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Chapter I

Introduction

Purpose, Orientation and Organization

In times of turbulence and crisis social institutions usually face the challenge of adaptation and, in some instances, encounter a veritable struggle for their continued survival. Form, structure and even fundamental values and purposes upon which the functioning of the institution is based have to be re-examined, re-affirmed or rejected, either tacitly or, at times, openly and quite consciously. Notwithstanding the lack of historical perspective in regard to contemporary events from which all analyses of the "present" suffer, the sixties seem to be such a critical period. The fact that the world is at war and at peace at the same moment, that bloody or peaceful "revolution"—social, political, racial, technological and ideational—rather than gradual evolution is characteristic of our times, that the destruction of humanity is so imminently possible is conducive to bewilderment and pessimism. These "facts of life" tend to permeate existence with an additional burden of anxiety over and above the anxiety that is associated with the pressures of daily, routine living in a complex society. It is reasonable to assume that in such a period as this man's emotions and his intelligence, his ideals and his ideas, his values and institutions would be put to a great test. Searching for answers, trying to cope successfully with
an exceedingly complicated and sometimes incomprehensible reality, re-exploring what is trivial as distinguished from that which is truly important, pondering solutions of man's existential dilemma are primary concerns of those who have the courage and the motivation to discover self-definition in this age of anomie.

It is indeed a truism to state that all institutions created to serve the needs of individuals as members of society would be affected by the spirit and "de-spiritualization" of the times. However, there still exists a tendency to try to simplify man's social life to the point of absurd naivete by considering our civilizational and sub-cultural institutions to be both in temporal and spatial isolation from the drama of humanity's battle for survival and man's quest for salvation and self-transcendence.

The student of problems, like the one touched upon here, must be conscious of the enormous complexity of the things he wishes to study. The procedure of isolation, of considering one feature of a complex phenomenon independently of the rest, is ineffective and contrary to the nature of the problem in the field of human studies. The isolating procedure creates nothing but artifacts. It has been pointed out that even on the level of mere biological analysis, of the study of animal behavior, the isolating, analytic procedure may be misleading. This is even more the case when the subject is man himself.

A significant, if not a primary, purpose of this study, thus, is to challenge and stimulate our thinking and feeling about the institution of American Jewish education, so that out of apparent complexity and seeming confusion may emanate
a tentative direction or some guidelines for further and deeper exploration and for possible future activity and action.

What we need, therefore, is to broaden our conception and our approach to the problem of research in Jewish education. What we need is to study the school, but the center of observation should be the community. The broader approach would then necessitate that we assess Jewish education—the curricula, goals, objectives of the ongoing systems—as part of the religious, intellectual, cultural, communal and demographic processes and developments which shape and mold the Jewish and general American community; and secondly, that we study the effectiveness of the different types of Jewish schools as instruments for the child's harmonious and continuous creative adjustment and integration into American civilization in terms of the child's Jewish religion, his classical Hebrew heritage, his millennia-old unique history, ethnic traditions, mores, and also in the light of the new values, concepts, and relationships that have evolved with rise of the State of Israel...

And finally, educational research is social research. The aim of social research is community-sponsored social planning and social action.2

This study is based on the premise that man, with all his frailties and limitations, has the power to understand, to act on his understanding with humility and compassion, and, even if only in minute ways, to improve his lot and his condition. It does not deny man's tendency towards irrational, irresponsible, immoral, animal-like feeling and behavior, nor does it deny the existence of evil or the fact that so much is unknown or "mystery" to man today. However, it acts as testimony to faith in humanity as correlative to faith in God, faith in humaneness as related to faith in the spirit of Godliness or holiness in life. Man's potential goodness, a premise upon which Judaism has been based since Mosaic times,
is a fundamental postulate of this investigation. If all is irrational, ineffable and hidden to man today and to his progeny in the future, man is no higher than the beasts, culture and civilization are illusions, and the need for understanding and the cultivation of intelligence and love is a mere hallucination of little worth and cogency.

It is of little wonder that in the last decades philosophies of education and socio-cultural histories of education have become more and more the focal points of educational discussion and controversy. Though educational technology—language laboratories, programmed learning, educational television, team-teaching—is the "educational fad" of the day, the real burning educational questions of our era deal with a thorough-going examination of the foundations of American education. Witness such volumes in the field of general education such as Brameld's *Philosophies of Education in Cultural Perspective*, Brubacher's *Modern Philosophies of Education*, and A History of the Problems of Education, Butler's *Four Philosophies and Their Practice in Education and Religion*, Brubacher's *Modern Philosophies of Education*, Butts' *A Cultural History of Western Education*, Mulhern's *A History of Education*, the National Society for the Study of Education's Fifty-Fourth Yearbook, *Modern Philosophies of Education*, Ulich's *A History of Educational Thought* and *Three Thousand Years of Educational Wisdom*, Park's *Selected Readings in the Philosophy of Education*, and Cremin's *The Transformation of the School* among many other comprehensive works as well as works dealing with some specific aspect of
or approach to the socio-cultural history or philosophy of education.

One would expect a similar phenomenon in the field of American Jewish education. However, here, as in other areas, Jewish Education exhibits "cultural lag."

Jewish education, in the last thirty years, has not produced any "great books." The student of American Jewish education will look in vain for a classic in the field of his main interest. Nor will he find a solid volume of scholarship in a major area of Jewish education.

Nothing comparable . . .

In the three decades between 1929 and 1959, the teachers of the People of the Book, as contrasted with its theologians, philosophers, historians, its scientists and artists, have written no substantial books. Jewish educational thought expressed itself in single and collected essays, in monographs, in scattered articles but not in sustained writing which issues forth in full-scale treatment. The basic areas of education, psychology, philosophy, history, methodology, and administration of Jewish education await the emergence of a corps of Jewish educators—scholars—scientists who will dedicate themselves to the production of basic educational literature, to reflection and to research reported in major volumes. 14

The slow growth of the profession of Jewish education in America as well as the relative youth of the institution in the United States may help explain this lag. Other possible factors will be alluded to in the body of the dissertation. Nevertheless, even though a serious lack exists, some encouraging signs have been noticed. The publication of Readings in Jewish Educational Philosophy by the National Curriculum Research Institute of the American Association for Jewish Education, 15 a doctoral dissertation by Dinsky, Secondary Jewish Education in the United States, 16 Judaism and the Jewish School: Selected Essays on
the Direction and Purpose of Jewish Education, edited and introduced by Judah Pilch and Meir Ben-Horin, and numerous articles calling for discussion and formulation of a philosophy of Jewish education and pointing to the need for serious research in Jewish education seem to indicate a growing maturity of thought and purpose, a desire to "catch up" with thought and scholarship in the field of general education.

In addition to this "philosophical ferment," as the social sciences have developed, it has become increasingly apparent that in order to gain respectable knowledge about education, knowledge that to some degree may be labeled "scientific," educational institutions and the educational process must be described and analyzed both historically and contemporaneously in a cultural or civilizational perspective. It would seem that Jewish education must be doubly considered—civilizationally (referring to American civilization) and culturally (referring to the Jewish religio-cultural group that is part of American civilization). One primary objective of the present study is to help clarify and give proper cultural perspective to the various philosophical alternatives pertaining to the direction, processes and content of Jewish education in the United States on the threshold of the seventies. A very important consideration that is basic today to any realistic approach aimed at formulating a program for Jewish education is an appraisal or determination of the role that ideologies of Jewish life have to play in Jewish life in America and their influence on and
stake in the Jewish educational process.

As a point of departure, a descriptive statement of the most widely-accepted principles and practices generally associated with progressive education was circulated on a nation-wide basis among a number of educators known for their interest in progressive education and their sympathetic but critical approach toward it. This process occurred in March, 1963, with the aid of Dr. Meir Ben-Horin, Professor of Education at the Dropsie College in Philadelphia and Dr. Judah Pilch, Director of the National Curriculum Research Institute of the American Association for Jewish Education.21 As a result of the critical comments of the educators to whom the statement was sent, the following summary was formulated and used as a basis for discussing progressive education and its relationship to Jewish education:

When progressivism in education is discussed, the following conceptions, postulates and characteristics are implied:

I. In the realm of ontology, epistemology and axiology—The universe is open, dynamic and in a state of continual flux. Knowledge is tentative, and truth is relative. Absolutist doctrines and dogmas are rejected. The real worth of anything can be measured in terms of its practical consequences in action, its instrumental significance as measured by the nuclear values or criteria of democratic living and individual growth.

Democracy is the most desirable type of human society and pattern of social relationship. By definition, it is that form of society that allows for maximum individual growth and fulfillment by virtue of the relatively free interaction of individuals, groups and ideas. It can function effectively only within the framework of an environment which also recognizes the opportunity for equality—social, economic and political.

Growth is to be measured in terms of the degree of realization by the individual of goals and values espoused
by democracy as a form of social life, some of which are equality of economic opportunity, social and political equality, religious freedom as defined in terms of separation of church and state, respect for the dignity of the individual, freedom as defined by responsible action and respect for law and the judicial process, the opportunity to determine one's destiny by means of voluntary association and freedom of interpersonal and ideational interaction, etc.

II. In the realm of philosophy of education—Education must be relative and appropriate to temporal-historical conditions, to geographic conditions and to sociocultural conditions. Education in twentieth century American society, therefore, must be democratic in objectives, in method and in spirit.

Education in a democracy implies a distinct process, far different from that of traditional education which is based upon authoritarian, mechanistic conceptions. It follows then that education in a democracy must concern itself with helping the learner find meaning and relevancy in the educational experience as he functions as part of a circumscribed learning group, a school, a community, and society. Meaning, in this context, refers to the intrinsic value that the educational experience may or may not have for the learner. Educational activity should make a connection with learner at one of a few levels—-at the level of immediate felt needs, at the level of his current interests (including his natural curiosity about the world of people, things and ideas) and aspirations for the present and the future, at the level of future needs that can be acknowledged by the learner in the present. A meaningful educational experience should enhance the learner's feeling of self-worth. He should feel "more complete" because of it even if he does not articulate this feeling.

Another obvious implication is that the educational process must be thought of in terms of actual democratic living for the purpose of individual and societal betterment. The school, then, should be a democratic community working toward democratic educational objectives and being democratic in all forms and at all levels of school operation.

III. In the realm of the educational process, the individual learner and their relationship to society—Real education is dynamic and active. The uncritical acceptance and passive absorption (with no personal response and no utilization) of subject-matter, as for example factual material, dogmas, ideas and unwarranted assumptions, is miseducative. Education is to be purposive. It should
be motivated intrinsically. It should involve the whole self of the learner. It should be adapted to the needs and interests of learners. It should allow for and respect individual differences. It should be as concrete as necessary so that the theoretical becomes as real as possible and should also be as functional as feasible. It is to be based upon self-discipline (by that is meant consciously directed effort) and group-control. It should be socialized but yet individualized within the group-framework. It is to focus upon the functional use of intelligence, such as problem-solving (having as its basis the five steps in the act of thought), such as projects and such as the learning of skills and the learning of factual material in the context of need.

Real education encourages spontaneity. It fosters creativity. It has as its goal responsible freedom of thought, action and emotive expression. It is related vitally to historical as well as to contemporary social and cultural realities. These realities include heritage and tradition, fundamental values of society, cultural creation and innovation, present-day social trends and problems, and contemporary socio-cultural educational needs.

IV. In concluding this definitive statement, it is important to make note of the major manifestations of progressivism in American education—Although progressive education has in many circles been regarded as a unitary movement, variations of progressivism have in reality been the case. These variants included the "activity program," the "child-centered school," the "socio-cultural reconstructionist" approach as well as the scientific movement which aimed at developing means and instruments of control and evaluation of the educational process and of the learner. Other manifestations were the "intellectualist approach," the "expressionist school," and the "experience curriculum." Less extreme curricular innovations emanating from progressivism included the "integrated subjects" approach, the "broad fields" plan, the "core" curriculum, and the "persistent life situations" design. Most of these expressions encompassed a number of aspects of real education (as Dewey envisaged it) at the cost, quite often, of other equally important aspects. These variant forms and others not mentioned must be recognized and appreciated, since from time to time they have been equated with "progressive education" by their champions and critics and have been acknowledged as such by much of the profession as well as by the informed and misinformed laity.
The evidence and materials utilized in this work consist of (a) theoretical statements presented in essay or book form, (b) recorded accounts of experiences and experiments, (c) critical comments and analyses, (d) parts of curricula, courses of study and teaching guides, and (e) a survey of a number of Jewish elementary schools conducted by the writer. The writer has not deluded himself nor does he intend to do so to those who review the overall study as to the inherent limitations of an investigation of this nature. Not every actual successful or unsuccessful attempt at implementing progressive principles and practices in Jewish education have been looked into. Similarly, the theoretical statements which analyze the deficiencies in the traditional approach to Jewish education, which attempt to introduce progressive ideas into the thinking and practice of Jewish education and which recommend new methods, approaches, etc., as bringing "salvation via progressivism" are not to be taken to represent the position of all Jewish educators. Also, they are not to be considered to have made an overwhelming impact upon Jewish educators as-a-group and the Jewish educational process as-a-whole in the United States. Nonetheless, it is felt that a well-documented presentation and discussion of even a limited amount of evidence is worthwhile as a first step.

