 (1948)

" " " Twenty Five Years of Teacher Training", *Jewish Education* VII, No. 1 (1935)

" " " Judaism in a Changing Civilization (Columbia University, 1933)

Drachman, B., "The Jewish Communal Organization of Tomorrow", *Israel of Tomorrow*, edited by Leo Jung (Herald Square Press, N. Y., 1946)

Duker, A. "Structure of the Jewish Community", *The American Jew*, ed. by O. Janowsky

Dushkin, A. M., "Common Elements in Jewish Education", *Jewish Education* XVII, No. 1 (1945)

" " " The Community Principle in Jewish Education", *Jewish Education* XVII, No. 2 (1946)

" " " Congregation and Community in Jewish Education", *Jewish Education* I, No. 2 (1929)

" " " The Development of a Community Program in Jewish Education" (Address delivered at the National Conference of Jewish Social Service, 1927)

" " " Democracy and Jewish Education", *Jewish Education* XIV, No. 2 (1942)

" " " Diversity and Unity in Jewish Education", Yesodot Hanimah, p. 151

" " " Essentials of a Community Program for Jewish Children", *Jewish Education* VI, No. 3 (1934)

" " " Influence of American Education on Jewish Education", Sefar Hayovel, pp. 99-113

" " " The Jewish Charities and Jewish Education", *Jewish Education* III, No. 1 (1931)
Jewish Education in New York City (N.Y. 1918)
" " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " 

Fifty Years of the Hebrew Education Society of Philadelphia (Phila. 1899)
Freeman, J., "Raising and Allocating Funds in the Organized Community", The Reconstructionist XIV, No. 9, 1950
Friedlaender, I., "The Problem of Jewish Education in America", Past and Present (Cincinnati, 1919) pp.279-308
Furie, Wm. B., "Yavneh", Jewish Education XVII, No. 3 (1946)
Gamoran, E., Changing Conceptions in Jewish Education (Macmillan, New York, 1925)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gannes, A. P.</td>
<td>&quot;Bureaus of Jewish Education and Group Work Agencies&quot;</td>
<td>Jewish Social Service Quarterly XXVI, No. 4 (1950)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>&quot;The Executive's Job&quot;</td>
<td>Jewish Education XVIII, No. 3 (1950)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Supervision in Agencies With Limited Personnel&quot;</td>
<td>Jewish Education XXI, No. 2 (1950)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>&quot;The Ktutzah and Camp Achvah&quot;</td>
<td>Jewish Education XX, No. 3 (1949)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginzburgh, S.</td>
<td>&quot;Three Years in Rural Jewish Education&quot;</td>
<td>Jewish Education XVIII, No. 3 (1947)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golub, J. S.</td>
<td>&quot;The Responsibility of Federation for Jewish Education&quot;</td>
<td>Jewish Education IV, No. 1 (1932)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenberg, S.</td>
<td>&quot;Basic Premises and a Proposed Structure for Jewish Education in America&quot;</td>
<td>Proceedings of Rabbinical Assembly Conference on Jewish Education (Dec. 1946)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>&quot;The American Rabbi As an Educator&quot;</td>
<td>Yesodot Rahimah, Hayehudi B'America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenstone, J. E.</td>
<td>&quot;Jewish Education in the United States&quot;</td>
<td>American Jewish Year Book (1914-15) pp. 90-127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Ten Years of Jewish Education in Philadelphia&quot;</td>
<td>(1924)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honor, L. L.</td>
<td>&quot;Comparative Study of Hebrew Teacher Training Schools in the U. S.&quot;</td>
<td>Jewish Education VII, No. 2 (1935)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Educating Teaching Personnel for Jewish Schools&quot;</td>
<td>(Unpublished manuscript)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>&quot;The Function of a Community Agency for Jewish Education&quot;</td>
<td>Jewish Education Register and Directory, 1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>&quot;The Function of the Central Educational Agency&quot;</td>
<td>Yesodot Rahimah, pp. 165-182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Jewish Education in the United States&quot;</td>
<td>The Jewish People, Past and Present (New York, 1948) Volume II, p. 1611</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Honor, L. L., "The Role of the Central Educational Agency", Sheviley Habimah III, No. 1 (1942)

" " , "The Three Who Had Influence", Sefer Hayovel Shel Agudath Hamorim (New York, 1944)


" " , "Hebrew Teachers Colleges in the United States", Jewish Education XXII, Nos. 1-2 (1950-51)

" " , "L'Natzav Habimah Ha-Ivri B'Boston", Sheviley Habimah, III, No. 1, pp. 69-65

" " , "Standard Examinations in Greater Boston Hebrew Schools" Jewish Education I, No. 2 (1929)


" " , "Hebrew Education in Baltimore", Jewish Education VII, No. 2 (1934)

Information Bulletins, Nos. 1-16, issued by the American Association for Jewish Education

Isaacs, B., "The United Hebrew Schools of Detroit", Jewish Education XVIII, No. 1 (1946)


Jewish Schools in America (American Association for Jewish Education, 1948)

The Jewish Community of New York "The Bureau of Jewish Education", Bulletin No. 1 (1910)

The Jewish Community (Kehillah) of New York - First Annual Report, 1910
Second Annual Report, 1911
Third Annual Report, 1912
Fourth Annual Report, 1913
Fifth Annual Report, 1914

The Jewish Community (Kehillah) of Phila. - First Annual Report, 1911-12
Second Annual Report, 1912-13
Third Annual Report, 1913-14
Fourth Annual Report, 1914-15

Kallen, Horace, "Critical Problems in Jewish Education", Jewish Education XIX, No. 3 (1947)

" " , "Jewish Education and the Future of the American Jewish Community", Jewish Education XVI, No. 1 (1944)

" " " , *The Future of the American Jew* (Macmillan, N.Y. 1949)

" " " , "The Impact of Dr. Samson Benderly", *Jewish Education* XX, No. 3 (1949)

" " " , "The Organization of American Jewry", *Jewish Education* VII, No. 3 (1935)


Kessler, A., "The Jewish Teaching Profession", *Jewish Education Register and Directory*, 1951

Klein, A., "History of Jewish Education in Buffalo", *Jewish Education* XIV, No. 1 (1942)


Korey, H., "Story of Jewish Education in Chicago Prior to 1923", *Jewish Education VI*, No. 1 (1934)

Kraft, L. and), "Report of Special Study of the American Association of Schoolman, A. P. emancipation for Jewish Education"

Lapson, J. , "The Hebrew Culture Council and Two Decades of Hebrew in the Public High Schools of New York City", *Jewish Education* XXI, No. 3 (1950)

" " " , "Hebrew in the Public High Schools", *American Jewish Congress Weekly*, Jan. 19, 1951

" " " , "The Hebrew Language in the Public High Schools and Universities of the U.S.", *Yesodot Hahimah* (1947) T.J.

Levitats, I., "An Experiment in Communal Education", *Jewish Education* XVI, No. 1 (1944)

" " " , "Communal Regulations of Bar Mitzvah", *Jewish Social Studies XI*, No. 2 (1949) pp. 155-162


Lowenstein, S., "Community Organization", *National Conference of Jewish Social Service* (1923) p. 192

" " " , "New Factors in Federation Work", *Jewish Social Service Quarterly II*, No. 1 (1925)

Lurie, H. L., "Is Democracy Possible in Jewish Community Life", *Jewish Social Service Quarterly XXII*, No. 2 (1945)
Lurie, H. L., "Jewish Community Organization - Functions and Structures", Jewish Social Service Quarterly, 1949


Medini, M., "The Hebrew High School and the Teachers Seminary of Cleveland", Sefer Hayovel, pp. 306-311


Minutes of Hebrew High School Committee of Associated Talmud Torahs, (1928-1940)

Mishkin, C. L., "The Talmud Torahs of Chicago", Jewish Sentinel (1948)

Mort, Paul R., Principles of School Administration (McGraw-Hill, N.Y. 1946)

Nardi, N., "The Jewish Education Committee of New York", Sefer Hayovel, p. 314

Pekarsky, H. M., "New Developments in Jewish Community Organization", Jewish Social Service Quarterly XXIV, No. 1 (1947)

Picheny, E. and Edidin, B. L., "Developing An Integrated Center Program", Jewish Education XV, No. 5 (1944)

Filch, J. "A Community Agency for Jewish Education: Five Years in Rochester", Jewish Education XVI, No. 2 (1945)

Pollack, L., "Boston Hebrew Teachers College", Sefer Hayovel, pp. 298-304

"Proceedings of Fourth Annual Conference of the National Council of Jewish Education", Jewish Education I, No. 3 (1929)

"Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the National Council of Jewish Education", Jewish Education III, No. 3 (1931)


Reed, Ward G., The Fundamentals of Public School Administration, (Macmillan, N.Y., 1941)

Report of the Special Committee of Seven on Religious Educational Societies Made To The Organization Committee of the Federation for the Support of Jewish Philanthropic Societies of New York City (March 1917)

Rosen, B., "The American Association for Jewish Education" (1944)
Rosen, B., "The Effect of the Economic Depression Upon the Jewish Educational Institutions", *Jewish Education* III, No. 1, (1931)

" " , "The Extension High School in Philadelphia", *Jewish Education* I, No. 5 (1930)

" " , "Jewish Education in Philadelphia, 1936", *Jewish Education* IX, No. 2 (1937)

" " , "Jewish Education - What Program Should the Jewish Community Support?" *Jewish Education* IX, No. 1 (1937)

" " , "Programs of Communal Agencies for Jewish Education", *Jewish Education* XIII, No. 5 (1942)

" " , "The Relationship of Federation of Charities to Jewish Education", *Jewish Education* IV, No. 2 (1932)

" " , "Recent Surveys of Jewish Education", *Jewish Education* II, No. 2 (1930)

" " , "The Nature and Extent of Secondary Jewish Schooling in America", *Jewish Education* XII, No. 1 (1940)

Scharfstein, Z., *Toldot Hahinmah B'Yisroel*, 3 volumes (New York 1945)

Schoolman, A.P., "Education and Philanthropy", *Jewish Education* IV, No. 3, (1922)

" " , "The Jewish Educational Summer Camp - A Survey of its Development and Implications", *Jewish Education* XVII, No. 3 (1946)

" " , "School, Community and Federation", *Jewish Education* V, No. 3 (1933)

Selekman, B. M., "Federation As a Vital Community Agency", *Jewish Education*, VI, No. 1 (1934)


Shulsinger, S. "Hebrew Camping - Five Years of Massad", Jewish Education, XVII, No. 3, (1946)

Soref, I., Prakim B'Toldot Hahinuh B'Los Angeles (M.A. Thesis 1950)

Steinberg, M., A Partisan Guide to the Jewish Problem (N.Y. 1945), Chapter 13

Stern, H., "The Synagogue and Jewish Communal Activities" Year Book, 1935-36

Structure and Function of Community Councils (Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, 1945)


Toshov, A., "The Hebrew College of Baltimore", Sefer Hayovel, pp. 305-307

Warman, M., "The Modern Rabbi as Educator", Sheviley Hahinuh III, No. 2 (1927)

Yefrokin, S. "Yiddish Secular Schools in the United States", The Jewish People, Past and Present, II.
APPENDIX
APPENDIX A

REPORT OF THE
SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF SEVEN
ON
RELIGIOUS EDUCATIONAL SOCIETIES
MADE TO THE
ORGANIZATION COMMITTEE
OF THE
FEDERATION FOR THE
SUPPORT OF JEWISH PHILANTHROPIC SOCIETIES
OF
NEW YORK CITY
MARCH 12, 1917

SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS CONNECTED WITH THE ACCOMPANYING REPORT

1. Jan. 8, 1917. Presentation of letter from temporary Committee of Twenty-five, to consider the financial aspect of Jewish religious education in New York City, signed by Israel Unterberg, Chairman, and

Isaac Allen
Joseph Baroness
Samuel Bayer
S. Benderly
Joseph H. Cohen
Julius J. Dukas
Harry Fischel
William Fischman
Israel Friedlaender
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Leon Kamaiy
Mordecai M. Kaplan
Edwin Kaufman
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J. L. Magness
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Bernard Semel
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2. Jan. 8, 1917. The Chairman appoints a Special Committee of Seven to study in all its aspects the subject of the relation of Jewish education in New York to philanthropy.
3. Jan. 25 - Mech. 11. Meetings between the Special Committee of Seven of the Federation and the Committee of Seven designated from the Temporary Committee of Twenty-five, above referred to. The Committee of Seven, representing the educational societies, consisted of Samuel Bayer, S. Benderly, Julius J. Dukas, William Fischman, Samuel I. Hyman, Dr. J. L. Magnes and Israel Unterberg.

4. Mech. 12, 1917. Presentation of the report of the Special Committee of Seven.

5. March 12, 1917. Adoption by the Federation of the accompanying Report, together with the following resolution:

"The Organization Committee accepts the report of the Committee of Seven on philanthropic-religious societies and recommends to the constituent societies their approval of the findings of said Committee."

6. Mech. 12, 1917. Presentation by the Law Committee of the following resolutions:

(1) Resolved: That Section 1 of Article 4, of the Constitution be amended by inserting after the word "societies" the words "and institutions engaged in philanthropic-religious activities."

(2) Resolved: That the proposed amendment be acted upon at the next regular monthly meeting of the Organization Committee and that notice thereof forthwith, and at least 10 days before said meeting be given to each member of this Board.

(3) Further resolved that a copy of the report of the Special Committee on philanthropic-religious activities be sent forthwith to each affiliated society with a copy of the foregoing proposed
amendment and notice that the same will be acted upon at the next regular meeting of the Organization Committee and a request that because of the urgency of prompt action, as shown in the report, immediate steps be taken by the Affiliated Societies to instruct their Representatives prior to the next meeting of this Board.

New York, March 12, 1917.

To the Organization Committee of the Federation:

In accordance with your instructions, your Special Committee undertook the consideration of the problem of religious education in relation to Federation, and held a series of conferences with the Committee of Seven, representing religious educational societies. Your Committee submits its conclusions in the accompanying report and recommends that there be submitted to the constituent societies of Federation for adoption an amendment of the plan of Federation which will make eligible for admission philanthropic societies engaged in religious activities, or such other amendment to this effect as the Law Committee may advise.

William N. Cohen, Chairman;
H. G. Friedman, Secretary;
Leo Arinstein,
Emil Baerwald,
Edward Lauterbach,
Arthur Lehman,
Fred E. Stein.
REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON RELIGIOUS EDUCATIONAL SOCIETIES, MADE TO THE BOARD OF THE FEDERATION,

MARCH 12, 1917

Religious education in New York is conducted mainly by two types of schools - Sabbath Schools, maintained by Congregations, and Week-Day Schools, which are independent of Congregations, and which provide instruction to children in Hebrew and religious subjects outside of the hours of public schools.