Improvement comes through understanding, understanding usually is a product of the collection and examination of evidence as well as of the drawing of limited conclusions based upon a thoughtful and critical analysis of the evidence on hand. In all honesty, this study represents nothing more
than that first step which hopefully will inspire others to make greater and more significant investigations of the facet of Jewish education dealt with in this dissertation and of other aspects of the Jewish educational process heretofore denied sustained treatment and thoughtful, serious analysis.

The next chapter, which might be considered introductory in nature also, will deal with the historical development of American progressive education as well as with the fundamental philosophy, ideas, and practices generally associated with progressive education. The ensuing chapter will delve into the universe of events, ideas, forces, trends, etc., that have been prevalent in an American society existing in an ever-contracting world and in an ever-expanding cosmos (from approximately the decade preceding World War I to the present). An additional chapter will examine the sociology of the American Jewish community and will present needed background material pertaining to the various philosophies and ideologies of Jewish life at play during the period under consideration. Finally a series of chapters offering a rather detailed description and analysis of Jewish educational thought and practice, viewed historically and divided into the major phases of the Jewish educational endeavor, will be presented.

As has been indicated earlier emphasis will be given to manifestations of progressive tendencies (or examples of obvious "anti-progressivism") in the literature and in other materials utilized. Discernible trends and pregnant hypotheses will be discussed and evaluated in the light of the available
evidence. An assessment of the degree and quality of influence of progressive education upon Jewish education will be attempted, both in historical terms and in terms of the present-day status of the relationship of the two processes. Consistent with the premise that educational progressivism is an outgrowth of American society in the throes of change and adjustment to the challenges of a modern world, it is important to distinguish those events, forces, factors, trends and ideational developments which may have contributed to the initial acceptance and eventual disenchantment with certain aspects of progressive education in the United States. Not only will this analysis help place progressive education in the proper social, historical, and philosophical context, but it will also allow us to gain some insight into the possible evolving relationship between educational progressivism as developed in the field of general education and the metamorphosis of Jewish education in the United States.

Finally, possible future tendencies, in the light of existing and futuristic philosophies of Jewish life and Jewish education, will be looked into.
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NOTES


18. Many articles and papers have been written in which a call for formulating a philosophy of Jewish education in the United States has been made. Some present the problems ensuing from not having a well-defined philosophy or set of objectives; others point to the difficulty of formulating a philosophy of Jewish education before an acceptable philosophy of Jewish life has been created; still others present tentative formulations and lists of possible objectives. Many of these statements are found in the National Curriculum Research Institute volumes alluded to in notes #15 and #17, above. These, as well as others found in a variety of periodicals and those incorporated into the proceedings of various conventions and conferences, will be discussed more fully in the sections dealing with the historical development of Jewish education as it relates to the progressivist tendency within it in the United States and the philosophy of Jewish education. Also articles and papers pertaining to research in Jewish education, the need for research and experimentation, and "researchable problems" will be examined in the body of this work. However, at this point, mention should be made of three articles which set forth the problem in a comprehensive and pointed manner:

a. Ben-Horin, Meir, "Major Writings in American Jewish Education," (see note #14, above).


19. Other factors have contributed also to the increasing demand for a serious exploration into the basic premises and purposes of Jewish education as well as of all aspects of the Jewish educational process. These will be discussed throughout the study. However, note should be made at this
point of the works of Dushkin, Berkson, Gamoran, Dinin, M. M. Kaplan, Kallen and Yudel Mark in the area of philosophy of Jewish education; of Honor and Scharfstein in the area of history of Jewish education in the United States; and of William Chomsky and Scharfstein in the area of methodology. Further reference to specific contributions of these educators and other later efforts, e.g., those of the Melton Research Center, will be made in a more appropriate context in the body of the work.

20. This is a working hypothesis that will be further scrutinized and discussed as the study unfolds. Needless to say, the nature of the Jew, individually and collectively, is a fundamental question on the American Jewish scene today and, in many ways, the fact that it is so, affects the course and process of American Jewish education. Though there has been a good deal of controversy in this area, the nature of the present investigation requires a functionally-oriented, though tentative, viewpoint so that adequate analysis can take place.

21. The following letters were sent by Dr. Ben-Horin and Dr. Pilch to men such as Dr. Israel Schefler of Harvard, Dr. Ralph Tyler of Stanford, Dr. Joseph Butterweck of Temple University, Dr. Lawrence Cremin of Columbia University (Teachers College), Dr. Thomas McMullen of the University of Pennsylvania, Dr. I. B. Berkson and others:

(Letter #1)

Dear

The enclosed material is intended to be part of an introductory section of a doctoral dissertation by Mr. Sholom Handelman (School of Education) in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. The dissertation, entitled Progressivism and the Jewish School in America (1900-1964), deals with the relationship of progressive education to Jewish education in the United States. This study, carrying important implications for the deeper understanding of Jewish and other forms of American education, is of considerable interest to the National Curriculum Research Institute of the American Association for Jewish Education.

I would appreciate your comments on the accuracy of the accompanying statement. In order to make sure that these formulations are accurate, the candidate and his committee are submitting them to you and several other leaders in educational philosophy.

Sincerely yours,

Meir Ben-Horin
Professor of Education

MBH:ro
Enc.
The "enclosed material" refers to the descriptive statement referred to in the text and included in revised form in this introductory section.

101 Fifth Avenue (Letter #2)
New York 3, N.Y.
OREgon 5-5656

THE NATIONAL CURRICULUM RESEARCH INSTITUTE

Judah Pilch, Ph.D.
Director

The enclosed outline is a summary statement to be included in a doctoral dissertation dealing with the historical and contemporary influences of progressive education upon Jewish education in the United States since 1900.

In this summary statement I am trying to present an accurate and complete picture of "generic progressivism in its unadulterated form," if this is at all possible. A much more detailed presentation of the historical development of educational progressivism and a discussion of its position in regard to philosophy of education, curriculum development, educational methodology, psychology of learning, and administration and supervision will be part of the dissertation. The attached material will be incorporated into the introductory chapter in order to establish a point of departure.

Does the enclosed statement accurately reflect the basic elements and fundamental postulates of progressive education upon which all major versions of educational progressivism agree, regardless of differences in emphasis? I am requesting your help in validating the necessarily concise overview accompanying this letter. I would appreciate if you would comment upon the total outline, including its format, as well as upon any specific points, stated or omitted, to which you feel further attention should be given on my part. Your comments and criticisms in regard to this aspect of the Study or in regard to the Study in general will be warmly received. With your permission a note expressing my indebtedness to you for reviewing the statement will be inserted into the dissertation. However, your specific comments will not be disclosed.

Sincerely yours,

Sholom Handelman

SH:ro
Please send your response to Dr. Meir Ben-Horin, The Dropsie College, Broad and York Streets, Philadelphia 19, Penna.
Chapter II

The Development of Progressive Education and a Statement of its Underlying Philosophy and Basic Educational Principles

The Historical Development of Progressive Education as a Movement and as a Program in the United States

As a response to the dynamism of twentieth-century American society it is not surprising that great changes in the method and content of the education of the American student should be projected, attempted and, in many cases, accomplished. The "new education," however, evolved slowly and met considerable initial resistance from conservative educational forces and various vested interests; later, it became "fashionable" and accepted totally by some and partially by many; thereafter, it allowed itself to sow the seeds of its own eventual eclipse; and, finally, it came into disfavor and ill-repute in many educational circles that had once praised it as well as in the eyes of a post-World War II conservatively disposed public.

To the uncritical eye, the unfolding of the progressive approach in general American education is replete with overtones of reaction and exaggeration. There is no denying that this was a characteristic of the movement. However, its original and all-encompassing objective, articulated with depth and insight by its "patriarch," John Dewey,²--the connecting of learning to the learner so as to reform, re-construct and re-affirm the values of a democratic society--must be identified
and traced through its diverse developmental stages so that the essential nature of this most significant of recent educational phenomena can be truly appreciated and comprehended. (We know that the human personality is a qualitatively unique amalgam of the sum total of all its experiences and its innate and learned responses to these experiences. Similarly, the "face" of progressive education has been molded by its teachers and thinkers, its experiments, and the responses of an ambivalent twentieth-century American society characterized by its dynamic and conservative aspects, its stresses and tensions as well as its all too infrequent periods of stability and calm.)

If we wish to understand the manifestations of progressivism and anti-progressivism (the explicit counter-reaction to progressivism, not simply traditionalism) in Jewish education, then we must make note of and describe the leaders, the notable accomplishments and the educational trends spawned by progressive education as a movement and as a philosophy of education. Points of interaction—acceptance and deviation—with the historical metamorphosis of Jewish education in the United States will then be more easily identifiable. 3

Though Pestalozzian influence and the theories and methods of Froebel were present on the American educational scene during the early and mid-nineteenth century, progressive education as a reform of the abuses of traditional education received its first comprehensive application in the hands of Francis Parker. Starting in 1873, Parker, as superintendent of the Quincy, Mass. school system, implemented what came to
be known as "the Quincy system": the set curriculum was abandoned; the speller, reader, grammar and copybook were done away with; simple words and sentences were learned by the students and teacher-devised reading materials were used; arithmetic was taught inductively by use of objects, etc. After great success at Quincy with his radical innovations, which were copied extensively by quite a few school systems, Parker went West to develop his thinking and refine its practical applications at the Cook County Normal School (Chicago) and its practice school. What has been described as the most exciting of progressive experiments, the "Laboratory School" of John Dewey, the philosopher and theorist par excellence of the movement, was inspired and stimulated by Parker's practice school. Dewey's educational "proving ground" came into being as a result of a special grant from the trustees of the University of Chicago in 1896. "Whereas Parker had begun in the realm of practice and only later moved to theory, Dewey began with a set of leading ideas—hypotheses, he called them—and devised methods and curricula to test them. These hypotheses were that life itself, especially those occupations and associations that serve man's social needs, should furnish the ground experience of education; that learning can be in large measure a by-product of social activity; that the main test of learning is the ability of the individual to meet new social situations with habits of considered action; and that schooling committed to cooperative effort on the one hand and scientific methods on the other can be a beneficial influence on social progress. The purpose of the Laboratory
School was "to discover in administration, selection of subject-matter, methods of learning, teaching and discipline, how a school could become a cooperative community while developing in individuals their own capacities and satisfying their own needs."\(^7\)

As may be implied from the above, a sense of dynamism and exploration pervaded the experiment in all its phases. In order to carry out the ideas of the "master," the faculty had to be well-trained in all aspects of pedagogy. Resourcefulness, anticipating learning outcomes, knowledge of subject matter were all requisites for the almost "omniscient" teacher who needed to "push forth into the unknown" with his students. Cremin comments quite appropriately:

"But there is a point to be made here, one that Dewey argued for the rest of his career but never fully communicated to some who thought themselves his disciples. A teacher cannot know which opportunities to use, which impulses to encourage, or which social attitudes to cultivate without a clear sense of what is to come later. With respect to character, this implies a conception of the kind of individual who is to issue from the school; and with respect to intellect, this implies a thorough acquaintance with organized knowledge as represented in the disciplines. To recognize the opportunities for early mathematical learning, one must know mathematics; ... In short, the demand on the teacher is twofold: thorough knowledge of the disciplines and an awareness of those common experiences of childhood that can be utilized to lead children toward the understandings represented by this knowledge. As Dewey himself pointed out, the demand is weighty indeed, and easily side-stepped. For simple as it is to discard traditional curricula in response to cries for reform, it is even simpler to substitute for them a succession of chaotic activities that not only fail to facilitate growth but actually end up miseducative in quality and character.\(^8\)"
Dewey, however, was fortunate enough to be able to recruit for his Laboratory School the staff needed to meet the demands of the "new education." The school gained a fine reputation, real learning took place, and Dewey was able to refine and re-affirm his hypotheses and over-all thinking. ⁹