In addition, there are a few schools which attempt to combine secular and religious education, a number of week-day schools maintained by congregations, and a large number of private pay schools or Hedarim.

The societies on behalf of which the application for affiliation with Federation was made, represent, with one exception, communal day schools, which are independent of congregations, and which carry on instruction so as not to conflict with attendance by their pupils at the public schools. Two of these religious schools are located in Brooklyn. One of the schools represented by the School Committee combines religious with secular education. The application in behalf of the Brooklyn schools and that in behalf of the school combining religious with secular instruction has been withdrawn. The application as modified is now in behalf of the following Week-Day schools, carrying on their activities in such manner as to conform with attendance of their pupils at the public schools. They are:

Salanter Talmud Torah, 74 East 118th Street.
Uptown Talmud Torah, 132 East 111th Street.
Central Jewish Institute, 125 East 85th Street.
Downtown Talmud Torah, 394 East Houston Street.
Machsike Talmud Torah, 225 East Broadway.
Bureau of Education Schools and Extension Activities, 132 East 111th Street, 31 West 110th Street, 394 East Houston Street, 34 Stuyvesant Street.

Your Committee confined itself to a consideration of the types of schools represented by the School Committee. According to the data furnished
to your Committee, there are forty-two communal day schools in Manhattan and the Bronx - that is, schools not associated with any congregation and dependent for their support on the general public. These have an aggregate attendance of over 14,000 pupils. Included in these figures is one school now conducted by the Educational Alliance, with an attendance of 1,315 pupils.

The six societies named above conduct ten schools, having an estimated average attendance of about 5,800 pupils. With the Alliance school they provide religious education for over 7,000 pupils, or more than one-half of the total number of children attending communal religious day schools.

The six societies had an income in 1916 from all sources amounting to about $110,000 net. Somewhat more than one-third of this sum came from tuition fees paid by the pupils and about $75,000 represented the net income from membership dues, entertainments, and miscellaneous collections.

From the figures submitted, it appears that in the main the work of these institutions is philanthropic in the sense that they minister for the most part to the needs of persons unable to pay for the services rendered. It was further brought to the attention of your Committee that a large number of the children come from families of the poor. In many instances, the children taught free are those of widows and of families in receipt of support from the United Hebrew Charities.

The Schools are devoted mainly to instruction in Hebrew, in Jewish History, and in Religion. Some of them also carry on general social-service work. Two of the buildings have gymnasiums. Some of the institutions are used as social centers and have clubs for children. One of the societies carries on extension work outside of the schools on a considerable scale, for the purpose of reaching children and adolescents who do not attend schools.
Auxiliary societies connected with the schools provide clothing for the poor and maintain other purely charitable and recreational activities. The work of these societies is, however, mainly the religious instruction to children; secular, social activities are secondary.

The support of the schools comes chiefly from two classes of contributors, about 2,000 paying in membership dues or donations Ten Dollars ($10.00) or more and about 6000 giving Five Dollars ($5.00) or less. In addition about $25,000 gross is secured through entertainments and miscellaneous collections. The amounts raised from small contributors, from entertainments and collections, involve a considerable cost for solicitation and collection. As a result the support of the schools is dependent mainly on the 2,000 larger contributors.

A study was made of the membership lists of the Talmud Torahs in order to ascertain the extent to which their contributors and subscribers to the Federation or members of the affiliated societies who had not yet subscribed. Among the more important contributors to the schools, those giving more than $10.00, it was found that over one-half were either subscribers to Federation or contributors to the affiliated societies. Thus about 350 persons who were both contributors to Federation and members of societies for religious education contributed to the schools about $40,000, or substantially one-half of their entire receipts from membership dues and donations. Among those giving $10.00 to the schools, more than one-half were found to be subscribers to Federation, and in addition one-fourth were members of affiliated societies who had not yet subscribed to Federation. Among those contributing $5.00 to the religious schools, nearly one-half were subscribers to the Federation, or members of its affiliated societies. These figures for $10.00 and $5.00 members of the Talmud Torahs are based upon examination of a considerable number of names taken at random; the results reached should, however, be indicative of the
general situation. It thus appears that those who constitute the substantial support of the Talmud Torahs are also subscribers of the Federation or affiliated with its beneficiary societies.

The amount designated by subscribers for the benefit of the schools cannot be determined accurately. It may be estimated, however, to be in the neighborhood of $40,000.

The six societies submitted a budget for 1917 calling for $125,000.

The School Committee suggests further that it would be desirable to set aside a reserve fund in the budget of 1917 to provide for the extension of Jewish religious education either through new schools, or the rehabilitation of old schools which might apply later. It proposes that for this purpose there be reserved $50,000.

II.

The application of religious schools for affiliation with Federation presents distinctly to Federation the problem of admitting societies carrying on religious education as distinguished from institutions engaged mainly in secular social work.

When the plan of Federation was adopted it was agreed to be "unwise for the Federation to complicate its problems at the beginning by taking over the support of institutions engaged in philanthropic-religious activities."

The committee which drew up the plan foresaw that the question of supporting societies engaged in philanthropic-religious activities should have to be considered again.

The societies conducting religious schools submit that this question be taken up now because Federation has made their present position, and, to a greater extent, their future development precarious.

As Federation becomes more successful and allies to itself the
various elements in the community, it will become increasingly difficult for
them to secure funds as independent organizations. The presidents of some
of these societies stated that in many instances contributors have returned
bills for dues with the single word "Federation," and that as a result some
of the schools may be obliged to close their doors.

It is further submitted by the applicant societies that if they
were to form a Federation of their own in order to finance their activities
and make an appeal to the public, the result would be detrimental to both the
religious schools and to Federation, the community would be disorganized by
the establishment of more than one Federation, and the endeavor to unify
philanthropic activities would be frustrated. There would result a separation
in the community between those now active on behalf of secular philanthropies and
those who are interested in religious education.

From the foregoing it appears that there is urgent reason for taking
up at this time the problem of the relation of Federation to philanthropic-
religious societies and for seeking a solution which will permit the religious
societies to continue their work.

Conferences between the School Committee and your Committee have
added to our information, and Federation is now in a position to consider the
problem in the light of fuller knowledge of the schools, the character of their
activities and the extent of their financial needs. Furthermore, it now appears
that to a very considerable extent our secular Jewish charities and our reli-
gious educational institutions are supported by the same class of contributors.

III.

It should be stated at the outset that Federation was organized
under a plan which contemplated the exclusion of religious educational activi-
ties. In order that there may be no question that Federation is complying
with the letter and the spirit of its pledges, it is now necessary for Federation to go
to its constituent societies and to obtain their consent to the extension of its
field of activity so that it may embrace philanthropic-religious endeavor.

The desirability of securing such an extension of the scope of
Federation must be determined upon the merits of the case for religious educa-
tion. The admission of religious societies to Federation has been advocated
both from the lay and the religious point of view. It is contended that they
are agencies for ethical instruction, giving in modern garb to the children
a presentation of Judaism leading to a sympathetic knowledge of their past.
They foster an intelligent self-respect on the basis of an understanding of
Jewish history. They tend to establish a bond of sympathy between the parents
and the children, and thereby to maintain the solidarity of the family and
beneficent home influences. These strivings are undoubtedly conducive to
good citizenship, and societies promoting them may be regarded as properly
within the scope of Jewish communal activity to be supported by the community
as a whole.

From the religious standpoint, religious education is in itself a
communal need. The fact that aside from congregational schools as many as
forty-two institutions for religious education have been established in
Manhattan and the Bronx, of itself testifies to the feeling among a large
number of Jews that there is need of providing agencies of this character for
the religious instruction of children.

From a broad point of view it may be argued that Federation should
respect the sentiments and ideals of any considerable section in the com-

munity and adopt such a definition of philanthropic activity as will embrace
not only relief, health, recreation, secular education, and the like, but also religious instruction for those classes in the community which are unable to bear the expense. This point of view is apparently embodied in the work of the Educational Alliance, which devotes a considerable portion of its funds to the maintenance of a religious school similar in character to those of the applicant societies.

In support of a modification of the Plan of Federation so as to embrace religious philanthropic endeavor, it is submitted by the School Committee that such a step will serve to unify the community and to win for Federation support for general charities from elements that have hitherto held aloof. In this way greater harmony will be brought about in the communal life of the New York Jewry.

The support of religious education presents grave problems for Federation. As noted by the Committee which framed the plan of Federation, the community is not a unit in religious belief, and in Federation there are represented the most divergent shades of faith. Questions of conscience and conviction are involved, rather than those of policy and method. Grounds for differences are thus more deeply seated. Serious attention must therefore be given to objections to the inclusion in Federation of institutions with activities in reference to which there may be wide differences of opinion.

Your Committee, however, is of the view that these objections to the admission of religious societies to Federation are not sufficient to counterbalance the injury which might result from their exclusion, not merely to the cause of religious education, but also to the work of these schools as moral influences in the community for bridging the gap between parent and child, and for maintaining the influence of the home and the family.

Moreover, it is fundamental in the plan of Federation that each society shall have autonomy in its internal management, and so long as this
principle is observed there should be no reason why the difference of opinion or belief among subscribers to Federation should constitute a bar to the admission of these societies. If religious societies are admitted, Federation must have nothing whatsoever to do with curriculum, or religious beliefs. The control of the policies of the schools must be left to each individual institution, and there must be no grounds for any suspicion that the Federation is in the remotest degree seeking to influence them in the instruction which they are to give in the matters of religion.

IV.

If the support of religious education is to be undertaken by Federation, certain standards must be insisted upon. These standards should be objective and the reason for them clear to all. They must not involve questions of belief or principles, but should be based upon consideration for the health and the welfare of the children entrusted to the schools and for the good name of the community. High standards of sanitation and safety must be essential require- ments for the schools seeking admission, just as they are for other institutions desiring affiliation with Federation. Insistence on high standards will doubtless tend to raise the general level in these respects even among schools which may not apply.

The committee is of the opinion that institutions for religious education should be admitted as beneficiary societies on the same terms and conditions as other philanthropic organizations. Your committee, accordingly, does not favor the plan of extending support to religious schools through a Board of School Aid as proposed by the School Committee. The application of each society should be made directly to the Federation, and, if admitted, the relations of such a society to Federation should be direct and immediate as in the case of other beneficiary societies of Federation.
The School Committee informs your committee that the societies for religious education now applying, and also other societies mentioned in the original application, have upon their own initiative resolved upon the establishment of a Board of School Aid, and that their institutions have agreed among themselves to submit to the Federation all budgets and other information through the Board of School Aid. The societies are doubtless free to make such arrangements for cooperation as suits their convenience or meets their needs. The relation of the Federation will, however, be directly with the individual societies. The eligibility of any society for admission or its standing in the Federation will in no way be affected by its relation with this Board. Any religious educational society not connected with the Board of School Aid will be eligible for admission also.

V.

The schools here considered, according to the information submitted, received from the community in 1916 approximately $75,000. They present a budget for 1917 for $125,000, in order that they may meet more fully the demands upon them.

The plan under which Federation was organised expressly excluded societies for religious instruction from participation in the General or Undesignated Fund. There might, therefore, be just grounds for criticism if moneys collected for societies now beneficiaries of Federation were diverted to other uses. In order that there should be no grounds for such criticism, it has been agreed that the applicant societies will raise for Federation by July 1, 1917, from persons who have not yet subscribed to Federation, the sum of $75,000. With the consent of the Membership Council, present subscribers to Federation may also be solicited for increased subscriptions. It is to be understood that the schools are to make good any losses in such subscriptions during
a period of three years, and that in default of this the Federation will have the right to reduce its appropriation to religious schools by the amount of subscriptions lost. From the figures submitted, it appears that the amount named, together with the amounts now subscribed through Federation for the use of the schools, will substantially meet the requirements for 1917.

The schools have also agreed to raise a further sum, to be set aside as a reserve fund for the extension of religious education. To the extent that such a fund is raised, it will be held by Federation for such uses.

In order that the support of the small contributors may not be lost, the schools undertake to maintain that class of membership so that their present support from persons contributing three to five dollars will not be diminished.

An examination of the membership lists of the religious schools indicates that to a great extent their supporters are the same as those of Federation. It will doubtless meet with the wishes of such contributors, that societies for religious education shall be brought within Federation. On the other hand, as persons now interested in religious education become supporters of Federation, much will be achieved towards the unifying of philanthropic endeavor and bringing to the support of Federation the different elements in the community.

CONCLUSION

Your Committee, in view of the entire situation, submits that the Organization Committee recommend to the institutions associating themselves in Federation, an amendment of the Plan of Federation which will bring within its scope philanthropic religious endeavor.
APPENDIX B

RULES OF THE JEWISH EDUCATIONAL BOARD OF PHILADELPHIA

(Quoted in Third Annual Report of the Jewish Community of Philadelphia, 1913-1914)

1. The name of this Board shall be The Jewish Educational Board (authorized by the Jewish Community of Philadelphia).

2. The objects of this Board shall be:

   a) To assist in the extension of Jewish education by enlarging the scope and increasing the efficiency of existing agencies and by creating new agencies for that purpose.

   b) To endeavor to promote a more intimate relationship among the various educational agencies, so as to avoid as much as possible unnecessary waste and overlapping.

   c) To endeavor to procure support and assistance for such educational institutions as may be in need thereof.

   d) To arouse the conscience of the Jews of Philadelphia to the gravity of the educational problem by means of propaganda.

   e) To endeavor to establish a Fund wherewith to carry out these several objects.

   f) And, in general, to aid and assist in the more perfect development in the community of the system of Jewish education, that shall be both effective and all-embracing.
## APPENDIX C

### CENTRAL COMMUNITY AGENCIES FOR JEWISH EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Established</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Name of Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>New York, N. Y.</td>
<td>Bureau of Jewish Education*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>Minneapolis, Minn.</td>
<td>Minneapolis Talmud Torah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>Pittsburgh, Pa.</td>
<td>Hebrew Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>Boston, Mass.</td>
<td>Bureau of Jewish Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>Detroit, Mich.</td>
<td>United Hebrew Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>Baltimore, Md.</td>
<td>Board of Jewish Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>New York, N. Y.</td>
<td>Jewish Education Association*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>Philadelphia, Pa.</td>
<td>Associated Talmud Torah **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>Portland, Ore.</td>
<td>Jewish Educational Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>Chicago, Ill.</td>
<td>Board of Jewish Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>Cleveland, Ohio</td>
<td>Bureau of Jewish Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>Indianapolis, Ind.</td>
<td>Jewish Educational Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Cincinnati, Ohio</td>
<td>Bureau of Jewish Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>St. Louis, Mo.</td>
<td>Board of Jewish Education ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Buffalo, N. Y.</td>
<td>Bureau of Jewish Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Omaha, Neb.</td>
<td>Bureau of Jewish Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>Newark, N. J.</td>
<td>Jewish Education Association of Essex County (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>Los Angeles, Cal.</td>
<td>Bureau of Jewish Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>New York, N. Y.</td>
<td>Jewish Education Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Toledo, Ohio</td>
<td>Bureau of Jewish Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - Incorporated in the Jewish Education Committee after 1940.
** - In 1948, the name was changed to the United Hebrew Schools and Yeshivos. The agency is now an affiliate of the Philadelphia Council on Jewish Education.
R - Regional Agency
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Established</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Name of Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Rochester, N. Y.</td>
<td>Jewish Education Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>St. Paul, Minn.</td>
<td>Bureau of Jewish Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>Akron, Ohio</td>
<td>Bureau of Jewish Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>Miami, Fla.</td>
<td>Bureau of Jewish Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>Milwaukee, Wis.</td>
<td>Bureau of Jewish Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>East St. Louis, Ill</td>
<td>Jewish Education Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>Lewiston, Me.</td>
<td>Jewish Education Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>New Haven, Conn.</td>
<td>Bureau of Jewish Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>Syracuse, N. Y.</td>
<td>Bureau of Jewish Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>Schenectady, N.Y.</td>
<td>Bureau of Jewish Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>Des Moines, Iowa</td>
<td>Bureau of Jewish Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>Atlanta, Ga.</td>
<td>Bureau of Jewish Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>Winnipeg, Canada</td>
<td>Bureau of Jewish Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>Dallas, Texas</td>
<td>United Hebrew Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>Peoria, Ill.</td>
<td>Committee on Jewish Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>Camden, N. J.</td>
<td>Bureau of Jewish Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>San Francisco, Cal.</td>
<td>Jewish Education Society (Reorganized)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Louisville, Ky.</td>
<td>Bureau of Jewish Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Bridgeport, Conn.</td>
<td>Jewish Ed. Dept. of Community Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Toronto, Canada</td>
<td>Bureau of Jewish Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R = Regional Agency
APPENDIX D

PRINCIPLES GOVERNING THE POLICY OF A CENTRAL
COMMUNITY AGENCY FOR JEWISH EDUCATION

Prepared by the Staff of the Board of
Jewish Education of Chicago, Nov. 1943

The Board of Jewish Education as a central community agency for Jewish Education in Chicago is vested with the responsibility of working with all elements of the community whose ideology reflects a positive attitude towards Jewish values and an active interest in the welfare of the Jewish group. The Board of Jewish Education shall foster the development and expansion of Jewish education for all age groups, leave to each element to expand its program in the light of its particular ideology; shall help each element raise the standard of its educational work and improve its methods and techniques; and shall help develop cooperative efforts between groups. The Board would in no way attempt to interfere with or influence the ideological orientation of any particular school, but would rather attempt to help it implement its educational program in accordance with its own orientation. In so doing, it would set standards for the housing of schools, the qualifications of teachers, and the methods employed in the instruction program. The Board of Jewish Education while working with each group separately, shall at all times strive to bring various elements together by sponsoring inter-group activities and cooperation.

AN OUTLINE OF FUNCTIONS OF A CENTRAL COMMUNITY AGENCY
FOR JEWISH EDUCATION

1. Insistence upon standards of safety and sanitation

2. Insistence upon standards pertaining to personnel
   a. Teacher qualification and certification
   b. Remuneration to teachers
   c. Tenure and professional status of the teachers

3. Rendering centralized services
   a. Training of teachers
   b. Providing opportunity to teachers for growth in service
      (Supervision, institutes, etc.)
   c. Maintaining teacher morale
   d. Conducting a Teachers' Placement Bureau
   e. Housing a permanent exhibit

Texts and collateral readings
Visual and auditory aids
Experiments
Courses of study
Plays
Keren Ahi material
Record Forms
f. Providing library service and information

g. Advising in regard to record keeping and proper financial accounting

h. Making statistical diagnostic analyses upon which prognostic recommendations can be based

i. Promotion of Jewish education and interpretation of the means and ends

j. Testing achievement

k. Encouraging the continuance of Jewish study beyond the elementary level

l. Reaching the unschooled - youth education

m. Promoting and providing facilities for adult education

4. Facilitating the improvement of the education work of its affiliates

a. Providing consultative supervisory service (Administration - school plant and equipment - curriculum method)

b. Stimulating a wider perspective and greater effectiveness through conferences of teachers, principals, and school committees

c. Organizing lay councils where such councils do not exist to facilitate the improvement of the work of each group through analysis, discussion, and counselling with the central agency.

d. Fostering Jewish education through the medium of the fine arts (Supervising and guiding fine arts programs upon request)

e. Helping each group to build up a uniform course of study and thus make possible the setting up of uniform graduation requirements and the transferring of pupils from school to school of the same type (Course of study to be sufficiently flexible to make it possible to adapt it to individual needs or to needs of special groups)

5. Encouraging experimentation, research, and evaluation

6. Giving financial aid

a. Scholarships

b. Grants-in-aid for specific purposes (Building improvements and decorations, personnel improvements, provision for recreation, visual and auditory aids, the arts)

c. Insurance program for teachers' illness, disability and old age pensions

7. Co-ordinating the educational programs of all groups

a. Inter-group activities on a community-wide basis

b. Community graduation and awarding of diplomas

8. Initiation of new approaches to problems of education
APPENDIX E

MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS FOR AFFILIATION WITH THE BOARD OF JEWISH EDUCATION OF CHICAGO

Building Facilities

1. A school affiliated with the Board of Jewish Education agrees to provide school quarters that meet accepted standards of school hygiene and safety.

Teaching and Supervisory Personnel

2. An affiliated school agrees to employ only qualified teachers who were certified or approved by the License Committee of the Board of Jewish Education of Chicago.

3. An affiliated school must look to the Board of Jewish Education for recommendation and approval in the appointment of teaching personnel and principals. The Board of Jewish Education must also be consulted regarding any plans involving changes of personnel. No appointments or dismissals may be made without the consent and approval of the Board of Jewish Education.

4. An affiliated school agrees that salaries paid to teachers and principals will be in accordance with the salary scales for teachers and principals adopted by the Board of Jewish Education and the Allied Jewish School Board.

5. An affiliated school agrees to provide security of tenure to the teachers and principals as stipulated in the Code of Administrative and Personnel Practices, pages six and seven.

Administration

6. An affiliated school must be administered by some capable and qualified person who can at all times be held responsible for the efficient management of the school.

Curriculum

7. The Board of Jewish Education shall guide the educational program of an affiliated school and shall supervise its proper implementation. The school shall enjoy complete autonomy in its particular interpretation of Judaism and in the determination of its educational objectives. In its educational practices the school shall be guided by educational principles as set forth by the Board of Jewish Education.

Bar Mitzvah Regulations

8. An affiliated school agrees to abide by the rules governing the preparation for and the admission to the Bar Mitzvah and confirmation ceremony as set forth by the Allied Jewish School Board and the Chicago Rabbinical Association, respectively.
Submission of Reports

9. An affiliated school agrees to submit periodic reports on registration, on class progress, etc...

From Information Bulletin #18 (American Association for Jewish Education, March 1951)
APPENDIX F

TERMS OF AFFILIATION OF CONGREGATIONAL SCHOOLS WITH THE
BOARD OF JEWISH EDUCATION OF BALTIMORE

I. Services to be Rendered Affiliated Schools by Board of Jewish Education.

A. Supervision of Classroom Instruction.

1. An affiliated school will be included by the Supervisor and Executive Director in their regular program of supervision.

2. The principal will be given a written record of each observation made at his school by the Supervisor.

3. Results of observations by the Supervisor or by the Executive Director will be discussed, whenever necessary or desirable, with the principal and the individual teachers concerned.

B. Educational Material

1. All programs, bulletins, projects, procedures, courses and other educational materials prepared by the Board of Jewish Education will be placed at the disposal of the principal and teachers.

2. Guidance and assistance in the proper use of these materials will be given.

3. Curricular material prepared for pupils will be made available to children at cost.

C. Inter-School Activities

1. In planning inter-school activities provision shall be made for full participation of every affiliated school.

2. These activities are: Festival Celebrations, Educational Contests, Jewish Education Week, Registration Campaigns, P.T.A. Council, Inter-School Athletic Program, etc.

D. Full Participation in Professional Program

1. The principal shall be admitted as a full member in the Principals' group and shall participate in the regular monthly meetings of the principals, with the Executive Director as chairman.

2. The teachers shall have the same rights as regular staff members of Board of Jewish Education, to attend all staff meetings, conferences, Seminars, Courses, etc.
I. Other Services

1. Consultative service in all aspects of the school program, inclusive of extra-curricular activities.

2. Setting up semester program for the week-day school, and annual program for the Sunday School.

3. Advice on school plant and physical and instructional equipment.

4. School survey and evaluation.

II. - Obligations Assumed by Affiliated Schools

A. Facilities

1. The Board of an affiliated school shall provide and maintain physical quarters in accordance with acceptable standards of school hygiene and safety.

B. Staff

1. It shall employ only qualified teachers, accredited by the Board of Jewish Education or by the City License Committee for Hebrew Teachers (to be set up).

2. Before dismissing teachers, the school Board shall consult with the appropriate committee of the Board of Jewish Education or its representatives.

3. Salaries, terms of employment, vacation, etc., shall be determined by the School Board after similar joint consultation, and shall, as far as possible, conform to the standards of the Board of Jewish Education.

4. The School Board shall require its staff members to cooperate with the Executive Director of the Board of Jewish Education and its supervisory staff in all matters undertaken by them to improve the organization and functioning of the school.

5. The School Board shall also require its staff members to participate in such teachers' guidance conferences and courses of training as may be arranged by the Board of Jewish Education for its staff members from time to time.

C. Curriculum

1. The practice of the Board of Jewish Education is that all changes in curriculum, texts, methods, schedules, etc., are first discussed by the principals' group and by it recommended to the Board.
2. In accordance with this practice, all changes in curriculum, texts, methods, schedules, etc., contemplated by an affiliated school shall first be discussed by the principal with the Executive Director and Supervisor, following which recommendations are to be made to the local School Board.

D. Reports

1. For the purposes of analysis, comparison and study, the principal and teachers shall submit to the Board of Jewish Education regular reports on attendance, progress, testing, etc., such as are now submitted by the schools affiliated with the Board and such as may be required by the Board of Jewish Education from time to time.

2. Copies of such reports shall always be retained by the School.

III. - Representation on Board of Jewish Education

A. A school affiliating with the Board of Jewish Education shall be entitled to one representative on the Executive Committee of the Board of Jewish Education and one additional representative on the full Board.

From: Information Bulletin #18 (American Association for Jewish Education, March 1951)
THE PURPOSE AND WORK OF THE BUREAU OF JEWISH EDUCATION

by S. Benderly

The work that the Bureau of Jewish Education is doing is in line with the ideas and principles that have been motivating its efforts since its establishment in 1910. In view of the fact that these ideas and principles will, I believe, continue to guide us in any further attempt, it would be helpful to enumerate them:

I.

TO MAKE JEWISH EDUCATION A COMMUNITY RESPONSIBILITY

When we began we had to approach our problem somewhat in the fashion of the medieval philosophers who were concerned with "creation ex nihilo". How could one solve the problem of Jewish education when the very concept did not exist? There were a few Talmud Torahs on a par with the poorhouse in medieval society, and a number of chadarim scattered here and there in basements, garrets, empty stores and crowded living quarters of melamdim.

Such instruction could not be called Jewish education. The first step, therefore, was to define the new Jewish education - that is, a system of Jewish training, both for the child and the youth, that would transmit the best of the Jewish tradition in a way that would make it possible for the community to perpetuate its Jewish life in harmony with the American environment.

The evolution, coordination and conduct of such a system of education would require a mastering of all the spiritual resources of the community, and must be under communal control. With control, of course, must come responsibility - responsibility not only in supplying sufficient central funds for experimentation, initiation, organization, coordination and supervision, but a responsibility which the community will manifest through its willingness to accept Jewish education as one of its major activities, and its readiness to give to it the authority of its name and its credit.

II.

TO MAKE JEWISH EDUCATION, IN THE SENSE OF THE MAINTENANCE OF SCHOOLS, A SELF-SUPPORTING UNDERTAking

Jewish education is, of necessity, a voluntary undertaking, just as Jewish living is. It therefore is self-evident that without having the taxing power, the Jewish community, even were it organized, could not possibly assume the full financial responsibility for a system of Jewish education. Furthermore, American tradition in public education is in the direction of
decentralization and local responsibility.

In a voluntary, decentralized system, then, how much of the responsibility can be assumed by the organized community and how much must be left to local effort and management? Looking at it practically, it seems that Jewish education would fare well if the community could assume financial responsibility for experimentation, initiation, organization, coordination and general supervision - a task quite large in itself, in view of the size of the Jewish community of New York City.

On the other hand, the maintenance cost, in the sense of accommodation, teachers' salaries, scholarships for children who cannot pay, and local supervision, must be borne by the local communities through tuition fees and local contributions. Difficult as this task would undoubtedly be for the less prosperous neighborhoods, the very responsibility that they will assume will act as a stimulus and as a strengthening of the will towards Jewish living - a by-product which will in itself be a gain for the stability and permanence of the educational endeavor.

III.
TO BUILD UP PROFESSIONAL JEWISH LEADERSHIP WITH HIGH STANDARDS

It was evident from the start that a voluntary decentralized system would require a more delicate mechanism for coordination and supervision than a centralized, legally authorized system does. The educational leadership would have to consist of men and women possessing tact, patience, and capacity for cooperation. In addition to their Jewish training they would have to be abreast of modern educational theory and practice, and, above all, be imbued with an abiding faith in the worthwhileness of their task and in the possibility of Jewish life in the American environment.

IV.
TO CREATE A PROFESSIONAL CLASS OF JEWISH TEACHERS

The success of any school system depends primarily upon the quality of its teachers. This is even more true of a Jewish school system. The task of the Jewish teacher is more difficult than that of the public school teacher. Due to the dejudaisation of the home, the children who come to the Jewish school are, as a rule, bare of Jewish legend and story, of ceremony and custom, and of sentiment for Jewish living. The absence of a Jewish milieu that should give warmth, atmosphere and background to classroom teaching is the first handicap of the Jewish teacher.
The second handicap is his economic status. The community does not recognize the worth of the Jewish teacher, and therefore is unwilling to give him a living wage and at least the illusion of security. In the effort to build up a class of professional Jewish teachers we shall have to concentrate primarily on ways and means of overcoming these two handicaps.