Though Dewey's school was criticized by the director himself for being too "individualistic" (when evaluated in terms of Dewey's "social reconstructionist" and "group-process" goals), a more pronounced conscious trend toward "child-centeredness" was observed in the Organic School of Marietta Pierce Johnson:

A studied informality pervaded the organization and life of the Organic School. Achievement groupings of all sorts were abandoned in favor of a simple classification based on age. Children were never compared; they were judged only in terms of their own abilities. And all extrinsic rewards were eliminated in favor of the inner satisfaction that is supposed to derive from 'wholehearted disinterested service.' Furthermore, formal studies of every sort were delayed as long as possible. ¹⁰

Upon discovering this school in 1915, John and Evelyn Dewey wrote, in their famous "case history book" of early progressive schools, Schools of Tomorrow, that the Organic School "has demonstrated that it is possible for children to lead the same natural lives in school that they lead in good homes outside of school hours; to progress bodily, mentally, and morally in school without factitious pressure, rewards, examinations, grades, or promotions, while they acquire sufficient control of the conventional tools of learning and of study of books--reading, writing, and figuring--to be able to use them independently." ¹¹
Cremin, however, labels the school and its philosophy utopian—inconsistent in its attempt to merge individuality with the necessities of group living, spontaneity with control. He compares its failings to those of Rousseau’s *Emile* and concludes: “Granted the method may have produced results in the hands of an artful teacher like Mrs. Johnson, one still shudders at the thought of what it becomes under less capable sponsorship. Ultimately, such theoretical unclarities might have mattered little had they confined themselves to Fairhope, but they were destined to take on incalculable significance when Mrs. Johnson became the guiding spirit behind the Progressive Education Association in the years immediately after World War I.”

But what of the first application of the developing progressive “credo” to an urban public school system? The “Gary Plan” represents such an attempt. Conceived and administered by William Wirt, a former student of Dewey at Chicago, the plan was an effort to apply progressive principles as stipulated by Dewey, especially that of “embyronic community life,” to the Gary, Indiana school system. Wirt’s notion was not only to afford each child vastly extended educational opportunity—in playgrounds, gardens, libraries, gymnasiums and swimming pools, art and music rooms, science laboratories, machine shops, and assembly halls—but to make the school the true center of the artistic and intellectual life of the neighborhood. Open all day, twelve months a year, and to all age groups, the Wirt school would be the heart of all effort toward
long-range community improvement, ultimately the most important single lever of social progress. A rotation system in regard to the use of facilities became known as the "platoon system," and it was attractive to school boards and school administrators as being not only progressive but also seemingly practical. In the Gary Plan elementary and high school students lived together in the same building, many school functions (meals, keeping school records, plant maintenance, etc.) were performed by the students themselves, and each youngster was assigned his own individual program. Though quite a few educators, among whom was Dewey in *Schools of Tomorrow*, lauded the Gary Plan as the crowning example of the application of progressive principles to mass, public education, there were nonetheless serious questions raised as to the feasibility, weaknesses and over-all educational value of the program as it was realized in Gary.

Experiments in adolescent and secondary education, though less widespread than those at elementary level, were also significant. Dewey's Laboratory School extended its educational program into the adolescent years. It was noticed that twelve and thirteen year olds had shifted their approach to learning "from the psychological approach of the learner of mere observer of facts to the logical one of the adult, who observes to an end and classifies what he has observed with the purpose of its further use." These youngsters were encouraged to involve themselves in specialized projects in one of the academic disciplines. By the end of their thirteenth year they had (1) amassed a wide range of knowledge, (2) developed
many skills and sensitivities, social as well as intellectual, (3) learned to work both cooperatively and independently, (4) learned how to express themselves clearly and concisely, (5) put their knowledge to use. They were considered ready for secondary education, defined by Dewey as "that phase of schooling marked by the dominance of distinctively intellectual interests organized along logically systematic lines."¹⁶

Marietta Johnson's Organic School included a junior high school and high school division. More formal subjects were taught, an arithmetic book was used for the first time, and social studies were taught with the aid of appropriate readings. Though the conventional fields of study were included in the curriculum, tests, grades and formal requirements were replaced by encouraging the students to establish their own purposes, to use their abilities to the fullest and to evaluate the results of their efforts by themselves.¹⁷ The Lincoln School, to be discussed shortly, offered a six-year high school program. It continued the "core" approach instituted in its elementary school with the addition of the following specialized studies (some required, others elective) and activities—mathematics, English, biology, physics, social studies, modern foreign languages, fine and industrial arts, home economics and physical education, opportunities for travel related to school activities ("core" units, etc.), a great number of extracurricular activities, an excellent library and a well-planned guidance and testing program.¹⁸
With the entrance on the stage of Charles Van Hise and "the Wisconsin idea," progressivism moved into the area of higher education. The University of Wisconsin came to stand for "service to the state," meaning, on the one hand, formal education for all its citizens of sufficient intellect on an equal basis and, on the other, the dissemination of the fruits of the university research program to the widest number of citizens. The university served as "consultant" to the state administration and also became the intellectual center of midwestern scientific progressivism.

Whereas the University of Wisconsin took on a general progressive orientation and consequently became the stronghold and guiding light of economic and political progressivism in pre-World War I America, educational and philosophical progressivism (pragmatism) became entrenched at Teachers College, Columbia University. Men such as Nicholas Murray Butler, first president of the New York College for the Training of Teachers which became Teachers College in 1893; James Earl Russell, the first Dean-Elect of the College and an administrator of exceptional ability; Paul Monroe, a pioneer in the field of American educational history; Edward L. Thorndike, renowned experimental and educational psychologist; John Dewey, officially a faculty member of the department of philosophy of Columbia University; and William Heard Kilpatrick—were some of the illustrious educationists who gravitated to the institution. They and many other distinguished faculty members contributed much thought and energy to all aspects of the struggle to elevate education
to the level of a profession and to develop a substantial academic program for the professional education of teachers. In addition to laboring toward the realization of this lofty objective, this group should be credited with placing on firm academic ground educational philosophy (mainly but not exclusively progressive) and methodology, educational theory and practice, and education's scientific as well as speculative spheres.  

During this period of maturation of faculty, pedagogic instruction, and professional training program at Teachers College, the founding of Lincoln School as the "laboratory school" for Teachers College (September, 1917) also took place. Cremin says of this significant venture in modern education:

If any one institution symbolized the private progressive school of this era—and there are good reasons for insisting that none did—it was probably the Lincoln School. Nowhere did the several strands of postwar progressivism converge and intertwine so effectively. Nowhere was the rich diversity of the movement more dramatically documented. And certainly, no single progressive school exerted greater or more lasting influence on the subsequent history of American education.

In his essay, A Modern School, Abraham Flexner, its first director, took a position of strict utilitarianism as to the inclusion of subject matter areas in the curriculum: "Modern education will include nothing simply because tradition recommends it or because its inutility has not been conclusively established. It proceeds in precisely the opposite way: it includes nothing for which an affirmative case cannot now be made out." Lincoln
School combined effectively the child-centered, scientific, and reformist aspects of the movement. Whether for reason of its becoming a victim of the "conservative reaction," or for other reasons (financial, etc.), it closed its doors for the last time in 1948.\(^{23}\)

As was implied in Cremin's statement regarding Lincoln School, the twenties and the thirties were characterized by many divergent moods and dramatic innovations in the ranks of progressive educators and sympathizers as was the case in the world in general. The twenties witnessed an increased emphasis on the child and his activity as the central focus for education, Harold Rugg's *The Child-Centered School* being the characteristic progressive work of the period. He and co-author, Ann Shumaker, equate progressivism in education with the quest for creative self-expression. Six articles of faith are postulated as representing the fundamental principles upon which real education should be based: freedom (vs. control), child initiative, the active school, child interest as the "orienting center of the school program," creative self-expression, and personality and social adjustment.\(^{24}\) Their final statement exudes an optimism and faith that pervaded the entire movement during the late twenties, a faith that oversimplified and over-emphasized one facet of the "new education" at the expense of other goals and realities:

Why is progressive education so inspiring? Are these new leaders merely hopeful enthusiasts? What is the magic of their message? It is a whisper of the promise of freedom to the sleeping genius in all of us—in teacher and pupil.
alike. It carries the assurance that mediocrity may be left behind; that the distinctive something lurking in everyone may be used and improved—in teacher, parent, child, school director.

We may then criticize the new schools, and justly, for their lack of application of the conditions of scientific procedure. We may point out their planlessness, their failure to evaluate their results objectively. But none who have been touched by the stirring promise of the new education can deny that here is possibly something too great to be measured by the limited standards we now employ. As profitably measure the horizon with foot rules.

For the progressive schools of today, for the first time in history, are actually working out in practice something which Rousseau perceived and only vaguely described to his contemporaries; which Pestalozzi apprehended only in the personal love and goodness of his heart; toward which Froebel strove through an obscure mysticism; which Dewey partially phrased but could not exemplify. In spite of the errors and gropings and mistakes of an imperfect methodology one fact stands supreme: The new education has reoriented educational thinking about its true center—the child. And all these other things are slowly being added unto it. [italics my own]

In addition to this great surge of enthusiasm by advocates of child-centered education, the twenties found quantitative measurement of intelligence and of subject-achievement being championed by Thorndike, whose faith in the scientific basis upon which pedagogy could be re-constructed was almost religious in fervor. Tests, and testing programs, thus, partially dominated the educational scene, also. The Stanford-Binet and the Army Alpha were the most prominent tests of the era. As with other innovations, heated controversy in progressive and other circles raged over the meaning and value of standardized testing.

Finally, Freudianism, psychoanalysis, and complete freedom of emotional and artistic expression insinuated themselves
into the thinking and practice of some avant-garde educational pioneers. The Play School (City and Country School) of Caroline Pratt embodied the expressionist emphasis which valued and nurtured creativity, curiosity, spontaneity, and freedom. After reviewing and analyzing the development of this aspect of the progressivism of the twenties, Cremin acidly comments:

Granted these superb results, though, the doctrine of creative self-expression raised the same problems in education as it raised elsewhere. Taken up as a fad, it elicited not only first-rate art, but every manner of shoddiness and self-deception as well. In too many classrooms license began to pass for liberty, planlessness for spontaneity, recalcitrance for individuality, obscuration for art, and chaos for education—all justified in the rhetoric of expressionism. And thus was born at least one of the several caricatures of progressive education in which humorists reveled—quite understandably—for at least a generation.26

Margaret Naumberg’s Children’s School (Walden School) was the exemplification of Freudian inroads into the educational profession of the period. Miss Naumberg wrote: "For to us, all prohibitions that lead to nerve strain and repression of normal energy are contrary to the most recent findings of biology, psychology and education. We have got to discover ways of redirecting and harnessing the vital force of childhood in constructive and creative work."27 All and all, once radical experiments such as the Children’s School are placed in their proper perspective, it must be acknowledged that the psychoanalytic theory of ego-development helped to alter in a positive direction the authority patterns and overall emotional climate of the American classroom and school.28
Whereas Dewey, the profound thinker and prolific writer, was the great progressive mentor of the first two decades of the twentieth-century, William Heard Kilpatrick—teacher, lecturer, and organizer—became the learned spokesman and academician of the progressive road to education in the twenties. The "project method" and "purposeful activity" became watchwords of progressive teachers and educators as a result of contact with the men and his teachings. In terms of influence on sheer numbers, Kilpatrick and his brand of progressivism was the leader by far. Typical of Kilpatrick's relatively lucid mode of expression as compared to the cumbersome and involved style of Dewey, is the following statement:

"Finally, we must realize that the philosophy of life discussed above is all the time in actual process of building by our students. For good or ill every insight that they get, every valuation that they make, every decision that they reach, will enter as constituent factors into the actual social philosophy they are building. Realizing this, we must do out utmost to help them think and judge carefully, objectively, inclusively, and reliably. Again, we are not to guide them toward our personal answer, but to the most careful thinking and judging they can do. What the students are to think, what decisions they will reach in these controversial areas, is for them to decide. The result we seek is a person able and disposed to think for himself and to act in accordance with his best thinking."

A contemporary of Kilpatrick, whose thinking was quite similar to that of Kilpatrick but was critical of the indiscriminate use of the project method was Boyd Henry Bode. Bode held that the cultivation of intelligence was the central purpose of education. He departed from Kilpatrick and asserted that no one general method should be utilized at all times. He felt
that methods and procedures should vary with the content to be learned and the nature of learner(s). His critical discussion of the project method in Modern Educational Theories illustrates his communion with Kilpatrick as well as his independence of thought. It is quite instructive:

It does not follow, however, that the project method, . . . can be made to cover the whole field. However, cordially its merits may be recognized, as a universal method it suffers from certain obvious defects. By definition it takes no account of either logical organization or "social insight." Its spirit is the spirit of immediate practicality which is the spirit of an exclusive vocationalism. This is no objection to the method, unless we apply it too widely. If we do so, we find that our practicality overreaches itself. Learning that is limited to this method is too discontinuous, too random and haphazard, too immediate in its function, unless we supplement it with something else . . . Learning for immediate purposes, or incidental learning, is too much a hit-and-miss affair—it dips in here and there, but it gives no satisfactory perspective, no firm hold on fundamental principles.

This is not a criticism of the project method, but an attempt to show its limitations. Since the principle is limited in its application, it does not fully meet the demand for a kind of education that is not tied up so closely with immediate demands . . .

There is no intention in the foregoing discussion to minimize the importance of purposeful activity. The point is rather that the whole idea of the project method easily becomes a means of evading instead of facing the problem of educational guidance or direction. The teacher must have a reasonably definite plan of campaign; he must foresee certain results that are to be attained . . . The conception of the project method as organization into "central teaching units" leaves the teacher entirely at sea. Similarly the identification of the project method with purposeful activity leaves the whole matter of "prior chosen subject matter" in a state of obscurity . . .

As was stated at the outset, the purpose of the project method is to prevent the work of the school from becoming perfunctory, mechanical, meaningless. The things learned in school must operate to change the pupil's everyday experience, his scale of values, his outlook on life; they must furnish incentives for the process of reinterpretation
which we call thinking. The question is simply how this result can be secured most effectively. The movement known as the project method has served a useful purpose in stressing the importance of independent and meaningful activity. But it has also introduced a new confusion and a new attempt to solve educational problems by means of a magic formula. In the interests of our common undertaking it would be better to limit the term project to its original meaning of incidental learning, or else to abstain for a time from talk about the project method and devote ourselves wholeheartedly to a consideration of educational aims, for the purpose of reorganizing our educational materials and methods so as to create new incentives and new meanings for the work of the school.\(^{31}\)

The spirit of social reform, which was the original impetus for the educational reforms espoused by progressivism, lay comparatively dormant among educators of the twenties as they did nothing more than reflect the social conservatism of the post-war period. However, the one strong voice, which became even more powerful and arresting in the fateful thirties was that of the educator-social philosopher, George S. Counts. In *Secondary Education and Industrialism*, Counts warns:

A school cannot be socially progressive by mere resolve. Unless it reaches down into the substratum of society and taps the deepflowing currents of social life, it can only be another pedagogical experiment, of interest to the academician but destined to an early grave. The founding of a progressive educational movement is as difficult as the founding of a progressive political party, and for much the same reasons. If it is not rooted in some profound social movement or trend, it can be but an instrument of deception. In spite of all the well-intentioned efforts of intellectuals, society stubbornly chooses its own roads to salvation.\(^{32}\)

Related to Counts' strong position and probably stimulated by his forthright statements as in his bold pamphlet, *Dare the School Build a New Social Order?*\(^{33}\) was the publication in 1933...
of a volume called *The Educational Frontier*. This collection of essays became the representative statement of progressive socio-educational philosophy during the thirties. The belief of the authors of the book—Kilpatrick, Bode, Dewey, John L. Childs, R. Bruce Raup, H. Gordon Hullfish, and V. T. Thayer—was that, because of the great changes occurring in modern life due to advances in science and technology, the goal of education should be to enable individuals to deal understandingly and intelligently with the conditions and forces at work, and to prepare these individuals to create and control their own destinies in regard to these forces.

Similar to many who contributed to *The Educational Frontier* and to its companion journal, *The Social Frontier*, Harold Rugg, who penned *The Child-Centered School* in the late twenties, reoriented his educational outlook toward the needs of the depression era—away from individual development and back toward social reconstructionism. In his finest and most comprehensive work, written a few years after the end of World War II, Rugg says of the progressive schools of the 40's (the very same ones which he described and discussed in *The Child-Centered School*):

"These were my reactions to the older progressive schools in 1942 and 1943 which, up to that time, I regarded as the best of our schools. But aside from the general spirit of active freedom, what I had seen was far from satisfying; measured in terms of what we had learned of the foundations of education, it was downright discouraging. As I became more critical in my visits to the schools, I kept asking, 'Why don't these 'activity programs' mature into an advancing study of our society? Why is there so little creative work going
on? Why this noise and intellectual disorder?"

Gradually my concern centered on one thing: These schools have not really been designed. I searched in vain for definite foundations, "first principles," which would guide the building of the life and program of the school. It seemed to me that in each one of these schools the teachers and directors, with the best of intentions, were so overwhelmed by the administrative and teaching tasks of running the school that they tended to give little time and energy to the conscious building of a theory and a total design. I found many sporadic instances of the planning of selected portions of the program but no deep, ever present concern with the theory of the total school. I began to see, for example, that one reason why the young people are not brought face-to-face with the actual conditions and problems of our culture is that the directors and teachers themselves have no "sociology." I found an utterly inadequate understanding of the new study of society which Veblen, Turner, Boas, Robinson, Thomas, Beard, and others have produced since 1890. And I found no study of that new sociology going on among the faculties of the schools (of higher learning).

Similarly with the dearth of creative expression. I was forced to the conclusion that there was no clear esthetics in even the best of our schools. Much random improvising activity there was—but no study of the first principles of esthetics and design . . .

Similarly, the disorder in the schools appeared directly traceable to the lack of a philosophy of freedom and discipline. To educate in a new society in which the fundamental meanings of democracy have changed, and new concepts of freedom, equality, and expression have emerged, requires a new consciously designed philosophy of freedom and order. A new morals and the vague structure of a new ethics have been evolving in our society, but still are not being utilized in even the best of our schools.37

The thirties was a significant decade for progressive education. Not only did it reach its peak of popularity among professionals and the interested public, but the decade also, paradoxically, witnessed the demise of the PEA, the Progressive Education Association. The PEA, founded in 1919, was originally an association of lay supporters of the "new education." It
included a few professionals and, consequently, exhibited a minimum of professional domination. According to Stanwood Cobb, president of the association until 1930, it was "taken away from us" in the thirties by the "people at Teachers College, Columbia University." During this period, at which time the lay foundation of the organization completely crumbled, it was plagued by much internal strife as it attempted to define its objectives in view of the necessities of the epoch. Nonetheless, some notable accomplishments did take place which tended to focus attention away from the ominous signs on the horizon:

1. The Eight-Year Study took place. This experiment gave evidence that progressively-oriented secondary education prepared students for better and deeper student involvement on-the-whole at college;

2. A number of colleges—Sarah Lawrence, Bennington, Black Mountain, Bard, and Rollins as well as the General College of the University of Minnesota—re-designed their curricula so as to take into account progressive principles;

3. The Federal Government, as a response to the mass unemployment brought on by the depression, created the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) whose six major aims were: to develop powers of self-expression, self-attainment, and self-culture; to develop pride and satisfaction in cooperative endeavor; to develop an understanding of prevailing social and economic conditions to the end that each man might cooperate intelligently in improving these conditions; to preserve and strengthen good habits of health and mental development; to assist each man, by vocational counseling and training, to meet his employment problems when he leaves camp;
to develop an appreciation of nature and country life;\textsuperscript{42}

(4) The PEA had its highest enrollment in 1938.

As has become quite obvious, the lack of a unifying objective or set of objectives, factionalism, extreme experiments and positions, and the absence of a many-sided approach to educational problems ruled the movement through the thirties even though attempts to overcome these pitfalls occurred. With the loss of popular support in post-World War II America and the upsurge of conservative sentiment, which was increasingly critical of the life-adjustment approach supported by the Educational Policies Commission of the United States Government Office of Education,\textsuperscript{43} progressive education became less and less influential in the educational arena as a philosophy and integrated program of education. The inordinate demands on the teacher as well as the piecemeal success of many of its reforms sapped the enthusiasm for and the energy of the progressive revolution. Finally, and most important to Cremin, "it failed to keep pace with the continuing transformation of American society."\textsuperscript{44}

Nevertheless according to Cremin, when all is said and done about the numerous failings of progressive education, the following concrete changes, which can be credited to the influence of progressive education, became widespread and accepted in general American education:

1. There was a steady extension of educational opportunity, downward as well as upward. A greater proportion of the population continued into the high schools, while kindergartens and nursery schools also flourished as the number of working women rose.
2. Numbers of school systems shifted from an eight-year elementary school followed by a four-year high school to a six-year elementary school followed by a three-year junior high school and then a three-year senior high school, partly to give greater attention to the special requirements of pubescent children.

3. There was a continuing expansion and reorganization of the curriculum at all levels, and frequently in directions advocated by the progressives. In the secondary schools in particular there were vastly extended opportunities for work in trades, agriculture, home economics, physical education and the arts.

4. Along with the proliferation and the reorganization of the formal curriculum, there came a concomitant expansion of extracurricular—or as the progressives called them to emphasize their integral part in the school program, "cocurricular"—activities...

5. There was infinitely more variation and flexibility in the grouping of students, most commonly on the basis of intelligence and achievement tests. In addition, as districts consolidated and schools became larger, guidance programs developed in an effort to take account of the varying needs and concerns of individual youngsters.

6. The character of the classroom changed markedly, especially at the elementary level, as projects began to compete with recitations as standard pedagogical procedure. Students and teachers alike tended to be more active, more mobile, and more informal in their relationship with one another.

7. The materials of instruction changed dramatically as those who prepared them sought to incorporate the latest research on learning and child development. Textbooks became more colorful and attractive, and supplementary devices like flash cards, workbooks, simulated newspapers, slides, filmstrips, and phonograph records were used in growing numbers...

8. School architecture was modified to take account of these new developments, thereby lending them a measure of permanence. Assembly rooms, gymnasiums, swimming pools, playgrounds, athletic fields, laboratories, shops, kitchens, cafeterias, and infirmaries; miniature tables and chairs; moveable furniture and partitions, improved lighting and ventilation—all testified eloquently to the changing program and commitment of the school.

9. Teachers were better educated; and by virtue of
state certification requirements, their programs of preparation—both pre-service and in-service—increasingly included professional courses that tended to reflect one or another of the versions of progressive education.

10. Finally, administrative relationships changed, if somewhat paradoxically. As schools and school systems became larger, bureaucracy increased; school administration became a separate professional function rather than a supplementary responsibility of the senior teachers. At the same time teachers were allowed a somewhat greater role in the determination of curriculum, while parents exercised a measure of influence through parent and parent-teacher associations. At few points did school boards or administrators relinquish important powers; nonetheless, there was a perceptible growth of parent and teacher participation in policy-making.45

The Underlying Philosophy and Basic Educational Principles of Progressive Education in the United States

Though many critics of the "new education" tend to hold it responsible for the ills of contemporary American society,46 a study of the historical milieu from which educational progressivism evolved refutes this tenuous cause-effect relationship. When new ideas appear upon the stage of history, they are rejected if they cannot make some connection with prevalent moods and needs, articulated or unrecognized. A society must be ready to change much as an individual exhibits a readiness to learn.

Actually, progressive education began as part of a vast humanitarian effort to apply the promise of American life—the ideal of government by, of, and for the people—to the puzzling new urban-industrial civilization that came into being during the latter half of the nineteenth century. The word progressive provides the clue to what it really was: the educational phase of American Progressivism writ large. In effect, progressive education began as Progressivism in education: a many-sided effort to use the schools to improve the lives of individuals.47
Of the many factors discussed in the preceding section four specific but interrelated ones are identified by Brameld, a critical sympathizer with "new education," as being basic contributors to the growth of criticism of traditional education and to the formulation of the "new" approach—the industrial revolution, modern science, the rise of democracy, and the American environment. Progressivism, characterized by the pragmatic world-view, by dynamism and by the complete acceptance of change and relativism, takes on the garb of an almost inevitable response and a reflection of a cultural pattern that existed in the latter part of the nineteenth and the early part of the twentieth centuries in America.