Teachers' salaries, according to our calculation, will have to be covered by tuition fees. The capacity of parents to pay tuition fees, the number of weekly teaching hours, and the possible total register of a teacher indicate that the income will not be sufficient to support a man with a family. The public school had to reckon with a similar situation. In spite of the taxing power of local communities they are not able to raise sufficient funds to draw men into public school teaching. Before the depression, almost 60% of the teaching personnel were women. Can we, without the taxing power, hope to do better? The professional class of Jewish teachers will, therefore, increasingly consist of women.

We must, however, reckon with the fact that the teaching staff in the Jewish schools has until now consisted of men almost exclusively. Some of them intended to teach only a few years while preparing themselves for other professions. A considerable number of men, however, have made Jewish teaching their life work. They have given the best in them to this work. They cannot simply be scrapped. As some of them are displaced by women it is the duty of the community, through its social service agencies and through a pension fund, to help adjust these men.

This increasing number of women in the Jewish teaching profession may not only help solve, at least in part, the economic phase, but women with their emotional attitude may be able to help us cope with the absence of the Jewish milieu, and the dejudized home. They may contribute to the re-building of both.

V.

TO RECKON WITH THE MODERN WORLD IN THE SELECTION OF THE CONTENT FOR JEWISH EDUCATION

The building up of a modern curriculum for the Jewish school will be one of the difficult tasks. The modern view requires emphasis on the present, and the practical. The substance of the traditional curriculum deals mainly with the past and the abstract. A large part of Jewish content which formerly had an immediate bearing upon life has, with the changing mode of Jewish living become more remote.

Furthermore, the old curriculum reckoned primarily with the child of elementary school age. The new must give emphasis
to the adolescent period. It is during this period that interpretation and orientation become possible. All the real questioning begins then. Jewish education must re-define for this generation all the issues that have been raised since the beginning of the Emancipation period.

Again, the modern curriculum must also include informal activities that would offer the child an opportunity for Jewish experiences formerly provided by the environment.

The place of the Hebrew language in the Jewish curriculum must also be defined. The Hebrew language is one of the links that unite the Jews of the past and the present, and is one of the symbols of the unity of Judaism throughout the world. It is also the medium through which the New Palestine is fashioning a new Jewish life. The Hebrew tongue is thus an integral part of the concept of Judaism.

We must, however, reckon with the difficulty involved in its acquisition. To acquire in a non-Jewish environment a sufficient knowledge of the Hebrew language to have access to Jewish literature in the original is an arduous task. Only those whose background is favorable will succeed in doing so. Yet, because of its integral importance, a certain amount of Hebrew should be acquired by every child, and the fostering of a love for the language must be one of the objectives of the content of a modern curriculum.

This new curriculum, as it is evolved, will not be accepted readily. On the one hand, the generation that still manifests considerable interest in Jewish education has brought with it the traditional curriculum from another environment and another period. It will naturally oppose change. On the other hand, the American born generation that might accept a modern curriculum is not sufficiently interested in Jewish education. Step by step, however, as the modern Jewish educator will succeed in demonstrating the efficacy of the new, and as a larger number of modern Jews become interested in Jewish education, the new curriculum will find its place in Jewish education.

VI.

TO EVOLVE METHODS OF INSTRUCTION THAT ARE FULLY IN ACCORD WITH MODERN EDUCATIONAL THEORY AND PRACTICE, AND TO EMBODY THE CONTENT OF JEWISH EDUCATION IN BOOKS AND EDUCATIONAL EQUIPMENT THAT ARE ON A PAR WITH THOSE IN THE FIELD OF GENERAL EDUCATION

Jewish content is in its very nature too abstract for the child of elementary school age. The content of general education is largely factual. A child learns to read the language which it speaks and uses in its daily life. Arithmetic and geography in the modern school have been brought within the ken of the child. The simple lessons in civics and hygiene deal with things with which the child comes in
daily contact. History as such, in the elementary schools, practically does not exist. Hero stories, nature stories, the story of man's conquest of his environment fill the child's readers.

Jewish content is not as simple. It is, as a rule, beyond the grasp of the child. Jewish history is a difficult subject even for an adult. It requires a knowledge of world geography, of ancient, medieval and modern history. Jewish literature presents an outlook upon life that is beyond the horizon of the child, for to know its essence is to know in a measure the history of human culture.

To bring some of this content within the grasp of the child of elementary school age would require the imagination, inventiveness and artistry of gifted teachers. To do their work effectively we must enable them to present this material to their pupils in as many forms as possible - through legends and stories; through poems and songs; through playlets and dances; through arts and crafts; through children's newspapers and libraries; through games and holiday celebrations. We must give them the aid of pictures, slides and films. And for the teaching of Hebrew we must have textbooks to fit the varied curricula.

Nor must we overlook the youth. For them there is great need for a well-written history of the Jews, a carefully prepared anthology of Jewish literature, a good book on Palestine, an informing book on American Jewry, a well-edited bulletin on Jewish current events, and source material for forums, symposia and debates on contemporary Jewish problems.

VII.

TO SO SCHEDULE JEWISH EDUCATION THAT IT WILL RECKON WITH THE TIME AVAILABLE TO THE CHILD, AND NOT OVER-BURDEN IT DURING THE DAYS OF ITS ATTENDANCE AT PUBLIC SCHOOL.

The two outstanding difficulties in the path of Jewish education are the absence of a Jewish milieu and the insufficient time available for Jewish instruction. After a child has attended public school until 3 o'clock in the afternoon, it needs the rest of the day for recreation. This recreation time cannot be invaded by Jewish education without fatiguing the child. Nor will the present schedule of five sessions a week, and the teaching hours from four to eight P.M. be feasible in Americanized neighborhoods. In normal homes the child is expected to eat his evening meal with the family and be in bed early. These factors played a part in the birth of the Jewish Sunday School.

But can adequate Jewish instruction be acquired in the limited time available in Sunday School? The Sunday School, as a rule, is in session thirty-five times a year, for about two hours. The more thoughtful rabbi with long experience in Sunday School work finds the time inadequate.
Is there no other solution? -- Of the 365 days of the year, the public schools demand attendance of the child approximately 190 days. During the remaining 175 days the child is free to engage in any non-public school activity. Jewish education, therefore, must move its center of gravity from the 190 days of public school attendance to the 175 when the child is free.

The summer vacation of seventy days offers a matchless opportunity through camps, and even through city playgrounds, for both formal and informal Jewish instruction. During that period we can lay the foundation of the child's educational program of the year. In camp it can live a complete Jewish life, in a Jewish milieu where the atmosphere, activities and experiences will energize it, or, so to say, charge it with momentum for the work of the rest of the year. On Saturdays and Sundays of the school year, the work so well begun during the summer, can be continued; and even some of the public school days can be utilized for an informal non-fatiguing Jewish educational program.

Since it will take time for a program as outlined above to be evolved and accepted, we must be satisfied for the present with one that can more readily be attained. For the elementary school child between the ages of eight and thirteen we need two types of curricula, involving different schedules of time.

For those who are linguistically minded, whose background and milieu encourage the study of the Hebrew tongue, and who show a genuine interest in Hebrew, an Hebraic curriculum is possible. Such an Hebraic nucleus is of value not only because of the benefit to the children who will acquire a more intensive knowledge of the Hebrew language and literature, but also for the influence that it will exert on Jewish education generally. Such a curriculum can be carried out in a three-day-a-week schedule.

For the bulk of the Jewish children, however, we need a curriculum which will center around Jewish hero stories, customs, music, Palestine, simple current events, and those parts of the Bible, in translation, within the scope of the elementary school child. The Hebrew language, too, should be a part of that curriculum. The purpose, however, here, should be to give the child a sufficient knowledge of the language to enable it to become acquainted with functional Hebraic terms -- terms that carry with them also Jewish content -- and to understand the simpler prayers used in the Synagogue. But above all, the aim should be to give the child a sense of affiliation with Hebraic Judaism. Such a curriculum will require a one-day-a-week session for the younger children between the ages of eight and ten, and a two or three-day-a-week session for those between ten and thirteen.

These two formal curricula should be supplemented by informal or extra-curricular activities, such as children's services, library, arts and crafts, dancing, dramatics, and
holiday celebrations.

of the adolescents, only a small number will be attracted
to either the Hebrew or the general curriculum which require
attendance more than once a week. Boys and girls in the public
high schools are quite busy with their studies. Because,
however, of their capacity at that age to prepare assignments,
a great deal can be accomplished with a one-day-a-week schedule.
For them, too, it is essential to have informal activities that
will give them an opportunity for association and the formation
of friendships.

VIII.

TO PUT THE EDUCATION OF THE GIRL ON A PAR WITH THAT OF THE
BOY

In medieval times the Jews gave formal instruction to
their boys only. The girl's training depended largely upon the
home. That the home was successful in training the girl
Jewishly is only another proof of the greater effectiveness of
the informal in education as against the formal.

In this country where a woman's status is entirely dif-
ferent from that of medieval society, where she receives a
general education on a par with the male element of the popu-
lation, where the greatest threat to Jewish life is a
dejudaised home, the girl must have her rightful place both
in the classroom and outside on a par with the boy.

IX.

TO MEET THE DISTINCTIVE EDUCATIONAL NEED OF THE PRE-SCHOOL
CHILD

The points enumerated above deal largely with what might
be termed educational engineering — financing, personnel,
content, method, schedule. The problem of the Jewish child
of pre-school age is of a more fundamental nature.

In the past, the institutions that made for Jewish living
were the home, public opinion, the Synagogue, and the school.
of these, the home was the most potent. Through the many
impressions that the child received in the home, the emotional
basis for his Jewishness was laid. This informal training also
made him more receptive to the formal instruction which he
received in the school.

Now the child is not only older when it enters the Jewish
school, but due to the lack of Jewish influence and background
in the home during its most impressionable period, it comes to
school too bare Jewishly speaking. This lack of preparation
makes the child less receptive to the formal instruction, and
is a big factor in the large elimination that takes place
during the first school year. It is also, in a large measure,
responsible for the lack of interest manifested by our youth.
towards things Jewish.

The pre-school child, hence, constitutes a distinct problem in Jewish education. A way must be found whereby the mother and the home may again be allied with the school.

X.

TO MOTIVATE THE ENTERPRISE OF THE NEW JEWISH EDUCATION WITH THE BELIEF IN THE WORTHWHILENESS OF A POSITIVE JEWISH LIFE IN AMERICA, AND IN ITS POSSIBILITY. IT IS THEN, AND ONLY THEN, THAT WE CAN CHALLENGE THE OVERSHADOWING MENACE TO JEWISH EDUCATION - THE UNSCHOoled

One wonders which is the greater task in Jewish education - the task of improving the education that American Jewry is giving to 25% of its children, or that of attracting the 75% who are at present not reached.

One asks why so many parents are willing to forego the Jewish training of their children. Is it because the work done at present with the 25% is unsatisfactory? This is undoubtedly a factor. The real reason, however, is the lack of a conscious understanding of the vital necessity of Jewish education. Even those who send their children to Jewish schools do so, largely, not because of a conscious understanding of its necessity, but rather through habit, momentum. Jewish education has so long been an expression of the Jewish will to live, that in the course of time it has gathered momentum, and a part of it has carried over into the new environment and new times. In a large number of Jews, however, this momentum is slowing down, and may even cease. That is why so many children of school age receive no Jewish instruction.

This indifference on the part of a large number of Jews does not only mean that their children remain ignorant of things Jewish, but as they mingle with those receiving a Jewish training, they neutralize with their indifference the work done.

Jewish educators, therefore, can not consider their task solely one of machinery, the coordination of fine parts, efficient management - essential as these are - but one that also concerns itself with the quickening of the Jewish consciousness. The work, therefore, which they will do must have that fine quality and must be the result of such an abiding faith in the positiveness of Jewish life, that it will contribute toward the strengthening of the Jewish will to live.
FUNCTIONS OF A CENTRAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY

From the 1936 New York Jewish Education Study

by I. E. Berkson

The functions of the New York Committee for Jewish Education will be divided into three main departments:

1) Education research, experimentation, and educational material.

2) Educational, administrative, and financial services to existing schools.

3) Public relations, propaganda, and membership.

A: Department of Educational Research, Experimentation, and Educational Material

A: Educational Research and Experimentation.

1) Maintain a school, several schools, or classes for the purpose of working out suitable educational programs, including types of curricula, methods of teaching, administrative techniques, extra-curricular activities, Sabbath services and holiday celebrations, parents' organizations, etc.

2) Cooperate with existing schools, which may wish to experiment and develop curricula along the above lines, providing there exist proper conditions for such experimental work.

B: New Types of Instruction and Educational Activity.

1) Supervised Home Study Groups

for small groups of children, who live in outlying districts, or whose parents prefer private instruction.

2) Summer vacation programs

through a) informal courses in schools; b) indoor home camps; c) Jewish educational work in camps.
iii) Extension education for youth through clubs and other informal educational activities.

iv) Informal activities for children under the age of eight who do not attend any Jewish schools, and cooperation with other organizations conducting such activities.

C: Text Books, Syllabi, Educational Material, etc.

i) Write and publish text books, syllabi; create educational materials and paraphernalia, required by experimental schools and classes, home study groups, extension activities, etc. mentioned in the preceding paragraph.

ii) Books and materials for home and library
   a) holiday pamphlets for children, youths and adults;
   b) literary classics and story books for use in children's library and home reading.
   c) children's newspaper and periodicals.

iii) Children's illustrated encyclopedia for home and school use.

D: Publications

i) Publication of experiments in teaching; surveys and reports of education, books on education, etc.

ii) Bulletins on special aspects of instruction and conduct of the school such as
    how to conduct a Jewish club, a choir, graduation exercises, records, etc.

iii) Publication of statistics and information on school enrollment and attendance.
E. Research Fellowships

1) For study of special pedagogical problems in connection with development of courses of study.

2) For research in history and Jewish problems required for text books.

2: Department of Educational, Administrative and Financial Service to Existing Schools

A: Educational Services

1) Maintain a staff of critic teachers and supervisors for guidance and instruction in various subjects, Hebrew, history, current events, etc.

2) Cooperate closely with teachers institutes and assist them in various ways, such as supplying critic teachers, instructors in club leading, dramatics, arts and crafts, and giving assistance in providing opportunities for practice teaching.

3) Maintain an exhibit of text books and educational materials with a supervisor in charge.

4) Maintain a supply department for renting and lending out slides, motion pictures, costumes, and other materials and paraphernalia needed by schools.

5) Supply special services for teaching of dramatics, singing, arts and crafts; assistance in holiday celebrations and other school events.

6) Cooperation with public high schools and other organizations concerned with the teaching of Hebrew, history, or other forms of Jewish instruction to the high school
youth.

vii) Cooperation with organizations engaged in adult Jewish education.

B: Administrative Assistance

1) Cooperate with the Principals and Teachers' associations

ii) Organize Parents' Association and parental education

iii) Maintain a Board of Examination and Teachers' License in cooperation with teachers' institutes and teachers organizations.

iv) Building service:

assistance in planning school buildings and major repairs, suggestions for financing, etc.

v) School records, attendance, and collections.

C: Financial Aid

i) Material assistance rendered in kind, supplying teachers for special classes, lending educational paraphernalia.

ii) Text books and other materials at reduced prices to enable schools to use approved texts, instead of cheap books published for commercial purposes.

iii) Assistance in repairs of building to stimulate provision of better school quarters by participating in expenditure made by local institutions. (See IV 5)

iv) Payment of scholarships:

the term is used in the limited sense to designate payments made to schools on behalf of parents who cannot afford to pay the tuition fee. Such payments are regarded as being only a minor element in the school income. (See IV 4)
v) Subsidies:
The term is used to designate substantial grants-in-aid, designed to supply the differential between what may be obtained through local support, including tuition fees, and the sum needed to conduct the school on approved standards in administration, minimum teachers' salary and educational work. (See IV 5)

3: Department of Public Relations

**Propaganda, and Membership**

1: Development of membership and financial support for the New York Committee for Jewish Education.

2: Assistance to local committees in organization of campaigns and in the development of local membership and support.

3: Parental education designed to increase attendance and to prolong the period of the child's stay at school.

4: General publicity and education to develop better understanding of the Jewish educational problems - unconnected with appeals for funds.

**IV. Financial Policy**

1: It is understood that the funds for Jewish education from the Friedsam Foundation, if obtained, will consist of a definite sum to be expended within the course of a specific number of years. If divided among the many Jewish schools, the fund would not go very far and at the end of its availability the institutions would again be thrown upon their own resources. While some temporary relief may thus be obtained, a precious opportunity for utilizing the funds for constructive purposes of lasting significance to the development of Jewish education would be lost. It is therefore urged that
the Jewish educational funds to be derived from the Friedsam Foundation, should be conserved for projects designed to improve the quality of Jewish instruction, such as maintaining a school or schools for experimental purposes, development of courses of study, methods and text books, issuance of publications, etc. Specifically the recommendation is to allocate the Friedsam Foundation to the Department of Educational Research, Experimentation and Educational Materials, to be used for the functions enumerated in Section II, under 1, A to E inclusive.

2: For the other departments - 2: Department of Educational, Administrative, and Financial Service to Existing Schools; and 3: Department of Public Relations, Propaganda, and Membership - there will be available the sums obtained from the membership of the Jewish Education Association to be transferred to the new organization, and from the Federation funds released each year as a result of the liquidation of obligations to the Religious schools, as recommended in Section II, paragraph 2. It is evident that in the early years, at least, a sum large enough for adequate program under these departments will be available, only if an active policy of developing financial support is pursued, and it is understood that the Council referred to in Section II, para. 4 above, will, in cooperation with the Governing Board, take the leadership in the development of such support.

3: As to the general policy in giving aid to schools, it is recommended that assistance should be given primarily in the form of services, provision of supervision, special teachers, paraphernalia, and text books, and that direct financial
assistance be avoided, as far as possible, at least until the time when the large funds needed for such purposes will be available.

4: Payment of scholarships for free cases shall be limited for the present to the amount now paid by the Jewish Education Association, as provided in Section II, paragraph 4, above.

5: The repair of school quarters is one of the important elements in the improvement of schools, both from the hygienic and educational point of view. Such assistance may be given as a one time, non-recurring financial grant, and should be limited strictly by funds available. To stimulate local initiative and to avoid multiplicity of demands, the financial assistance for building repairs should be in the form of a proportionate payment of a sum expended by the local institutions.

6: The Jewish educational work demands funds far beyond the present ability of any Jewish central agency. The main support for Jewish education must come from tuition fees and local funds derived from memberships, etc. Nevertheless, the development of a coordinated system of Jewish education on an approved level is highly improbable without substantial assistance from central sources. Such subsidies should be large enough to make possible the conduct of the school on approved standards, but not so large to discourage the development of payment of a maximum of tuition fees, and the development of neighborhood support.

However, there is no likelihood of obtaining - in the
near future - a sum large enough for adequate subsidies, and it is not desirable to divide up whatever little there may be into small appropriations. A planned system of subsidies may be introduced when a sum will be available - over and above the funds needed for other functions described above - large enough to permit the organization of twenty-five schools in various sections of the city on a standardized basis. Such a nucleus of schools, operating together with the factors of better text books, curricula, experimental schools, supervision and other educational assistance outlined above, will undoubtedly be effective in raising the standards of school work throughout the city in all its aspects.

It is therefore proposed that the granting of subsidies be included among the functions of the New York Committee for Jewish Education. However, it should be left to them to decide when, and under what conditions such subsidies should be granted.

V: Educational Policy

1: The proposed central agency will not exercise any powers or administrative control over schools. The various services outlined above will be available for all schools which may wish to make use of them.

2: If any form of financial assistance, either in kind or through scholarships or subsidies be given, the New York Committee may require the fulfillment of certain usual conditions, such as provision of sanitary quarters, balancing of budget, employment of certified teachers, and inclusion
of "minimum essentials" in the course of study. But the Committee will not interfere with the religious, Philosophical, or educational viewpoint of any institution, nor attempt to impose any particular viewpoint upon them.

3: On the other hand, it should be clear that in the conduct of any school or classes for experimental purposes and in the development of text books, syllabi, etc. certain educational assumptions would have to be made, and the following are accepted as guiding principles:

a) Jewish education is regarded as supplementary to the general education received in the public schools.

b) Religious elements receive full consideration, both in course of study and in practice, as in the conduct of Sabbath services and celebration of holidays. With reference to the particular religious viewpoint in any school, the principal and teachers must be guided by the general attitude prevailing in the homes from which the pupils come.

c) Hebrew is included as an important element in the course of study.

d) English is regarded as the vernacular and would be used in all elementary courses as the language of instruction in "content" subjects where free discussion is necessary, such as history, current events, certain aspects of Jewish literature.

4: A special point arises with reference to direct financial assistance. Here a distinction should be made between scholarships for poor pupils and subsidies for maintenance, using these
terms as defined above in Section III C, IV, V.

As far as scholarships are concerned, all types of schools should benefit equally, provided they give at least a minimum Jewish education under satisfactory conditions. Such procedure finds its justification on the theory that inability to pay the tuition fee should not limit the parents' freedom of choice of the type of school to which the child is sent.

Subsidies, however, which are designed for the maintenance and development of schools present a more difficult problem. No subsidies of this type are at present being given by any of the central educational organizations to the Yiddishist or All Day schools, and on the grounds of precedent, the New York Committee would be justified in concentrating its efforts on the very large middle group of schools, which include the Week Day and Sunday schools.

To avoid misunderstanding, it should be added that no question can be raised as to the right of the individual groups or organizations to conduct schools in accordance with their own philosophy, even when this philosophy differs from that held by the majority. And as already indicated, no type of school is to be excluded from the benefits of scholarship payments, as provided for above in Section IV. Furthermore, as implied throughout, it is hoped that all the Jewish school types will take advantage of whatever educational and administrative services the New York Committee may have to offer.
Appendix I

Proposal for the Establishment of a Central Educational Agency in Philadelphia

(Excerpt from the Survey of Jewish Education in Philadelphia (1943) by L. L. Honor and E. Liebman)

The establishment of a central bureau of Jewish education to work with all elements of the community is desirable and feasible. Such a bureau should be established under the aegis of the Philadelphia Council on Jewish Education and all of the present educational groups should enter as constituent units.

The budgets of the constituent agencies receiving support from the Allied Jewish Appeal should be submitted to the Council for review prior to their being submitted to the Allied Jewish Appeal. Community support to the agencies should be given for the payment of full and partial scholarships and for grants-in-aid for specific purposes to enable the schools to carry on their work on a proper level.

The functions of this Bureau would be:

1. To study the problems confronting each unit, to give advice and guidance on the basis of such a study, but in each instance to leave the decisions to each element unless the safety or health of children is involved.

2. To stimulate each element to improve its work and to try to maintain the highest possible standards. Once a group has of its own accord, or under the stimulus of the Bureau but nevertheless of its own volition, adopted a standard of performance, guiding principle of program, it would be within the province of this Bureau to see to it that the group in question implement its own decisions.

3. To encourage intergroup activity and intergroup cooperation and to explore areas of cooperation.

4. To maintain a permanent exhibit, an educational library and information service calculated to be of help to the rabbis, superintendents, of the constituent systems, principals, lay leaders in Jewish education and students.

5. To encourage necessary research, experimentation and the preparation of needed texts and educational materials, and

6. To interpret the problems of Jewish education to the community.

Moreover, the Bureau would be on the lookout for ways and means to meet growing needs and for new approaches to the problems of educating the Jewish child to live intelligently as a Jew in America, without any disharmony but with a thorough integration of the Jewish and American elements.
of his experience and a thorough integration of his loyalty to his country to which he owes undivided civic allegiance and loyalty to the Jewish people with which he is identified through a long history and an aspiration for a creative future.

Since the goals of Jewish education need to be conceived in terms of total personality development, there can be no marked delimitations of the area in which the Jewish educational process is involved. This process impinges on many fields of community endeavor, particularly the recreational. There should be an integration of the educational and recreational programs of the community without any diminution of the essential objectives each program is intended to achieve. For that matter, the programs of all community agencies which have a bearing on Jewish personality development should be so integrated. It should therefore be the function of the Bureau of Jewish Education together with the Jewish recreation and other Jewish communal agencies to embark on a joint exploration of possible areas of cooperative effort and of ways and means of correlating and articulating all programs bearing on the development of personality of Jewish youth and adults so that these programs might serve the best interests and welfare of the Jewish community as a whole.

To accomplish these purposes the Bureau would need the services of an executive director and five supervisors - one for the Yeshivot and Associated Talmud Torahs, one for the congregational three-days-week schools, two for the one-days-week schools - Conservative and Reform, and Orthodox and one for the Yiddishist schools. In addition there should be three fine-arts supervisors, for music, artcraft, and dramatics. These supervisors must in every instance be acceptable to the groups with whom they will be expected to work, sympathy with their educational aims and objectives and at the same time concerned with the welfare of the Jewish community as a whole. They should be appointed by the Council on Jewish Education with the approval of the executive director to be appointed, subject to his guidance and responsible to him for the effective execution of their tasks. Ample budget should be provided by the central community agency to make it possible to invite for these posts the kind of men who would be equal to their responsibility.

The success of the proposed program is predicated on the assumption that all of these individuals will possess a rich Jewish background, thorough training in educational theory and practice, full knowledge of the progress and developments in American Jewish Education and an appreciation of the problems which challenge the American Jewish educator. They will not succeed in their task unless they are, in addition, men or women of inspiring personality who have faith in the future of American Israel. They must also believe in the possibilities of American Israel’s working out its Jewish educational problem in a manner which would insure Jewish living in America on the highest possible plane. They must have confidence in the possibility of developing individuals who will be thoroughly integrated into the American community, but fully conscious of the privilege which is theirs and the responsibility which they carry as Jews.
APPENDIX J

SUGGESTED PLAN FOR COORDINATION OF EXISTING AFTERNOON WEKNDAY SCHOOLS (TALMUD TORAH) IN GREATER MIAMI

Preamble

In order to effect greater cooperation and coordination of activities among existing afternoon weekday schools (Talmud Torah) in Greater Miami, in order to provide extended facilities and opportunities for Jewish education for all age groups in accordance with the studied needs of the Jewish community, and in order to encourage existing as well as newly established schools to attain higher standards of pupil achievement, the J.E.A. will offer these schools and educational agencies expert professional services, central direction and certain forms of financial aid.

Plan of Coordination and Unification

1. Each of the existing schools remains an autonomous unit, continues to meet in its present quarters, and its budget is supplied by the congregation with which it is affiliated.

2. In order to help a school in its efforts to raise its standards of educational achievement, the J.E.A. will offer such school certain specified forms of financial aid in accordance with available funds. Congregations will not be expected to make direct contributions towards the budget of the J.E.A., except to pay a nominal affiliation fee to register their respective schools with the J.E.A.

3. The religious point of view of each school is determined wholly and directly by the congregation to which it belongs, and is under the direct and full supervision of the rabbi in charge of the congregation.

4. Each school will follow a course of study, jointly prepared by the Rabbinical and Teacher Councils with the aid of the supervisor or the Director of the J.E.A. This course of study will include subjects to be studied, minimum ground to be covered, texts to be used in each course each year. Point of view and texts to be taught must represent that of the congregation where the teacher is serving.

5. The Joint Council of Rabbis and Teachers shall, with the aid of the J.E.A. director, set standards for all courses, and arrange for periodic tests in all schools to be administered in accordance with joint decisions made by them.

6. The Joint Council of Rabbis and Teachers may, with the aid of the J.E.A. director, set minimum qualifications, conditions of service, and standards of remuneration for teachers, to be recommended to the Board of the J.E.A. for adoption.

7. All decisions made by the Council of Rabbis and Teachers, and by the Supervisor or Director of the J.E.A., may, if necessary, be reviewed by the Board of the J.E.A.
8. Teachers employed in the weekday schools of Greater Miami should apply or qualify for a Hebrew teacher's license, if they do not already possess one. This contemplates obtaining license from the National Board for Licenses of Hebrew Teachers, c/o The American Association for Jewish Education, 1776 Broadway, New York City. Such licenses represent minimum requirements for teaching in a Talmud Torah or Hebrew school. The Greater Miami Joint Council of Rabbis and Teachers can add to these requirements if they see fit to do so. Most of the present teachers in the Greater Miami Weekday Schools would seem to qualify for such licenses and would be able to obtain them upon written application. Others should be given from three to five years to qualify. (Incidentally, regularly ordained rabbis are automatically recognized by the Board of License). Nothing that has been said above should be construed as recommending the dismissal of any teacher now employed in the Greater Miami weekday schools (Talmud Torah).

9. New teachers to be appointed by each of the respective congregations or schools will be upon the joint recommendations of the rabbi in charge and the Executive Director or Supervisor of the J.E.A.