The second most significant conclusion reached by Cremin in his comprehensive work is that "the movement was marked from the very beginning by a pluralistic, frequently contradictory, character. The reader will search these pages in vain for any capsule definition of progressive education. None exists, and none ever will; for throughout its history progressive education meant different things to different people, and these differences were only compounded by the remarkable diversity of American education." Some of this diversity has been a result of honest misunderstanding, for example, by those who did not read Dewey thoroughly and who gained only a superficial, formula-like comprehension of the essence of the "new" education. Another group may have been consciously using the "new" education to justify their rebellion against inadequacies and excesses of the "old," traditional type.
Thus, they would take some facet that would meet their needs and was in tune with their interests and then define progressive education in certain restricted terms, in a spirit of militancy and reaction—"the project method," "the activity program," "the child-centered school," "the free individual," "socialized education." 52

John Dewey, being quite visibly disturbed by the distortions and extremes that had emanated from his teachings, pointed out in one of his later works published in 1938: "There is always a danger in a new movement that in rejecting the aims and methods of that which it would supplant, it may develop its principles negatively rather than positively and constructively. Then it takes its clue in practice from that which is rejected instead from the constructive development of its own philosophy." 53 Cremin also attributes the misinterpretations to the ever-present problem of "discipleship":

The problem of language, of course, is compounded by the problem of discipleship; and here Dewey suffers a fate common to all major thinkers. For almost by definition, influential ideas lend themselves to widespread appropriation, and the historian immediately faces the difficult task of allocating responsibility for the inevitable distortions. For example, to what extent were William Heard Kilpatrick's 35,000 graduate students actually influenced by Dewey? Or conversely, to what extent should Dewey be held responsible for the "project method" which Kilpatrick formulated and preached for four decades as the pedagogical extension of Dewey's philosophy? What was Dewey's responsibility within the movement for pointedly clarifying his differences with Kilpatrick? And in the absence of such clarification—Dewey was a gentleman—is Dewey responsible for whatever distortions of his thought Kilpatrick might have introduced? Now, if the same questions are raised with a host of other disciples once, twice, and thrice removed, the difficulties in assessing
Dewey's significance became enormous. The problem cannot be solved merely by recourse to what Dewey actually said, though this may often clear the air. For a man's influence frequently exceeds his intentions, and sometimes in quite unexpected directions. Dewey, clearly perceiving this serious dilemma, went so far in Experience and Education as to question very explicitly the "either or" hypotheses of the traditional vs. modern education controversy still raging in our own day. His words are quite arresting in this era of educational crisis and criticism:

I have frequently used in what precedes the words "progressive" and "new" education. I do not wish to close, however, without recording my firm belief that the fundamental issue is not that of new versus old nor of progressive against traditional education but a question of what anything whatever must be to be worthy of the name education. I am not, I hope and believe, in favor of any ends or any methods simply because the name progressive may be applied to them. The basic question concerns the nature of education with no qualifying adjectives prefixed. What we want and need is education pure and simple, and we shall make surer and faster progress when we devote ourselves to finding out just what education is and what conditions have to be satisfied in order that education may be a reality and not a name or a slogan...

Notwithstanding this profound and provocative statement, it is still necessary to attempt to set forth the basic characteristics of progressive education in the areas of philosophy of education, psychology of learning and methodology, curriculum development, supervision and administration. Only then, can an adequate appraisal of how and to what degree progressive theory and practice have influenced and continues to influence Jewish education and the Jewish school be rendered.
A. Philosophy and Philosophy of Education

To the progressive, who can be identified as a pragmatist in philosophical outlook, no doctrines of absolute reality (closed universe, universal and eternal truths, etc.) are valid. Experience is the fundamental postulate of the pragmatic ontology. The present reality, characterized as dynamic and active, evolving and changing and influenced by chance is the matrix of all human endeavor. Experience is, therefore, temporal, spatial, dynamic and pluralistic. Man's unique function is that of mind. Mind, is the power of intelligence in action. "Intelligence is always a way of acting, directly or indirectly, in relation to a concrete problem in specific historical circumstances under the triple controls of a desire to find truth (no matter how defined), knowledge already won, and the hard facts of experiment." Mind, is not an entity but rather a function. "It is, indeed, what it does." Epistemologically, progressives distinguish between mediate and immediate experience. Mediate experience entails an output of energy and needs action on the part of the doer in order to eliminate a disturbance or problem and achieve once again harmony and equilibrium. Immediate experience, on the other hand, is rather passive and is undergone by a person without the encountering of obstacles or problems. All mediate experience involves consciously or unconsciously five steps, the famous "act of thought." Identifying the obstacle, analyzing the problem, posing suggestions or hypotheses, thinking through
the consequences and implications of each inference, and finally actually testing the most likely hypotheses.

From this distinction between mediate and immediate experience follows the differentiation between truth and knowledge. Truth is active, it is the result of knowing; "The crucial test of whether an idea becomes true is its long range effectiveness in the conquest of difficulties demanding that reflection shall mediate, thereby permitting us to resume our union with immediate experience." Knowledge is relatively passive; it acts as a reservoir of information, facts, laws, habits, principles, and processes which are accumulated. It is social, a product of activity, and it grows. It is also relative; though it may have been of use yesterday, it may not be helpful today.

In conclusion, intelligence is the method of human interaction with the environment, the product of this interaction becoming "truth" or just ordinary "knowledge." Also, all "knowledge" or "truth" must be considered operational in character; it is not an end in itself but serves as a means of formulating and testing hypotheses, of approaching and interpreting human problems. It is this "instrumental use of intelligence," its "mediating" property that Kallen champions as he contrasts his conception of what education should be to what it appeared to him to be in the mid-twenties:

Free public education and private instruction purchasable at a price are both the community's device to meet present needs by transmitting the past unchanged. They provide a grammar of assent, not a logic of inquiry. The mental posture they habituate the young in is not the posture of reflection. The mental posture they
habituate the young in is the posture of conformity. They require belief, not investigation. They impose reverence for the past and idealization of the present. They envision the future as a perpetuation of the past, not as a new creation out of it.60

Though progressivist axiology distinguishes between instrumental and intrinsic values (mediate values that serve as means and values that are immediately satisfying), this distinction is not one that holds true at all times. Values have a social character just as the self is a social product, but values that are socially acceptable do not necessarily have validity for a given individual. Values are to be tested and re-tested by intelligence throughout the individual's lifetime. "But in this very fact we find one of the chief justifications of the use of intelligence ... By bringing what is out of sight in view, by anticipating consequences and so bringing them into mind where mind means 'minding,' intelligence can diminish the occasions of human cruelty."61 A fundamental value is growth which is both intrinsically and instrumentally good. The pattern of social life in which growth in all its aspects and ramifications can occur with the least amount of obstacles is democracy in its most profound philosophical sense—"democracy symbolizes the kind of growing life in which, first, each person consciously seeks and finds the fullest and the most varied satisfactions of his own capacities and in which, second, each group of persons seeks and finds comparable satisfactions through interplay with other groups."62

As has been alluded to earlier, the pragmatic philosophy
rejects obviously such traditional concepts as the closed, absolute universe with its dependence upon some source of absolute authority and immutable, universal truths, values, ideas, etc. It dismisses the concept of a static, pre-conceived, mechanistic universe (structurally and in terms of form) in which all human experience is anchored and interpreted. Furthermore, the classical dichotomy between body and soul is totally negated. There seems to be no question but that it tends to undermine traditional religious concepts of God, creation, immortality, etc. This does not mean, however, that pragmatism and progressivism have eliminated religion from the realm of possible meaningful and rewarding human experience:

In short, as these pragmatists contemplate the vast transformations in religious interpretation which have been in process for more than a century, they find little substance in the view that religious beliefs are of a sort that scientific inquiries and the evidence developed through these inquiries have no important bearing on them. They hold that religious attitudes and beliefs have changed and will continue to change as a result of scientific discoveries. But they consider that it is one thing to say that religious beliefs should be modified so as to bring them into line with whatever evidence has bearing on them, and that it is another and quite different thing to assert that they should be abandoned because the logic of experimental inquiry in and of itself renders them meaningless. Many pragmatists find nothing in the contextual principle which automatically makes inquiry into the acceptability of the theistic explanation a "self-defeating" undertaking . . .

The most forceful presentations of educative principles upon which progressive education is based are usually those that contrast the "old" education with the "new." However, for the purpose of this summary overview, a descriptive
statement and elucidation of principles seems more appropriate. In 1919, "The Association for the Advancement of Progressive Education," the first organized voice of the movement, set forth the following tenets as basic to progressively oriented education. A general pronouncement stated that "the aim of Progressive Education is the freest and fullest development of the individual, based upon the scientific study of his mental, physical, spiritual and social characteristics and needs." This was further amplified with the result that it could be said that progressive education emphasized "freedom to develop naturally; interest the motive of all work; the teacher a guide, not a taskmaster; scientific study of pupil development; greater attention to all that affects the child's physical development; cooperation between school and home to meet the needs of child-life; the progressive school a leader in educational movements." Brameld, in summarizing the position of progressive education in regard to its basic educational concepts, lists the following as being especially relevant: (1) interest, (2) effort, (3) purpose, (4) intelligence, (5) habit, (6) growth, (7) organism, (8) culture. Kilpatrick, in his discussion of a "modern theory of learning," states (B type law of learning): "We learn what we live, we learn each item we live as we accept it, and we learn it in the degree we accept it." He also considers as important: degrees of learning, cumulative learning, and concomitant learning.
In the final analysis, progressive education looks at the learner as a complete individual; he is not an "intellectual robot." Learning is not simply the stamping in and out of responses, but it involves the entire organism—his intellect, his feelings, and his whole body. Though a person can be forced or cajoled into learning, truly effective learning occurs when an individual is interested in learning and finds in the learning process meaning and purpose for himself as an individual and as a member of some primary group, of a larger society and of a culture or way of life. Effort, ideally, should be self-imposed and should flow from inherent interest. Intelligence, the sustained effort to think through and reorganize a disorganized situation, a process characterized by observing, recalling and making judgments, is a major instrumental function of the self and is indispensable to effective learning. The utilization of skills and habits of reflective thinking are definitely important in increasing the efficiency of human behavior. In *Experience and Education*, Dewey says that "the basic characteristic of habit is that every experience enacted and undergone modifies the one who acts and undergoes, while this modification affects, whether we wish it or not, the quality of subsequent experiences." It follows, on the one hand, that habits can be obstacles to effective learning. However, they also have the power to make learning more efficient and, in so doing, decrease the amount of energy devoted to performing many routine actions and thus free the self for greater and deeper reflective action. Finally, the
habit of reflective action can make us habitually intelligent. 72 

In summation, real learning leads to the total growth of an intelligent organism who is prepared to function as a participating member of an evolving socio-cultural group.

From the preceding philosophical and psychological beliefs an educational methodology, an ideal or ideals of a curriculum, and an approach to administration and supervision have been created. Caswell and Foshay, leaders of an enlightened and self-critical progressivism, enumerate the following as being traits of a good elementary school: the program is conceived and operated as a whole; it provides a rounded program of living for children; it contributes to the maximum realization of democratic ideals in the actual living of pupils; the program is based on an analysis of the interests, needs, and capacities of the children it serves; the children are afforded guided experiences compatible with their maturity in all the areas of living; it is an integral part of the immediate community it serves; its physical facilities and instructional supplies facilitate desirable pupil activities; the growth and welfare of all members of the professional staff are fostered; it organizes the general life of the school so as to foster democratic values. 73 Implicit in these characteristics is a definite and unique outlook upon curriculum, educational method, administration and supervision. An attempt will now be made to investigate these sub-divisions in greater though not exhaustive detail, so a comparatively complete picture of the progressive approach to education can be painted at the outset.
of this study. Needless to say, much overlapping and "inter-connectedness" will be noted as the examination takes place. This is as it should be for any integrated and relatively consistent educational program flowing from a common philosophical viewpoint.

B. Curriculum Development

It is apparent that progressive education's critique of the traditional curricular content and structure is directly related to the contrast between the pragmatic view of the universe—dynamic, changing, pluralistic, etc.—and the static, mechanistic, absolutist conception espoused by philosophical and educational perennialists and essentialists. Kilpatrick argues:

The old outlook, as has already many times been stated, assumed that education consists precisely of the acquisition of preformulated knowledge presented to the learner either in textbooks or orally by teachers (or parents). It further assumed that acquiring the assigned content would build the desired mind in the learner. On the basis of these assumptions the old curriculum is the requisite content knowledge arranged systematically (logically) for progressive acquisition.74

Though the traditional "subject-matter" curriculum is logical in structure (and may have an increasing and more necessary role as specialized education takes place at the secondary school and college levels), it is at odds with many of the fundamental principles of learning and experience championed by the progressivists in the formulation of their plan for "modern general education."
Kilpatrick lists six basic assumptions upon which the "new curriculum" rests:

1. Education for the purpose here in mind is the effort of adults in charge to guide the child’s development and learning so that he may grow up to take his proper place in society and himself live the good life.

2. Each learns what he lives as he accepts it to live by, and he learns it in the degree he accepts and lives it.

3. What one learns he builds, in corresponding degree, at once into character.

4. "The whole child" is always involved, and many cumulative, concomitant learnings are always in process.

5. From these various considerations the schools should be a place of living, living of the kind to help build the desirable all-around character to serve the all-round good life.

6. Teaching exists to cultivate this quality of living in those taught.

With these presuppositions before us, the new curriculum becomes the total living of the child so far as the school can influence it or should take responsibility for developing it. 75

As with all theoretical principles, degrees or levels of implementation in practice are the rule. Rugg, in Foundations for American Education, cites five different types of curricular innovation which came into being as a response to the progressivist "revolution":

1. Reorganization within a particular subject: juggling items about with little actual redesigning;

2. correlation of two or more bodies of subject matter: for example, between English and social studies;

3. grouping together and integrating related subjects within broad fields of knowledge: for example, "general
education" in the natural sciences or arts;

4. "core curriculum": a loosely used term to suggest blocks of learning experiences around common needs;

5. "experience-centered curriculum": dissolving subject-matter lines and emphasizing "units." 76

As can be seen, each variation becomes "progressively more progressive" or more psychologically oriented rather than logically compartmentalized. The truly progressive curriculum is the "experience-centered unit" curriculum in which factual knowledge and the learning of skills are used as tools to help students meet their needs, solve their problems, and answer their questions that emanate from the flux of their on-going, immediate, life experiences.

The "persistent life situations" curriculum for general education, a sophisticated, progressively-oriented approach to curriculum development, is an illustration worthy of being noted and more closely examined. The authors of Developing a Curriculum for Modern Living 77 state:

The basic problems and situations which are central in life itself are central in education;

the content and organization of learning experiences are determined by the experiences of learners as they deal with everyday concerns and the persistent life situations which are a part of them (these situations of everyday living take the place of "subjects" and the varied other ways of focusing the curriculum);

the scope lies in the range of persistent life situations with which, to some extent, each individual deals;

the sequence and continuity are determined by the changing aspects of persistent life situations as the learner moves from childhood into the full responsibilities of adulthood;
school and community experiences are related because the same persistent life situations are faced in the home, at school, in the neighborhood, at church, and everywhere the learner works and plays; the nature of the learner’s daily living at any stage of his development is recognized as important to the society of which he is a member.

A curriculum in which the learner and society are brought into relationship is one in which the daily life concerns of children and youth are seen as aspects of persistent life situations with which all members of society must be able to deal.

A curriculum that develops maximum effectiveness in meeting the problems of modern living makes use of the immediate situations learners face as a basis for developing competencies and understandings for future action.

A master list of potential persistent life situations broken down into three major areas, and subsequently sub-areas, is presented—situations calling for growth in individual capacities, situations calling for growth in social participation, and situations calling for the ability to deal with environmental factors and forces. Finally, all sub-areas are then analyzed, and probable focal points and areas of concern for early childhood, later childhood, youth and adulthood are listed in a very specific and meticulous manner.

The criticism of vagueness and lack of adult direction and planning certainly cannot be leveled at this curricular design. The exact content or factual knowledge to be learned is, however, an unknown since it depends upon the direction in which and the pace at which the selected experiences of a given group unfold. Nonetheless, what will be learned will be more than "memorized" and "recited"—it will be lived, used and
will possess a connectedness with and personalized meaning for the learner. Problem-solving, flexibility, motivation and interest, decision-making, and thorough discussion as part of the democratic process are basic to this approach which makes great demands on teacher, school, and community but which typifies progressive education at its best.

A last word in regard to curriculum development will be allowed to Caswell and Foshay. As has been intimated before, these educators support an approach to elementary education that is basically progressive in nature but is sharply critical of the past excesses and inadequacies manifested by the movement in actual day-to-day practice. The following seven points are postulated as a guide for curriculum organization:

1. A broad, flexible plan of a curriculum organization should be developed co-operatively by the staff of a school.

2. The curriculum should be organized so that individual teachers and pupils consummate planning.

3. The curriculum organization should encompass all experiences which the child has under the guidance of the school.

4. The curriculum should be so organized that direct attention is centered on problems and needs of broad social significance and of immediate concern to children.

5. The curriculum should be so organized as to provide a series of broad, meaningful experiences for children which serve as a major, integrating force for the various activities engaged in.

6. The curriculum organization should provide for the direct instruction of pupils in techniques and methods of work as they are needed.

7. The curriculum organization should provide for development of the individual interests and aptitudes of the children.
As might be expected, progressivist psychology of learning and of general individual development and functioning, if at any level it can be identified as a distinct approach to these aspects of human life, is a reflection of much speculation and research in the fields of learning theory, personality development and "group-psychology" (group dynamics, social psychology, and sociology). Though an argument might be presented that a unique psychology exists—the psychology flowing exclusively from the insights of Peirce, James and Dewey—it seems that such an assertion is an inaccurate oversimplification. That this "triumvirate" formulated the fundamental progressive epistemological position cannot be contested. However, historically and developmentally, progressive psychology has become a selective eclecticism which, admittedly, has gained and sustained its direction and focus from the prejudices and inclinations of these three "philosopher-psychologists."

Of James, Benjamin Wolman, in *Contemporary Theories and Systems in Psychology*, states:

It is hard to say whether James developed a new psychological theory. His original contribution, the theory of emotions, aroused much controversy and has been largely disproved by later studies. The greatness of James does not lie in this or any other particular research. He influenced psychology by his new and fresh approach to the problem, by his philosophical idea of pragmatism and his perception of psychological function as a part in the process of adjustment. What for? was the question he asked. And even if he himself could not furnish the answer, he guided psychologists in posing this fruitful question.
Of Dewey, Wolman comments:

It would be rather difficult to understand Dewey's contribution to the psychological theory without paying due attention to his philosophical inquiries. In fact, Dewey's philosophical studies reached greater prominence and had more influence than his psychological studies.

Dewey was one of the leading American pragmatists; he could agree with Peirce and James that action precedes knowledge. Life is action . . .

Dewey's influence in psychology is more related to his broadly conceived philosophy than to his specific contributions to psychological research. First, his concept of instrumentalism paved the road for the functionalist approach to and purposivistic conception of psychology. Then, the emphasis on adjustment and learning led to a series of fruitful investigations in several laboratories. Dewey was opposed to the structuralist's "anatomy of mind" and introduced the molar point of view. And last, Dewey's theory of scientific inquiry stimulated the minds of Hull, Tolman, and scores of other research workers in psychology. It is worth while to mention that Dewey was in favor of operationism and, in a way, prepared the ground for this method of investigation.

J. Murray Lee and Dorris May Lee, in the process of arriving at a definition of learning in chapter five of The Child and His Curriculum, note some of the "non-pragmatic" voices which have contributed to the growing body of knowledge and hypothesis dealing with human learning and which have consequently elicited positive responses or negative reactions from progressive thinkers on the subject. Locke and his tabula rasa theory; Ebbinghaus and his measurement of retention; Thorndike's Connectionism and its Laws of Use, Disuse, and Effect; Pavlov and the conditioned reflex; Watson's Behaviorism with its emphasis on the active learning of reaction patterns—all are part of the environment that formed and shaped "the
Of greater importance, however, is the recently developed body of theory and research produced by the Gestalt or field psychologists. There is evidence that it has influenced quite markedly the progressive position. In attempting to understand the principles of human learning, it leans heavily on such concepts as wholeness, synthesis, insight, etc. as opposed to the analytical, stimulus-response approach of orthodox Behaviorism. The findings and theoretical constructs of Koffka, Kohler, Wheeler, and Hartman have become quite well-known to those in progressive circles seriously concerned with the problem of how children learn.

Two other schools of psychological inquiry are also prominent in relatively recent progressive pronouncements dealing with learning theory—the depth psychology of Freudian psychoanalysis and the field-force or vector psychology of Kurt Lewin. In an attempt to summarize and integrate the principles and positions subscribed to by progressivism as it worked to create a viable psychology of experience and learning, the views of a few educators of stature will be cited. In discussing the nature of the learning process in his major work, Child Psychology, Jersild points out:

It is axiomatic that a child learns but when what he undertakes is tied in with his own purposes, when he recognizes at least some of the meanings and goals involved and finds himself absorbed in the process of learning rather than simply in the end point of mastering a particular problem. To be sure, in the case both of children and adults, a vast amount of learning takes place apart from consciously formulated goals. Furthermore, both
children and adults learn to adjust to a good deal of regimentation and countless regulations pretty much as a matter of course, without stopping to inquire into the underlying purposes or reasons. This, of course, is fortunate, for if adults stopped to explain or if children tried to formulate the significance and purpose of all everyday acts, it is likely that everyone would go crazy.

A primary consideration in helping children to utilize and cultivate their interests is to take account of their abilities, to scale the program of opportunities and requirements to their growing capacities. Another important consideration noted previously is that interests thrive on successful effort. This principle, in turn, implies that, in teaching children, it is important to be ready to learn from the children who are being taught, so that there may be a degree of give-and-take and adjustment by the teacher to the child’s concerns and problems. In the case of very young children, the teacher is perforce a learner. The teacher, while thus participating in the learner’s problem, will also better be able to make effective use of other incentives and aids. It has been found, for example, that judicious praise usually is more effective than reproof.

It would be helpful also if adults could learn not only to accept a child for what he is but also to respect him for what he is. Such respect means that adults try to realize that the concerns of a child are as important to him at his level as are the concerns of adults at their level. It means also recognition of the fact that the child is one who, in the main, is trying at all stages of his growth to do the best he can with what he has.

In Interaction: The Democratic Process, Hopkins devotes a chapter to what a desirable conception of learning is (chapter IV). The spirit of the progressive psychology of learning is well indicated:

A desirable conception of learning comes from a critical appraisal of many conditions. Learning is not a simple, isolated, discrete process, and desirable learning cannot be achieved by the A-B-C procedures, rules, regulations that masquerade in its name. Some of the important conditions contributing to a conception of learning are:
First, learning is affected by the philosophy of life of the group in which the learning takes place. With us this means the democratic philosophy or way of life.

Second, a conception of learning is conditioned by the available information concerning child growth and development in the culture in which the conception is formulated. It must square with the knowledge of inheritance contributed by the biologist; the facts concerning the physiological functioning of the organism accepted by the physiologist, the information about the physical, mental, emotional, social growth of the organism contributed by many persons such as physicians, mental hygienists, psychiatrists, endocrinologists, specialists in child development, parents, and many others.

Third, a conception of learning is conditioned by the traditions which are already in operation or by the existing theories which lie back of the tradition.

Fourth, a conception of learning is conditioned by the experimentation of the psychologists. Both experiments and results must be appraised by the insight they give into the process of learning in a democratic culture and the ways of interpreting that process in an educational system.

Fifth, a conception of learning is affected by a theory of knowledge and experience. If knowledge exists for its own sake, the child must absorb the existing knowledge selected for him by others. Ordinary experience of everyday life, or primary experience, is of an inferior sort as it deals only with objects found in the realm of activity of inferior beings or in a world of mere appearance and shadows. The child must learn truths or ideas that are superior to human experience. If primary experience is the real stuff of life, then knowledge must arise out of the study of such experience. Superior knowledge must come from more competent inquiries into experience. Knowledge, then, varies with the purposes of those engaged in the inquiry. Experience is neither true nor false. Neither are ideas in themselves, nor facts as facts. Truth or knowledge in the abstract passes. Only truths are left and these are effective only as they are instrumental in promoting better inquiry into experience. The conception of knowledge and experience affects the attitude toward cooperative interaction, and with it the basis for desirable learning.

Sixth, a conception of learning is conditioned by the results of practices in American schools.
In the most general sense, learning is any change in the behavior of an organism. Behavior represents all movements to restore equilibrium after the organism has been upset by some condition or stimulus either within or without itself. Restoring equilibrium means that the organism continues to move against the condition or stimulus until such time as it no longer arouses action.