10. Individual weekday schools (Talmud Torah) can receive the following services and others from the J.E.A.

   a) Help in the registration of pupils, through joint enrollment campaigns, and through the maintenance of a continuing school registry and a Jewish child census for the Greater Miami area.

   b) Assistance in keeping school records and getting school information.

   c) Assistance in stimulating the collection of tuition fees, and in raising of tuition fee standards.

   d) Assistance in maintaining high standards of building facilities and school equipment.

   e) Assistance to teachers in all pedagogic matters and help towards their self improvement. Preparation of pedagogic materials.

   f) Assistance to Rabbis and local Boards of Education of each congregation in all administrative matters pertaining to their respective schools, including the preparation of school budgets.

   g) Assistance to the Joint Council of Rabbis and Teachers and to the Board of Directors of the J.E.A. to carry out decisions made by them.

   h) Expert consultation and assistance from a qualified Jewish educational supervisor and his staff.
11. The Supervisor

a) Because of the size of the Greater Miami community, it would be advisable that the executive appointed by the J.E.A. serve in two capacities:

1) An executive director of the J.E.A.

2) As supervisor of the Weekday Schools.

b) The qualifications of such a person should include:

1) Advanced secular academic training

2) Advanced Jewish academic training

3) Advanced pedagogic training

4) Advanced experience as teacher, principal and educational administrator

5) Exceptional character, and a record of achievement to command respect of rabbis, teachers and laity.

TENTATIVE MINIMUM PROGRAM FOR JEWISH EDUCATION ASSOCIATION
OF GREATER MIAMI

General Purposes of the J.E.A.

1. To help to coordinate existing facilities for Jewish education in Greater Miami.

2. To help to extend such facilities, and to help to increase opportunities for Jewish education in this city, wherever they are found necessary or desirable for the benefit of children, youth or adults (especially the unschooled).

3. To help to improve existing facilities, and to help advance standards of Jewish education for all age groups in existing educational institutions.

General Manner of Operation

The J.E.A. will endeavor to fulfill these purposes through:

a) Mutual discussions with each of the existing educational agencies (schools, Y's etc.)

b) Offering educational information and assistance.
c) Offering particular forms of financial aid to old and new educational agencies recognized as necessary or desirable in the community.

d) Continuous study and research of local educational facts and experiences.

Functions and Services of the J.E.A.

1. To effect greater cooperation and coordination of Jewish educational activity among the several religious schools and other educational agencies in the Greater Miami Jewish community.

2. To assist all types of Jewish educational agencies in Greater Miami whether they be weekday schools (Talmud Torah), Sunday Schools, youth organizations or adult groups, and whether they belong to orthodox, conservative, reform or any other recognized grouping in Jewish life.

3. To help local organizations or congregations of Jews in new and growing neighborhoods in their efforts to establish elementary schools if the same are needed, whether they be weekday or Sunday schools.

4. To stimulate the organization of high school courses for children of the weekday schools (Talmud Torah) or Sunday Schools, and to help establish a central high school for advanced Jewish studies, when pupils are ready for same.

5. To establish an adult school for Jewish studies which would provide:
   a) Central classes for adults
   b) Training for Sunday School teachers
   c) Training for club leaders of youth
   d) Parent education
   e) Assistance to Congregational classes for adults

6. To gather and distribute educational information which will help to develop community interest in Jewish education, as well as individual institutions in the conduct of their respective programs; to establish and assemble school records and statistics which include facts about enrollment, attendance, graduation, progress of pupils, tuition fees, costs, finances, teachers, etc.; to carry on educational research in accordance with the development and growing needs of the Jewish community.

7. To assemble and maintain a Library of Judaica, Hebraica and pedagogic materials.

8. To encourage improvements in school buildings and school equipment.

9. To encourage collection of tuition fees from parents, whether directly or indirectly, and to help raise tuition fee standards.
10. To assist schools and other educational agencies in preparing budgets for their respective programs of work.

11. To formulate plans for the adequate financing of a community program in Jewish education for all elements and geographic sections in the Greater Miami area.

12. To offer Jewish educational supervision, guidance and assistance wherever needed in the community.

13. To these functions and services, others may be added as the need for them develops.

Relations between the J. E. A. and Federation

Since most of the views expressed by lay leaders consulted seem to point to Federation as the source for providing the budget of the J. E. A., it is reasonable to expect that the J. E. A. is or will become a participating member of Federation. Under such circumstances it will be subject to the same mutual responsibilities and relationships as govern other participating members of Federation.

Presented by Dr. Israel S. Chipkin and approved by Jewish Education Association of Miami on November 3, 1943.
APPENDIX K

BUREAU OF JEWISH EDUCATION - LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

RULES AND REGULATIONS GOVERNING SUBSIDIES TO SCHOOLS

INTRODUCTION

The Rules and Regulations Governing Subsidies have been worked out over a number of years in order to fix standards by which subsidies, grants and allocations are made to schools. Inasmuch as the Bureau has at its command limited funds for this purpose, it has to decide how to use these funds most effectively for Jewish educational purposes without prejudice to the ideology of the school involved. These rules and regulations have been amended from time to time in accordance with the changed needs of the schools and the changed resources of the Bureau and may be subject to further amendment as new needs may arise.

I. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

The Bureau of Jewish Education grants subsidies to its affiliated schools only if they meet the following requirements.

1. The school requesting a subsidy must be conducted by a reliable organization, which takes full responsibility for the conduct of the school and undertakes to meet all obligations incurred in such responsibility.

2. The school must demonstrate that it cannot meet its budgetary requirements out of tuition fees and other local resources.

3. The school must be of such size and standards as will make for worthwhile Jewish education.

4. It must employ qualified and licensed teachers approved by the Board of Review and Certification and adhere to the minimum curricular and other requirements set up by the Bureau.

II. REGULATIONS GOVERNING SUBSIDIES TO ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

A. Attendance Requirements

1. To receive a subsidy a school must have an average daily attendance of at least fifty pupils. This minimum is established in the interests of educational efficiency and economy.

2. A newly affiliated school, having less than the required minimum, may receive an outright grant for one year, whenever, in the judgement of the Bureau, there are prospects that the school can be developed to the required minimum.
3. Wherever and whenever special grants have been given to small schools in the hope that they will come up to the minimum standards required by the Bureau and where such schools have not come up to the requirements after receiving such grants several years, such grants will be discontinued if the Bureau offers a satisfactory alternative plan of schooling which will adequately take care of the needs of the children of that school. Specific recommendations in line with this resolution will be made for each school separately.

4. To receive a regular subsidy for one teacher, a school must have an average minimum daily attendance of 50 pupils, for two teachers of from 80 to 90 pupils, for three teachers of from 120 to 130 pupils, etc.

5. Wherever and whenever schools cannot conduct classes daily because of transportation problems or other special conditions, the basis of subsidy will be the total number of hours of instruction per week. If classes in such schools meet at least three days a week for a total of six or more hours of formal instruction, the school will be treated like any daily school in the determination of subsidy but will be subject to the same attendance requirements governing five day-a-week schools.

B. Teachers' Salaries and Hours of Instruction

1. Subsidies are given in the form of 70% of teachers' salaries, using the scale of salaries fixed in the Code of Practice for Teachers adopted by the Bureau of Jewish Education.

2. Subsidies to afternoon schools for teachers' salaries are granted on the assumption that they teach 20 hours per week.

3. The present attendance requirements in afternoon elementary schools are based on the assumption that teachers teach three classes each for an hour and twenty minutes a day per class. In schools which make provision for more than six hours of instruction per class, the number of classes per teacher and average attendance will be determined proportionally, but in no case will a subsidy be given for more than ten hours a week of instruction and for less than 35 pupils per teacher.

4. Subsidies to schools for teachers' salaries are granted on the assumption that teachers are to teach ten and a half months and to get six weeks vacation. Whenever a school is in session less than ten and a half months, the teachers must be given equivalent work by the school satisfactory to the Bureau.
III. REGULATIONS GOVERNING SUBSIDIES TO KINDERGARTENS AND ALL-DAY SCHOOLS

1. Subsidies to all-day schools will be granted only for specifically Jewish instruction. The general secular education of children is the responsibility of the parents themselves.

2. Inasmuch as 25 hours of teaching in all-day schools are considered by the Board of Review and Certification the equivalent of 20 hours of teaching in an afternoon school, subsidies to all-day schools will be granted on the basis of a maximum of 12½ hours a week per class and an attendance of 35 pupils per teacher.

3. Subsidies to kindergartens are given as special grants depending upon conditions and resources in the kindergarten of the school and resources in the budget of the Bureau.

IV. REGULATIONS GOVERNING SUBSIDIES TO HIGH SCHOOLS

It is generally recognized that Jewish education on the secondary level, because of its prohibitive cost, should not be considered the responsibility of the community as a whole. It has therefore been agreed that the Bureau of Jewish Education, which is the agency of the community at large, should undertake to maintain secondary schools wherever they are needed assuming the total burden of the cost of such schools.

If an individual school wishes to operate its own secondary classes, that school may apply to the Bureau for assistance. However, no subsidy will be given to a school for high school classes or junior high school classes taught under its own auspices wherever there is a high school or a branch of a high school or junior high school conducted by the Bureau, which can adequately take care of the needs of the pupils of that school. When subsidies to high schools or high school classes are given, they will be governed by the same attendance requirements as for elementary Jewish schools. Subsidies will be given in the form of outright yearly grants taking into consideration the size of the school or classes, budget of the school and the resources of the Bureau in any given year.

V. REGULATIONS GOVERNING SUBSIDIES FOR SUPERVISION AND ADMINISTRATION

1. The Bureau subsidizes the administrative and supervisory program of Bureau-affiliated schools needing such supervision up to 50% of that part of the administrator's salary designated by the Board of Review and Certification (beyond the teachers' salaries) as special remuneration for administration.

2. In the case of principals, head teachers or teacher-administrators teaching less than full time, schools are to be subsidized on the basis of 70% for their actual teaching schedule and of 50% for the difference between the salary paid them as teacher-administrator or head teacher or principal, provided the work done by them constitutes a full job in the opinion of the Bureau supervisor.
3. Where a teacher-administrator or head teacher in the school teaches part time, and his total hours of work do not add up to a full time position, his salary is to be determined proportionally.

VI. REGULATIONS GOVERNING SUBSIDIES FOR TEACHERS OF THE ARTS

Schools can apply for special subsidies for teachers of music, arts and crafts, etc., on condition that all such special teachers appointed be qualified and approved by the Bureau, and that the sum spent for such instruction be at least double the amount of the subsidy granted by the Bureau. Subsidies for this purpose are not to exceed $300 for each instructor per year.

VII. TRANSPORTATION SUBSIDIES AND SCHOLARSHIPS

During the past year the Bureau has established a transportation fund to assist schools having to purchase or to utilise buses for transporting children to their schools from outlying areas. The amount of subsidy for this purpose, transportation, depends on local conditions and needs. The Bureau will make available a limited number of transportation scholarships to provide for children who cannot get proper Jewish schooling without this transportation and are not in a position to pay for such transportation.

VIII. UNIFORM TUITION FEES

In order to have a standard basis for study in matters involving tuition fees, and in order to avoid competition in the matter of tuition fees between schools in any one neighborhood, minimum uniform tuition fees have been established in all week-day Bureau-affiliated schools.

1. Tuition fees are fixed at $60 a year, payable in four instalments, the first instalment to be paid at the time of registration.

2. A uniform contract form has been devised by the Bureau to be used by all its affiliated schools.

3. Quarter, half or complete scholarships are granted whenever and wherever, upon proper investigation, it is found that parents cannot afford the regular tuition fees. Parents who cannot pay at least half of the tuition fee are encouraged to become patrons of the school and to give an outright contribution in accordance with their means.

4. Rates may be reduced where more than one child per family is enrolled in a school, in accordance with a schedule which can be obtained.

5. An annual book fee of $5 per child is charged to cover books and materials given to the child during the school year.
The problem of standardized tuition fees for kindergartens and all-day schools is now being given special study.

Careful study is also being given to the needs and requirements of schools in suburban communities and if necessary the rules and regulations regarding subsidy will be amended in the light of the special needs of and conditions in the suburban communities.

From: Information Bulletin 68 (American Association for Jewish Education, March 1951)
1. We recognize that the perpetuation and enrichment of Jewish life in America will in large measure be decided by the character of Jewish education that we provide for our children. We further realize that in order to achieve an adequate system of Jewish education it is imperative that all forces dedicated to the achievement of this goal cooperate fully and wholeheartedly. We, the United Synagogue Commission on Jewish Education and the American Association for Jewish Education, therefore join in issuing this statement on the cooperation of congregational schools and Bureaus of Jewish Education. We also resolve to study the respective areas of our work with the view to define areas of cooperation and to plan the implementation of such cooperative efforts on a nation-wide scale. Since not all areas in Jewish education have been covered by this statement, it is desirable that additional discussions take place between the United Synagogue Commission and the American Association to supplement this statement and to discover additional areas of cooperative effort.

2. The past quarter of a century has witnessed an increase in the number of central educational agencies commonly known as Bureaus of Jewish Education. Similarly, there has been a rise in the number of congregational schools. Both increases were brought on by special needs of the American Jewish community. Both the Bureaus and the congregational schools can contribute greatly to the well-being of American Jewry.

3. Bureaus should recognize and accept the existence of congregational schools and of organized groups of congregational schools as a logical concomitant of American Jewish life. In consonance with their philosophy of encouraging, promoting and extending the programs of all educational agencies and segments in the community, the Bureaus should cooperate with the congregational schools or their groupings in carrying out their programs as effectively as possible.

The congregational schools should accept the Bureaus as the central community instruments for educational coordination and consultation in terms of improving standards of achievement and progress.

4. For the purpose of effective cooperation between the congregational schools and the Bureaus, it is imperative that the following principles which have proved effective in many communities be regarded as basic:

   a. The Bureaus, as central community agencies, shall at all times recognize the autonomy and the ideological integrity of the congregational schools.

   b. Whatever services a Bureau renders to any one ideological group it must be prepared to grant to all ideological groups.

   c. Whenever congregational school units are too small to be effective, the Bureau may take the initiative to encourage congregational and other schools of similar types to pool their efforts with the end in view of operating a program school effectively. In achieving the subordinated cooperate
school. However, he should be given the opportunity to guide the religious growth and experience of the children of the congregation of which he is the spiritual leader.

5. Congregational schools should be encouraged to provide educational facilities for their children from the pre-school through the high school level. In the event that a congregational school is not equipped or is too small to be effective, or is otherwise unable to undertake this responsibility, either in the pre-school or the high school area, and if there does not exist a local congregational school system prepared to assume this responsibility, the Bureau should undertake to carry on such an activity with the full cooperation of the school involved. The Bureau, however, should help the congregational school mature to its responsibility for the conduct of its own pre-school and high school program. However, if a community high school now exists, the congregational school should make every effort to cooperate with that community high school before it decides to establish a high school of its own.