Though permeated by a "reconstructionist" bias, Rugg's statement of the "psychology of act re-interpreted" is inclusive of many of the influences mentioned heretofore as well as its being addressed to the wider socio-cultural context of our times:

We know that human experience is the only valid source of psychology . . . all authoritarian concepts and systems are false.

We know that while all human beings differ greatly among themselves, each has a unique experience and some original power of thought, all but a negligible few have some capacity to see, think, and feel expressively and to state their own views of life . . . hence democracy is the only proper government for family, school, community, nation, or world; the people together distill judgment and decision out of the collective experience.

We know that we can now assume the operational interpretation of meaning; namely, that we react with meaning . . . that, with Dewey, we "know" only as we make practical responses . . . that, with Peirce, "differences in meaning are but differences in action," "our conception of an object" consists of the "practical effects . . . we conceive the object to have."

We know with Dewey, that growth is the basic characteristic of life . . . that the course follows in general the shape of the parabolic growth curve as experimentally documented by Thorndike and others . . . that growth from the egocentric, aggressive, self-defensive Individual of childhood to the cooperative Person of mature adult life is the greatest goal-setting of education.

We know that the Self is the unifying, motivating, directing, and inhibiting agent and its purposes constitute the most effective drive for learning and growth . . . that the complete human is Self in expression.
We know that every human act is organic, general, the organism tending to act as a whole . . . hence that the act of knowing is organized, that stimulus and response are one, that we know as we generalize . . . that the concept of organism is central to man's conception of the physical universe as well as in the realm of living creatures . . . that all mechanistic-atomistic explanations of natural or human behavior are invalid.

We know that mental development as well as the individual human act is a social process . . . that the Self is social . . . that education, therefore, is "a freeing of individual capacity in a progressive growth directed to social ends."

We know that much of life is problematic, "the problem is central in human life"—and one of the profound intellectual aims of education is training in thinking of the "problem-solving" type.

We know that the great promise for the future clarification of human psychology lies in the force-energy-field concept . . . that the "raw materials" of personality—physique, temperament, and intelligence—should be interpreted as forms of kinetic energy . . . that we stand at the threshold of a new intellectual era in which the concept of the field-of-force promises to provide the cue to vastly increased understanding.

We know that the raw materials with which education builds the Person—physique, temperament, and intelligence—are basic and relatively unchanged throughout life . . . that they are genetically determined through structural inheritance and are only slightly altered by conditions existing subsequent to birth . . . (but) if the genes are altered, the personal characteristics are altered.

We know that the social pressures which mold the individual create deep-lain feelings of inferiority, frustration, repressed desires, which, deposited and persisting in subtle ways below the threshold of conscious awareness, bedevil the smooth functioning of accumulating experience . . . create the alternation of imbalance and balance, tension and release, and produce a vigorous body of self-defense responses.

We know that the problem of "I" and "We"—of the Self and Other, of Individual and the Culture, of Freedom and Control—is the basic psychological and sociological problem of life.
In summarizing the progressivist psychology of learning, as he interprets it, Brameld enumerates the following six general principles:

1. **This psychology definitely and consistently applies the underlying pragmatic philosophy.**

2. **As a direct inference from our generalization, learning is itself a natural experience.**

3. **Such a view of learning means that "the whole child" is necessarily involved in learning, not only his "mind."**

4. **The child's surroundings are as fundamental to his nature as is his own body, which, in a way, is also part of his surroundings.**

5. **Learning functions on rising levels of complexity the highest of which is intelligence.**

6. **Progressivism rejects several concepts concerning the nature of the child that are held widely influential traditional psychologies.** The child is not endowed with innate mental attributes; he conceals no chrysalis of intellect that at the proper time unfold their wings. The child is not a mechanism that responds to stimuli in the environment as a motor responds to drops of gasoline. He is neither a "soul-stuff" to which bodily activities have little immediate relationship nor mere atomic substance in which mental processes are altogether physical. In the older language of psychology, the child is not all mind or all matter for the excellent reason that he is clearly both.

By "both," however, the progressivist again must explain what he does not mean. He denies that the physical and the mental are planes of human existence or that they are ultimately always separate, dualized, static, and discreet substances or "elements. The older psychology's concept of "instincts," to consider one example, is replaced by a concept of plastic, overlapping tendencies, which are capable of being modified and directed in manifold ways. Likewise, progressivism discards the widely held theory that response follows stimulus in a one-to-two order of cause and effect, that behavior is merely a product of exercising and strengthening the sequences or bonds of stimulus-response. Agreeing that a given stimulus helps to determine the nature of the particular response, progressivism holds that the responses of
which the child is capable (according to his capacities, interests, habits, environment) are themselves selectors and conditioners of particular stimuli. The child invites a certain stimulus because he has been conditioned to invite it. Response and stimulus are thus interactive because each is a function of the other. 96

D. Educational Methodology

Keeping in mind the various strands of thought predominating in statements of progressive philosophy of education—Dewey, Kilpatrick, Johnson, Rugg, Flexner, Pratt, Naumberg, Bode, Counts 97—on the one hand, and in the summary of psychological theory and principles just described, on the other, it is not surprising that it is near impossible to set forth in a straightforward manner a single, integrated, and unified progressive educational methodology. Its essential many-sidedness and apparent paradoxical and conflicting elements as well as the seeming assimilation of many of its techniques if not its overall methodological orientation by general American education is a resultant of the progressive evolution of a movement which struck out in new directions, which attempted to rectify and reform, which did not worship consistency, and which continuously had difficulty in identifying and articulating its ends and objectives. Nonetheless, the preceding sections pertaining to the historical development of the movement, to its overall philosophy of education, and to its psychology of learning have prepared the ground for a presentation and discussion of some of basic issues, significant innovations and problematic aspects which characterize "progressive methodology."
Dewey, in *Democracy and Education*, devotes a chapter to the analysis of the nature of method—the method of learning rather than teaching—method strictly. His major thesis, similar to that to which he adheres in other related areas, is that of monism, in this instance the unity of subject matter and method: Method is a statement of the way the subject matter of an experience develops most effectively and fruitfully. It is derived, accordingly, from observation of the course of experiences where there is no conscious distinction of personal attitude and manner from material dealt with. The assumption that method is something separate is connected with the notion of the isolation of mind and self from the world of things. It makes instruction and learning formal, mechanical, constrained. While methods are individualized, certain features of the normal course of an experience to its fruition may be discriminated, because of the fund of wisdom derived from prior experiences and because of general similarities in the materials dealt with from time to time. Expressed in terms of the attitude of the individual the traits of good method are straightforwardness, flexible intellectual interest or open-minded will to learn, integrity of purpose, and acceptance of responsibility for the consequences of one's activity including thought.98

This assertion of unity, though it may be philosophically valid and though it may have been the basis for the creation of the "project method," could be held responsible for the retardation of the development of a comprehensive and integrated as well as functional statement of method directly following from a bona fide re-interpretation of the learning process.

Also worthy of citation in the present context is Dewey's discussion of interest and its correlative, discipline:

Interest and discipline are correlative aspects of activity having aim. Interest means that one is identified with the objects which define the activity and which
furnish the means and the obstacles to its realization. . . . The time difference between the given incomplete state of affairs and the desired fulfillment exacts effort in transformation; it demands continuity of attention and endurance. This attitude is what is practically meant by will. Discipline or development of power of continuous attention is its fruit.99

Here Dewey reaches the conclusion that method—subject matter and how it takes on meaning for the learner—based on inherent interest and handled with sensitivity and skill will eliminate the "eternal" problem of external discipline and control.

The distinction between the broad problem of method and the narrow problem of method is another significant contribution of progressive criticism in the area of philosophy of method. "The narrow problem of method is concerned solely with the subject to be taught and how best to manage that restricted type of teaching. The broad problem of method is concerned with the many values at stake—subject-matter values, attitudes and character being built, effects on democratic living, community values, and all other matters inherent in the particular situation."100 Thus, if democracy is our way of life and the source of our values, then educational method, in addition to being inherently related to subject-matter, pupil experiences, and pupil capabilities, e.g., the project method or the problem-solving approach stemming from Dewey's "five steps in the act of thought," must be democratic in spirit and reflect democratic beliefs and attitudes:

If democracy is to be our choice, then we must decide whether to take as our primary aim for schools
the imparting of knowledge, in and of itself, or the building of character of the kind demanded by democratic living—inclusive character, the individual's inclusive tendencies to behavior in personal living and in group living, as a person and as a citizen...

Suppose, for example, we wish to develop self-directiveness, initiative, an inquiring mind, as befits democracy... then must the children live accordingly. To teach pupils not to question, not to take initiative, not to engage in self-directiveness, the old school had the perfect answer; ... Those pupils lived what they were to learn—docility, no initiative. But if we wish pupils to learn democratic traits they must live quite different experiences... As the learner thus lives the instance of democratic life, he will to that extent learn to think for himself, use initiative, direct his own behavior responsibly. If he makes the choice often enough, consciously enough, and under sufficiently varied conditions, each time with inner acceptance on his part of the desirability of so acting, he cumulatively builds these traits of responsibility as an integral part of his character...

This theory holds most definitely for learning to behave democratically. If democracy is to rule in our society, youth must be learning democracy in preparation; and this means that they must live democracy in home and school and community...

If the principle of "democratic method" is accepted, then the role and function of the teacher has to be modified accordingly. The teacher becomes the agent of democracy, the sustainer of the democratic process, and not the wielder of irrational authoritarian power. The teacher is no longer the "imparter of absolute truth" but becomes rather a "guide to student-learning:"

The teacher will as well as possible help the learners at each stage of the effort: (i) to initiate the activity (to form or choose the purpose); (ii) to plan how to carry the activity forward; (iii) to execute the plan; (iv) to evaluate progress during the activity and the result at the end. While all this is going forward the teacher will also; (v) encourage
the learners to think up and note suggestions or new leads for other and further work; (vi) help them to formulate these suggestions both for clarification of thinking and for later recall and possible use (perhaps writing them in a book or on the board for future reference); (vii) help pupils criticize their thinking en route or at the close, as may seem wise; and finally (viii) look back over the whole process to pick up and fix important kinds of learning involved as well as draw lessons for the future from both successes and failures. 102

The role of "teacher-as-guide," though applicable to many learning situations, is geared, obviously, to the "problem-solving" approach or the "project-method," the famous innovation of Kilpatrick's methodology. The "project method," granting all its distortions in practice and its theoretical inadequacies, 103 still seems to be the most acknowledged prototype of progressive method as well as the methodological invention which best embodies, in theory at least, the bulk of progressivist principles of learning and experience.

Burton, in discussing the "unit-approach"—whether it be "subject-matter," "experience," or "process" unit 104 and which, incidentally, seems to represent a more comprehensive and thorough development of what was originally the "project method"—mentions the following points in regard to any and every unit:

The ultimate aims of all units is aiding the integration of the learner... The important thing is to provide a combination of subject-matter materials and of process which will have real value for him, i.e., aid him in continuously integrating his learning...

The third point is that the key to the varying emphases lies in the level of maturity, the experiential background, the purposes, needs, and interests of the
learner. These factors inescapably determine which experiences will be educative, that is, will enhance the integrating growth of the learner.

A unit is any combination of subject-matter content and outcomes, and thought processes, combined in learning experiences suited to the maturity and needs of the learners; which clearly serves the needs of those learners; which is a whole with internal integrity determined by immediate and ultimate goals.

Though to Burton this is the ideal organization of learning as opposed to traditional organization with its ensuing standard methodology—assign-recite-test routine, etc.—, he does believe, as later reference will give evidence to, that techniques based on progressive insights and principles can fit in well within the traditional learning environment.