6. It is hoped that this statement, which was drafted by the American Association for Jewish Education and the United Synagogue Commission on Jewish Education, will be implemented in a spirit of mutual faith and wholehearted cooperation so that the sacred duty of teaching the Torah to our children may be effectively fulfilled.

For the United Synagogue Commission on Jewish Education
Elia ChARRY
Moshe Davis
Leo L. Honor
Abraham E. Willgram

For the American Association for Jewish Education
Azriel Eisenberg
A. P. Gannes
Judah Pilch
David Rudavsky

From: The Synagogue School, VOL. VIII, No. 4 (April, 1950)
Questionnaire - Community Central Agencies for Jewish Education - 4 -

Extension Activities

Radio Programs
Consultation Service to Jewish Clubs
Book and Gift Shop
P.T.A.'s
Others

Neglected Areas:

What has your agency done in the last three years? (e.g. delinquent homes, handicapped children, etc.)

What are some of the long range achievements of your agency? (e.g. such as combination of schools, etc.)

What is your opinion of the Central agency and its proper place in the Jewish community?

What outstanding problems has your agency had to contend with

What is the effectiveness of your agency in the community as measured by such criteria as:

a) has the agency contributed to the promotion and the raising of standards of Jewish education in the community?
b) has the agency created or helped to create new educational facilities for age groups which were hitherto unprovided for by existing educational programs?

c. has the agency contributed or failed to contribute to the raising of the general cultural level in the community?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities of your agencies (continued)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary Education</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Conduct Hebrew High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Conduct High School of Jewish Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Supervise High School of Jewish Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Supervise Hebrew High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Yes or No</th>
<th>Number of students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Teachers Bulletin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Inservice Courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Training School for Sunday School Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Training School for Hebrew Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Seminars and Conferences for teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Pedagogic Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Audio-Visual Aid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Prepare program materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Prepare Code of Practice for teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adult Education</th>
<th>Yes or No</th>
<th>Number attending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. College of Jewish Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>College of Jewish Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Institute of Jewish Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Lectures for Adults</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Study Groups for Organizations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Holiday Institutes for Mothers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. Schools your agency works with

1. Schools maintained by your agency | Number | Type
2. Schools subsidized by your agency | Number | Type
3. Supervised by your agency | Number | Type
4. Affiliated with your agency | Number | Type
5. How many schools in your community are not affiliated with your agency | Number | Type

Why are they not affiliated?

6. Approximate number of pupils in schools of those you work with

7. Approximate number of pupils in schools of those you do not work with

8. Other schools serviced not in above categories and what kind of service

V. 1. Do you have a basis for giving subsidies, or maintaining schools?

   What is the basis?
   (Please send me a copy of requirements for receiving funds from your agency).

   2. In schools receiving subsidy what are criteria for determining amount of subsidy granted

VI. On what basis do schools become affiliated with your agency

   (Please send me copy of these regulations)

VII. Activities of your Agencies

   Elementary Schools
   Conduct Kindergartens
   Conduct Talmud Torahs or Hebrew Schools
Conduct Sunday Schools
Supervise Sunday Schools
Conduct interschool affairs
Visit schools regularly
Assist with Registration
Uniform Examinations
Dramatics Service
Music Teacher
Release Time
Questionnaire

Community Central Agencies for Jewish Education

May 1949

Name of Agency ____________________________ City ____________________________

Director ____________________________

I. Form of Organization -

a. How is Board of Directors Composed?
(Representatives from congregations, community at large, Federation, organization, etc.) ____________________________

b. How large is your Board? _______ Length of Service on Board? _______

What is your opinion of size of Board ____________________________

Why? ____________________________

__________________________________________________

__________________________________________________

c. Do you have a Constitution? _______ (Please send a copy of same)

d. Headquarters: Are you in an office building? ______ Your own building ______

Are you in a Center Building ______ Others ______ 

e. How often do you hold Board meetings? ____________________________

f. Type of Standing Committees ____________________________

Are they functioning? ____________________________

Give your opinion on Committees ____________________________

II. Administration

List Administration Depts. of Agency and indicate their functions:

1. ____________________________
II. Community Relationships and also areas of cooperation or lack of cooperation with these groups. (brief description)
   a. To Federation or Welfare Fund
   b. To Y M H A, Centers
   c. To Congregations
   d. To Yeshivoth
   e. To Others
BUREAUS OF JEWISH EDUCATION AND GROUP WORK AGENCIES

By ABRAHAM P. GANNES

IN the past decade, numerous Bureaus of Jewish Education have been established in communities throughout the country. To date there are a total of thirty-seven central community agencies for Jewish education. Although not all the central agencies in existence bear the same name or have the same functions, all of them are partially or entirely financed by the community. The great majority came into being during the past ten years as a result of studies and surveys conducted by the A.A.J.E. and it is no accident that the ten years' existence of the association coincides with the growth and development of community responsibility for Jewish education in many cities as manifested through establishment of these agencies.

A comparative newcomer, the Bureau of Jewish Education is generally faring well, is gaining recognition, and is taking its place among the agencies through which the organized Jewish community performs its activities and functions.

The objectives, functions, activities of the Bureau of Jewish Education warrant a separate treatment. Suffice it to say for this paper that the general pattern of the more recently formed Bureaus of Jewish Education is different from that of most Bureaus of the twenties. Whereas the earlier Bureau was an agency of a particular ideology or type of school system (mostly Talmud Torah systems), the one of more recent vintage is more encompassing, attempts to include within its orbit all ideologies and school systems, and renders service to all elements. Whereas the older type of Bureau was a functional agency in that it conducted the schools directly, the newer agency lays stress upon service to all elements in the community without interfering with the autonomy of any institution. Called “unity in diversity,” the pattern of service was largely set by the Chicago Board of Jewish Education and the Jewish Education Committee of New York and has been followed by agencies in the smaller communities. The reasons for the development of a pattern of service by the Jewish educational agency are many and are discussed elsewhere. Suffice it to say for the moment that the reasons are inherent in the development of Jewish life in America which is diversified and which has had a concomitant development of a diversified Jewish education.

To coordinate the divergent ideologies and to relate them to the total Jewish community, the community agency for Jewish education has had to change its approach, or in the first instance, has had to be set up with a view to encompassing all elements in the community. So that today, while the recent agencies follow...
the pattern described above, the older agencies are going through transitions and are moving in the direction of including all schools of thought and are attempting to render services to all elements. In short, the central Bureau of Jewish Education bases its philosophy on the concept of Jewish life which allows for cultural pluralism.

In the attempt to render educational services to all elements with a view to encouraging each to set up and carry out a maximum program in accordance with specific goals, the Bureau must have a relationship, not only to schools but to all agencies in the community which have goals related to it.

The relationship of Jewish education to group work has been under discussion for many years in both fields. There are records of successful experiments in cooperation and integration. Most of the experiments have been conducted in individual institutions and on a limited scale with some joint community-wide activities mostly of a cooperative nature. More recently conferences have been held on national and local levels to work out overall programs and objectives. These will be discussed a little later. At this point, however, the writer wishes to touch upon basic principles in Jewish education and group work which make cooperation and integration imperative:

**Broader Concept of Jewish Education**

"Jewish education is not formal and informal but consists of a program directed towards preparing people to live as Jews and Americans." "Jewish education can no longer be conceived as book education. Our major task is to inspire Jewish youth to identify themselves as Jews." Emphasis is put on preparation for living, for participation, for affiliation. This viewpoint has been expressed by Jewish educators in the last generation, especially since the time when Dr. Samson Benderly came to New York to direct the first Bureau of Jewish Education in the country. The writer believes that there are two basic reasons for the emphasis laid by Jewish educators upon "living, acting, experiencing, participating" as Jews. The primary reason is the meagerness of Jewish life in the home and in the general environment. Whereas in former times the home and the environment were rich in Jewish living and the formal school was supplementary, today the Jewish school has little to expect from the home and the environment in support of it, spiritually and culturally. The Jewish school has become an isolated, incidental factor in the lives of Jews. Realizing this lack, Jewish educators have attempted to make the school "a home away from home." They have attempted to introduce into the school those elements which make Judaism a living experience, and not merely a classic culture relegated to the past and to the book. Making of the school the "Jewish home" and the "Jewish environment" has meant that the teacher and Jewish school have "to reach out beyond the confines of the formal curriculum into the area of social and mental recreation."
The second basic reason for emphasis upon "living and participating and experiencing" are the theories of progressive education. Succinctly expressed, progressive education holds that the process of education cannot be confined to the classroom, but must involve a variety of purposeful activities, of participation and of self-expression.

"Jewish education, like general education, must make the growth of the child the end of its educative process, and the process must start with the actual experiences of the child as he lives them and at the present time." 6

"Jewish education must have a curriculum which will have regard for the personality of the child—his uniqueness, and his helplessness, but which will at the same time give him a vision of the new social order and the new civilization, and will make him an active participant in bringing these about... A civilization must be acquired through actual participation, through making and doing. As soon as we realize that a great deal of what we have termed extracurricular activities constitutes the activities of life, of experiencing, of living, so soon will we have to discard what we have been attempting to teach and substitute purposeful activities, actual life experiences involving Jewish dances and songs, Jewish cooking, Jewish handwork, Jewish stories, Jewish games, celebration of Jewish holiday." 7

By necessity and by the partial or total acceptance of modern educational theory, Jewish education has branched out into spheres of activity, which formerly were strange and foreign to formal Jewish education, and which were formerly relegated to the the sphere of the group work agency. The school includes in its curriculum proper or in the extra-curricular program, singing, dancing, arts and crafts, club work, mass holiday celebrations, home camping and country camping. The latter especially has been seized upon by Jewish educators to supplement Jewish studies and to create modes of Jewish living.

The Broader Concept of Group Work

The Jewish Center, originally founded in many instances for the purpose of accelerating the process of helping recently arrived immigrants become Americanized, or of providing for the social and recreational needs of young people, has developed "to that of an over-all embracing community serving agency whose primary function is to serve as a reservoir of Jewish activity and influence in the community, and more particularly to bring our youth nearer to Jewish life in sentiment, thought and action." 8 The above statement was made in 1937, and it is definitely more correct of the situation today. The Jewish Center has come to see the wider Jewish educational implications of group work and has attempted to intensify this aspect of its educational program, and it has come to realize that a distinctive function of the Center is to deepen the Jewish background, broaden the Jewish outlook and strengthen the bonds of affection of youth for Judaism. The most recent J.W.B. survey bears witness to this fact. In it, it is stated succinctly that "... it should be clear that the Jewish Center is an agency maintained for the specialized needs of the Jewish spiritual-cultural..."

---

6 S. Dinin, Judaism in a Changing Civilization, p. 199.
7 Ibid., p. 201.
tural group, and that the primary emphasis of its program is upon Jewish content."

The Jewish Center program, based on principles of progressive education, stresses learning by doing, participation, fulfillment of needs and interests of its members. In its approach to the Jewish part of the program, the Center has recourse to the same guiding principles. In its program it includes mass celebration of Jewish holidays, each with its distinctive Jewish motif, planning, organizing and executing an arts program, Oneg Shabbat activities, adult education courses, concerts, forums, celebration of Jewish Book and Music Months and a variety of other Jewish activities. The number of Jewish Centers carrying on such activities is increasing and the program is being more intensified.

Jewish education, as we have pointed out, has broadened its scope to make room for life experiences in consonance with the principles of progressive education and in compliance with the exigencies of Jewish life today. So too, Jewish group work, based on principles of progressive education, has come to recognize the importance of Jewish content, formal and informal. Not so long ago, both fields were far apart, at least theoretically. Today the orbits of Jewish education and Jewish Center have moved together from complete separation to very close relationships.

As in Jewish education, there are two basic reasons for the shift in emphasis in group work. The primary one is similar to the one in Jewish education, namely, the realization that the Jewish home and the Jewish environment are disappearing and do not furnish the apperceptive mass of Jewishness which was taken for granted, and that the Jewish school does not provide for the rich Jewish background attained formerly. Furthermore, not every Jewish child obtains a Jewish education. The Jewish Center has become a substitute for many, and the Jewish Center has come to feel some responsibility toward filling the void and providing an outlet for Jewish needs and interests.

The second reason is again a principle of progressive education which calls for the development of a complete personality. Filling the recreational and social needs of Jewish youth is not sufficient to make for an integrated personality. The specific Jewish needs must be met, if the Jewish Center is interested in helping to rear a generation of American Jews, who will feel at home in the American environment, but who will at the same time be positively related to Jewish life in all its manifestations, religious, cultural and educational, and will contribute towards its perpetuation and advancement.

Crossing the Borders

The felt need on the part of the Jewish educators to reach out beyond the confines of the classroom into patterns of education involving living experiences attuned to the growth of the individual, and the felt need on the part of group workers for deepening the Jewish knowledge of its participants, necessitated the

---

10 Conference of Jewish Education and Center Work, op. cit. There are many articles in this mimeographed booklet describing the Jewish activities included in the program.
See also O. Janowsky, J.W.B. Survey, p. 189, and Table 17, p. 190.
crossing of borders. As a result a significant part of either educational program and approach belongs both in education and group work. That there should have been and still are jurisdictional disputes is not unnatural. The jurisdictional disputes are particularly keen in the smaller communities where the Bureau of Jewish Education and the group work agency attempt to reach all segments and carry on programs that are overlapping. The conflict is especially acute when the Bureau of Jewish Education first comes into being and begins to embark on activities also engaged in by the Jewish Center.

Planning on a National Level

On the top level Jewish educators and group workers for many years have expressed themselves in favor of exploring the possibility of agreeing on common objectives and areas of cooperation and integration. Dr. Israel Chipkin of the American Association for Jewish Education and Mr. Louis Kraft of the Jewish Welfare Board have been the prime movers in this movement.

A Conference on Jewish Education and Jewish Center work was convened in November, 1946. Sixty-three persons from twenty-three cities attended, including Jewish Center executives, members of the staffs of the J.W.B. and of the A.A.J.E. and Bureau of Jewish Education executives. Representing the A.A.J.E., the National Council of Jewish Education, the National J.W.B. and the National Association of Jewish Center Workers, the numbers alone were indicative of the deep interest in the problem.

The main purpose of the Conference was to canvass the actual experiences in cooperation and integration between the two fields, in child, youth and adult education, in individual institutions as well as joint activities on a community level and to take further steps toward common effort. The stories told at the Conference by Jewish educators and group workers bore witness to the fact that "borders have been crossed" and pointed to the need for joint planning and cooperation.

The result of the Conference was a "Proposed Statement on Common Objectives and Areas of Cooperation in the Fields of Jewish Education and Jewish Center Work."

The statement emphasizes common objectives and continuous cooperation. "Jewish Center work and Jewish education have in common the objectives of Jewish education for all age groups."

The statement stresses the need for a "maximum of continuous coordination and cooperation in the local community and on the national level."

Areas of cooperation are indicated: "... The Jewish school is the basic institution for Jewish education of children. ... Yet it is agreed that education includes group experience as well as knowledge. Both the school and the Center have a contribution to make to the total Jewish education of the child. It is recommended that where a school is housed in a Center, that there be the fullest integration of program, staff, man-

---

1 It took several years in Miami to work out joint planning to avoid duplication and to avoid jurisdictional disputes. The writer has spoken to directors of Bureaus of other cities (Akron, Buffalo, Rochester) where there were problems of jurisdiction, and the same situation prevailed.

2 Conference on Jewish Education and Center Work—statement by Louis Kraft, p. 4.
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Management and financing. Other schools are urged to utilize the services of the Center in developing and integrating group activities with their curriculum.

Cooperation is proposed between Jewish education and Center in the field of home and country camping with the view of utilizing to the fullest extent each other's resources.

In youth and adult education, joint study, planning and cooperation and joint management are proposed wherever possible.

Likewise, fullest cooperation in community-wide celebrations and projects (Jewish Education, Book, Music, Hebrew Months) is urged, and in the preparation of all kinds of educational materials.

The practice of making joint community studies by J.W.B. and A.A.J.E. is endorsed, as is joint planning and coordination of new school and Center buildings.

The statement on personnel is significant and warrants a full quotation:

"We consider it essential that Jewish educators have adequate group work training so that they may perform effectively their functions in the field of Jewish education. We consider it equally essential that Jewish Center workers possess adequate Jewish education and Jewish background so that they may function effectively in the Jewish Center field. The training of personnel is one of the serious problems in both these fields and is so complex in character that it merits careful study by a selected joint committee which should explore all areas in which two fields can cooperate. This committee should also consider joint training of volunteer leaders and the education of the lay members of boards and committees."

The statement further recommended the appointment of a joint committee to pursue continued study of areas of cooperation indicated, and the establishment of a Commission on Jewish Educational Policies to deal with Jewish education in all of its forms.

At the Annual Conference of N.A.J.C.W. and N.C.J.E. held in May, 1947, a joint session on the subject of relationships was held. A resolution was adopted by the N.A.J.C.W. that its "Committee on Jewish Education be instructed to offer its cooperation and assistance in the further development of the plans for cooperation between Jewish Education and Jewish Center work."

In December, 1947, a joint committee meeting of the A.A.J.E. and J.W.B. was held and preliminary reports were made in the areas of Interpretation, Research, Training and Personnel, Youth Education, and Program Materials. Concrete suggestions were made for the implementation of the Proposed Statement on Common Objectives and Areas of Cooperation.

The basic principles to be derived from the conferences and meetings include the idea that the practitioner in each field can make a contribution to the other in program content, educational techniques, and that each has to have training in the other's field; that there must be a give and take on both sides involving a mutuality of relationships; that classroom and group experiences flow into each other and form a whole pattern of Jewish education.

"It is noteworthy that Jewish educators and social workers have ignored vested interests and concentrated their attention upon common objectives. Evidently aware that no sharp lines can be drawn between formal and informal education, they have sought to delineate areas of cooperation rather than to mark off jurisdictional boundaries. In so
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... doing they have laid the foundations for common action, which is deserving of the highest praise and of commensurate public support." 6

Guiding principles have been worked out and adopted. Can they be implemented? The record of cooperation up to recently was varied and was amply reported on at the Conference in 1946.7 At this Conference, Rabbi Philip Goodman reported that in answer to a questionnaire relative to cooperation between Centers and Bureaus, thirty-one replies were received from Center executives.8 Only two executives indicated existence of friction between local Bureaus and Centers. Seven enjoyed no cooperation with local Bureaus. Twenty-two indicated existence of cooperation. Fifteen reported excellent cooperation, three reported a fair degree of cooperation and four reported limited cooperation. Cooperation was taking place in the Hebrew school housed in the Center, in home camping, adult education and in training programs for club leadership. Very little cooperation was indicated in the areas of community-wide cultural projects, youth work and interchange of personnel.9

Recently the writer sent a questionnaire to 35 Bureau executives throughout the country regarding their activities and one of the questions had to do with relationship of the Bureau of Jewish Education to the Center.10 Thus far 19 replies have been received. Only one reports no relationship. The others report a variety of cooperative efforts involving conducting Center schools jointly,11 joint programming, community-wide activities in youth and adult education forums, celebration of Book and Music Months, home camping, artists series, leadership training. It is evident from the answers that although there is mutual cooperation, an effort to work out a community blueprint has not been made yet.

In several communities, however, the relationship between the local Bureau and the group work agency has been the subject for discussion and definite plans are being made for implementation. The Schenectady Plan is unique.12 The plan is so designed as to take care of every Jewish child’s educational, social, recreational needs. This is done on a community-wide basis with the support of the Welfare Fund and the cooperation of the Center, the Bureau of Jewish Education and the local synagogues. A similar plan is being projected in St. Paul, Minnesota.13

In Miami, where the writer has been director of the Bureau of Jewish Education for five years, ambitious planning was undertaken by the Y's and the Bureau. In 1945 the Y directors and the writer met with Mr. S. Gershovitz of the J.W.B. to draw up a preliminary plan for joint programs. Several projects were projected and successfully consummated. Others did not succeed due to lack of funds and proper direction.

In the past two years many meetings were held and more detailed projects planned. Four areas were explored for

---

6 Janowsky, op. cit., p. 334.
7 Conference on Jewish Education and Center Work, op. cit., Reports from Akron, Rochester, Cincinnati and others.
8 Conference on Jewish Education and Jewish Center Work, p. 2.
9 Ibid.
10 “Communal Agencies for Jewish Education Questionnaire” prepared by writer.
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joint planning: (1) Youth and Adult Education. (2) Leadership Training. (3) Community-wide celebrations (Book and Music Months). (4) Extension work.

In order to facilitate the execution of the program it was decided to divide the responsibility among the three agencies (two Y's and the Bureau of Jewish Education). Thus the Bureau was made responsible for Jewish Book Month observance in the community and was directed to organize a Book Council to plan it. Jewish Music Month was assigned to the Miami Y and Leadership Training assigned to the Miami Beach Y. Extension Activities in the congregational schools was left in the hands of the Y's with the Bureau as a resource agency for Jewish content and materials.

To claim success would be rash indeed. The program is still in the process of development. Leadership training was not started. Time was not ripe. A high degree of success was achieved, however, in Jewish Book and Music Month Celebration, Adult Education and Extension Activities. In Adult Education, the synagogues in Miami were asked to co-sponsor the courses together with the Y and the Bureau. The success was phenomenal. The Jewish Book Month community celebration, with a central book exhibit, forums, and discussion, attracted more than a total of 2500 people, and left a mark on the cultural interests in the community.

In Extension Education, the Y on the Beach "loaned" its personnel to the Jewish schools for athletics, dramatics, and dancing. Again there was a high degree of success.

The Bureau conducted an orientation course in Jewish problems for the staff of the Beach Y. This is the beginning of an attempt to study each other's problems.

The writer does not wish to imply that he is satisfied with the quality of the programs conducted. Far from it. Many problems need to be ironed out, and it is too soon to draw conclusions. For example, extension activities in the Jewish schools should be integrated into the curriculum. The personnel, content, quality and type of extension activity need study. The writer feels, however, that the relationship built up between the agencies, based on sound principles in consonance with the Statement on Common Objectives, is a wholesome one. As more experience is gained, joint Board meetings will take place, the projects started will be continued, and new areas will be explored.

An ambitious plan on a community-wide basis was undertaken in Buffalo in 1948—and a pattern of cooperation between the Bureau of Jewish Education and Jewish Center of Buffalo was suggested. In essence it followed the pattern suggested at the November, 1946, Conference. From the writer's discussion with Mr. Mark Krug, until recently the director of the Bureau of Jewish Education, many of the proposed plans were carried out effectively, although it is too early to judge the total effectiveness over a period of years.

Other communities, too, have made rapid strides in implementing the Statement on Objectives. Rochester, Cincinnati, Syracuse, St. Paul, Akron, Los Angeles, Atlanta, Newark, New Haven, and others are leading the way.14

13a Buffalo Pattern of Cooperation between B.J.E. and Jewish Center, mimeographed, 4 pp.
14 This statement is based on the writer's questionnaire, op. cit., and on many items listed in the J.W.B. Publication—The Circle, as for example the item of January, 1949, on the jointly-sponsored institute for training of youth leaders in Cincinnati.
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Gaps Between Jewish Education and Group Work

From the point of view of theory, and from actual experience, the orbits of the two fields have moved together to very close relationship—in objectives, common tasks, techniques, and an approach to the total community. Yet it must be recognized that there are gaps that need to be bridged before satisfactory cooperation and integration may be expected. It is one thing to agree in theory and quite another to put it into practice. There are two categories of gaps to be bridged. The one is tangible, the other intangible. In the former category, the writer would include personnel training, preparation of materials, experimentation, testing and research. In the category of intangibles, the writer would include interpretation, suspicions among educators and group workers, and general prejudices existing between the two fields.

The most serious gap to be bridged is that of trained personnel. Group workers are without sufficient Jewish background. Janowsky pointed out that of 550 Center workers including 43 rabbis, 20 per cent were entirely without any formal Jewish education; 60 per cent of the 550 had no training beyond Hebrew or Sunday School. The 43 rabbis had no Center work training whatsoever. Few engaged in Jewish education have group work training and experience.

This problem has long been recognized by Jewish educators from two points of view: Firstly, the broad concept of Jewish education as discussed above makes it imperative for the Jewish educator to have group work experience and training. The Jewish teacher can “no longer regard the sole aim of Jewish education in terms of imparting information, but also in terms of meeting the needs of American Jewish children who have individual adjustments to make.” In addition, other educational problems such as youth education and adult education need his attention. Secondly, the development of a Jewish education profession has been most difficult to achieve.

Since the time of Dr. S. Benderly, a serious attempt is being made to put Jewish teaching on a professional basis—including such matters as academic requirements, salary scales, tenure, pension, etc. Much has been accomplished, but the professional status of the Jewish teacher is precarious. This is due to many factors, but among them are: The decrease in teaching hours in the Talmud Torah where formerly the schedule called for 20 hours of teaching weekly, and the growth of the congregational school where the teaching schedule may be 10 or 12 hours of teaching weekly. There is a natural reluctance to pay a full salary for what may be considered a part-time position. Such a situation is not likely to attract young people into the profession. To encourage young people to come into the field, more outlets for their activities must be provided. The answer lies in expanding the Jewish educational work to include youth, club work, and adult education.

The question of hours of work may not affect the group worker. In his case it is a question of philosophy and out-
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look on Jewish life. To carry out the recommendations of the Jewish Welfare Board Survey in regard to Jewish content, the group worker needs better Jewish training in order to obtain a deep understanding of the Jewish heritage, and a deeper insight into Jewish life today.

A veritable revolution in teacher and group work training will have to take place. "We shall have to cease thinking of teaching as a specialized formal discipline and think instead of the total needs of the institution or agency and the organic needs of the child." 18

It will require training in group work, adult education, youth education, administration, and supervision. The new teacher will have to cope with the whole Jewish educational field and utilize every educational opportunity presented to him. 19

Some attempts are being made to bridge this gap. Such institutions as Dropsie College, The Training Bureau for Jewish Communal Service, the College of Jewish Studies of Chicago, Gratz College, have made beginnings in this direction. These programs, however, are in the early stages of development.

Materials, Experimentation, Testing, Research

Another important gap is the dearth of proper Jewish educational materials for adolescents and young adults. There is a lack of plays, original programmatic materials, audio-visual aids. Very little experimentation has been carried in integrated programming, and almost nothing is recorded on testing results and achievements. While this gap is a serious one, it is not insurmountable. This gap is related to the question of personnel training. The solution of the latter problem will have bearing on the type of materials produced. Yet it is not necessary to wait until then. There is need for exchange of ideas and for joint committees to prepare suitable materials. Steps in this direction have already been taken by the J.W.B. and A.A.J.E.

Interpretation

How to interpret this program to the lay people? How to break down prejudices among heads of Jewish educational institutions, and group work agencies? This is a serious task. The writer feels that recognition of the common tasks, problems and objectives will arise out of the joint activities engaged in by both agencies. Naturally, there is need for joint Board meetings, joint surveys and studies, but the actual program, engaged in will in the long run prove to the lay people the necessity of cooperative efforts. This, too, is related to the personnel, for it is upon the right type of personnel that much of the success of the relationship of the two community agencies hinges.

The prejudices between the Jewish teacher and the Center worker cannot easily be resolved. The Jewish teacher, steeped in Jewish learning, has always been suspicious of the Jewish Center worker engaged in recreational activities. Traditionally, the Jew has looked with disdain upon physical activities and it has not been easy to accept the Jewish Center as an educational agency for Jewish purposes. The fear has always been present that the Jewish Center can at the most have a minimum of Jewish content and thereby hinder the progress of Jewish education.
of the Jewish school. Furthermore, the Center has been looked upon as a competitor ready to take children away from formal Jewish studies. Unfortunately the suspicions have not entirely been resolved. However, certain facts need to be brought out to indicate that the gap may be bridged by mutual understanding and cooperation. Janowsky points out that as a matter of record the Jewish Centers have always concerned themselves with formal Jewish education. "Of the 301 Centers identified with the J.W.B., 161 (54 per cent) report the presence of Hebrew schools in the institutions. In many instances the school is governed by the Center board or a committee of the board and the school budget is part of the Center budget." The group work agency, in short, has been deeply involved in Jewish education directly. The group worker, too, has also looked with disdain upon the Jewish teacher, sometimes considering him foreign, unprogressive and uninterested in the American environment of the child and in the immediate needs of the child.

To bridge this gap, will require a re-thinking, a readjustment, a re-orientation on the part of the Jewish educator and Jewish group worker.

Conclusion

There is definitely a meeting of minds on a national and local level among educators and group workers, as evidenced by the cooperation already in existence in individual institutions and in communities, and by the conferences recently held. Many communities are attempting to implement the Common Objectives outlined by J.W.B. and A.A.-J.E. and some have already set machinery in motion to carry them out.

If Jewish educators and group workers can go beyond cooperation into that of integration, if Jewish educators and group workers can face the challenge and implications of joint experiences, joint experimentation and planning in terms of a new approach to the school curriculum and to the programmatic content in the group work agency, a great change will take place in Jewish life in America.

---

20 A. M. Dushkin—Survey of Jewish Education in Los Angeles—Section on Jewish Centers Association and B.J. Education.
21 J.W.B. Survey, op. cit., p. 325.
22 Idem.