Certain progressive emphases, which may have been misunderstood by practitioners and thus abused in practice, have become common "discussion pieces" in the educational forum. One of these controversial issues pertains to the use or lack of use of "drill" in the learning of content material and skills. Brameld, in his discussion of progressive educational methodology, says of "drill," which many non-progressivists assert has no place in the progressive "problem-centered" approach:

The best way to perfect a given skill is by its constant use in whatever vital projects students may pursue. The effective use of language, for example, is not taught so well by formal grammar and vocabulary lessons, or similar techniques, as it is by permeating the curriculum at every point with language opportunities—above all, by providing many opportunities for communication among students, teachers, and resource people of the community. Words, say instrumentalists, are man's chief tool of meaning and control. But as with any tool, he
becomes expert in their use only by applying them as a means to obtain worthwhile ends. Repetitious exercise is justified, therefore, only if it is commonly perceived by all participants as such a means.106

Traditionalist criticism has also accused progressivists of confusing work with play, i.e., too much emphasis on activity, satisfying and enjoyable learning experiences, etc. Again, the traditional dichotomy, "demolished by Dewey," is held invalid:

The progressivist replies that to identify schooling with work and much outside activity with play means again that the former is divorced from ongoing experience while the latter remains an intimate part of such experience. Only when work is cut off from the drives, enthusiasms, and talents of the growing individual does it become a necessary evil—an onerous task to be completed as quickly as possible. Labor, under these conditions, is considered antithetical to leisure-time activity.

Work that is meaningful and creative, however, is not a burden to be avoided. In the joy and satisfaction it affords, one might properly contend that it is similar to play. The latter, on the other hand, has many of the qualities of work; . . . 107

Progressivists also recognize the relative distinctions between the two activities. They call attention to the fact that work of any kind, in school or not, requires periods of relaxation . . . . Play, then, must be removed from the fringes of school programs, where it is inaccurately termed extra-curricular. Children learn equally from work and play when both are functional to their fields of meaning.108

Progressive methodology, based as it is on democratic philosophic principles, is a militant enemy of "indoctrination," the uncritical imposition of some single doctrine, dogma or set of beliefs. The progressivist states:

Academic freedom is the right of children or adults to confront any controversial issue of
importance. It implies unrestricted opportunity to examine facts and test hypotheses. But the choices that result from intelligent activity are still not to be indoctrinated—that is, they must not be taught in such a way as to preclude questioning or possible alternatives. Secondly, choices are true for a limited time, subject always to the probability that they will need to be revised. Finally, this philosophy reveals an underlying conviction that the method of intelligence is in all respects the best method that men have found by which they are able to advance. This conviction is as close to "indoctrination" as progressivism ever approaches in theory.109

An interesting development that has forced contemporary progressive educators to look more critically at their "philosophy of method" is the introduction of instructional technology—programmed teaching machines, television, etc.—into the arena of mass education. Though progressive educators have certainly encouraged the use of audio-visual aids as part of the effort to concretize learning and make it more psychologically sound, the idea of a teaching machine, with its connotation of mechanizing and dehumanizing learning and teaching, has caused much consternation among orthodox progressivists. James Finn, in an article in Phi Delta Kappan,110 chides the progressive educator for his lack of flexibility and vision, his misunderstanding of Dewey's pragmatic philosophy of education, and for his inability to accept the implications and the demands of the present phase of the technological revolution. He attempts to point out that progressive educational theory, as formulated by Dewey and if interpreted within the context from which it gained its impetus, anticipates the arrival of technology on the educational frontier and looks forward to
its presence. Some extracts from his argument may be helpful and enlightening:

Technology is not, as many of the technically illiterate seem to think a collection of gadgets, of hardware, of instrumentation. It is, instead, best described as a way of thinking about certain classes of problems and their solutions.

Since about 1930 we have had a slow development of a group of tools for communication and teaching, and a program of research into their use. These instruments and materials include what today we call conventional audio-visual devices—the sound motion picture, various forms of projected still pictures, recordings, etc. Since 1950, this arsenal has expanded to include television, electronic learning laboratories, teaching machines of various kinds, and, recently, computers. Accompanying these devices and materials, again, has been a vigorous program of research into the nature of learning and communication, supported by a rapidly growing body of theory derived from experimental and social psychology and related disciplines such as linguistics, criticism, and engineering.

Finn, trying to analyze the problem manifest in current progressive thinking and then offering a tentative but possibly fruitful direction for future theorizing, continues:

First, there is a generalized, non-specific attitude that holds that instructional technology is both trivial, and, at the same time, dangerous.

Second, there is in educational philosophy a distrust and a strong antagonism to what in the Thirties was called "scientism" in education.

A third point on which I should like to offer advice is in the other direction. I think current educational philosophy should pay more instead of less attention to Dewey on the questions of means and ends in education.

The suggested direction for clarification of this long-suffered problem is to return to Dewey and to work from there. Because he believed in a unified, nondualistic universe, Dewey maintained that method could not, when in use, be separated from subject matter; However, for
purposes of study and control, he was equally firm on the point that method had to be teased out of this universe, examined, analyzed, and put to work in the most intelligent way possible.

Now add to this idea that . . . Dewey suggested that we live in a technological, industrial culture and that technology was, in fact, the main determinant of its direction. The school, he felt, should reflect this. Such a view could be considered a special case of the general law of pragmatism—that ends and means are inseparable, that ends become means to further ends.

If you now consider technology from two perspectives—the entirety of technology that has transformed our society in about two hundred years and the special application of technology to the instructional process—it is possible to indicate the direction the educational philosopher must go to clarify the problem of method in relation to aim.

First, as the perceptive students of general technology continually insist, technology in society is an organic process . . .

Taking technological development as the central organic process of our society, the implications, as this process invades education, are interesting indeed. The process does not destroy aim and its role, but it binds aim inevitably to technology. For technology is an aim-generator as much as purpose or philosophy is a technical direction-giver. Each conditions the other and is not . . . arranged in a hierarchy with aim on top and method at the bottom . . .

At any rate, objectives can only be developed in this sense by a thorough analysis heretofore rarely applied in education . . .

Finally, you must face the consequences of the generation in which you have been born and the world in which you live. You cannot deny technology on arbitrary, literary, uninformed grounds. If you deny the teaching machine, the computer, television, and the motion picture, if you deny new ways of teaching and learning, you cannot stop until you deny yourselves fire, the wheel, and even the very language which you speak.

Today, teaching machines are being adopted more and more in relatively traditional educational settings. They fit in well with and make more efficient the classical "assign-
study-recite" procedures and in many instances seem to represent a mechanization of learning as depicted by the Connectionist-Behaviorist school of thought. Granted that the adoption of this innovation in traditional settings is not unexpected or revolutionary, the assimilation of progressive techniques and disjointed elements of progressive method and thinking on method by traditional education would be less expected unless the eclectic nature of American education, which is primarily essentialist in theory and practice, is fully comprehended. These latter innovations are not to be minimized either by the progressivist or the traditionalist. Many progressively-oriented educators have come to value these inroads and have thus accepted a piecemeal approach to the introduction of progressivism into American mass education.

Caswell and Foshay, exponents of a "down-to-earth" progressivism which has enhanced considerably general American education, accentuate the importance of teaching for student-creativity. They are critical of any education that does not appreciate and foster creativity in children:

The traditional program of the elementary school has been based on certain conceptions which have minimized the creative phases of experience. These conceptions are basic to the activities of many elementary schools even today and need to be recognized if due emphasis is to be given to the creative aspects of learning. A widely accepted view, both within and without the school, has been that only the select few, the geniuses, are blessed with the possibilities of creative expression . . .

A second influence, and one of great power, has been the conception that creative potentialities are largely, if not exclusively, restricted to adults. To many it has been inconceivable that children could engage in experiences with significant creative content.
Open-mindedness, critical judgment, insight, complete absorption, self-fulfillment are all characteristics of the creative experience. Though these aspects of experience are basic to the progressive conception and though they embody many of the elemental psychological concepts and principles of real learning championed by the movement, they have their place in the traditional setting which is sensitive to the findings and emphases of modern educational research and thought. Six considerations in teaching for creativity are listed: Everyone has creative potentialities; every type of activity has creative possibilities; a rich, stimulating environment is an essential basis for creative expression; modes of expression and standards of judgment cannot be imposed; the child should be free to select the mode of expression appropriate to his creative idea; techniques and skills must be balanced to the insight and needs of children.118

A second witness to the attempt to get a portion of the progressive message across to traditional educators is a book with a fetching title, Successful Teaching.119 Mursell, the author, states in the preface to the work: "The author tried to wipe his mental slate clean, to suppose that nothing at all is known about what makes teaching successful. He attempted particularly to suppose that all methods—progressive, conventional, or otherwise—are equally unacceptable. This assumption was not too difficult, for it is quite clear that good teaching is not a very common thing. Thus, no method could be considered as answering the problem immediately."120
He then goes on to enumerate and discuss in the body of the work fundamental characteristics of real, worthwhile learning. The most important task of education is to make learning meaningful. No matter what "method" is adhered to, meaningful learning must be purposive; it is a process of exploration and discovery. Achievement of successful learning means a gain in understanding, insight or intelligible responses. It provides for generalization and transfer of understanding to new situations. Mursell then goes on to examine basic principles which all sound—traditional or progressive—method must consider and by which it is to be evaluated: context (the setting of materials—experiential background, etc.—in which learning goes on); focus (that around which learning is to be organized); socialization; individualization; sequence. Much of what Mursell emphasizes stems from principles promulgated by the "new education" but can be applied to the traditional situation, and the examples he gives are taken from experiences encountered in the traditional and semi-traditional school.

Finally, in The Guidance of Learning Activities, a progressively-oriented, comprehensive exposition that can boast of a section which attempts to describe possible applications of progressive principles to traditional method, Burton discusses techniques common to both traditional and modern settings. Therefore, the traditional learning climate, if not entirely reconstructed, is made more psychologically acceptable. For instance, in the area of "questioning," Burton suggests that the teacher's attitude should be natural,
friendly, and conversational; the pupils should be encouraged to ask questions; the teacher should not hesitate to say "I do not know." He states in reference to drill that "children will often be further interested in a skill they have met in a functional situation." Furthermore, "practice processes and requirements should be adjusted to individual differences." He goes on to explore, in the light of the tenets of modern education, such concerns as student evaluation, diagnosis and treatment of learning difficulties, marks and reporting progress, classroom management and control—all pivotal aspects of traditional teaching and learning.

It is quite appropriate to have concluded this summary presentation of progressive methodology with the citations from Caswell and Foshay, Mursell, and Burton. They attest to the conviction that even if unadulterated progressive methodology is not being or cannot be practiced widely in conventional settings, it does not indicate that progressive education has had no contribution to make to the enhancement of general educational methodology as practiced in the American elementary and secondary school. Voluminous evidence of the application of progressive principles and the utilization of progressive techniques could be easily presented. Thus, we recognize at once the basis for Cremin's conclusion that one major circumstance which contributed to the eventual loss of popularity and centrality of the progressive movement in education was the incorporation of "progressive corrections and reforms" into the generally accepted body of essentialist method which has
continually held sway over the overall American educational stream of activity.

E. Administration and Supervision

The evolution of a progressively-oriented approach to supervision and administration revolves around the effort to re-interpret authority in terms of the concepts of democracy and growth, the two "nuclear" values of progressivist axiology, as well as around the effort to anchor them within the context of the latest findings of educational "science" and research and the latest developments in the field of human relations. Just as the progressive credo has attempted to completely overhaul and re-fashion curriculum and method, so has it impinged upon the administrative process, which for the purpose of this summary will include supervision as a major but differentiated administrative function.

As has been noted previously, Dewey, as educational reformer, was mainly concerned with the philosophy of education, curriculum development, and methodology. However, his demand for a true socialization of curriculum and method, as stated in Democracy and Education, applied also to the administrative process: "It is then but to restate explicitly the import of our earlier chapters regarding the social function of education to say that the measure of worth of the administration, curriculum, and methods of instruction of the school is the extent to which they are animated by a social spirit." This new emphasis on the quality of interpersonal and intergroup relationships, so related to the essence of democracy as understood
by Dewey, has served as a stimulus or direction-giver to the development of a "humanized" philosophy of administration by later progressive educators and by those that have appreciated and accepted the new foci of "democratic administration."

Kilpatrick's chapter on "school management and administration" attempts to apply the "progressive bias" to administrative problems and to the overall philosophy of educational administration. To some degree, he expands on Dewey's "social spirit" focus:

Whenever people associate, they stimulate reactions in each other; and these reactions ... bring educative effects which register themselves as character. At this point, democracy and ethics become concerned, as always where the acts of one person affect the living of others. Is this school run with the conscious democratic intent to let each one—teacher and janitor and official—live freely and truly as a person and therein build himself as well as possible into the finest and richest character and personality of which he is capable? Or is it run autocratically in disregard of what happens to the interests, lives, and personalities of those affected?

However, as can be quickly perceived, he does not present a detailed analysis and self-examination which is a trademark of the many contemporary works on democratic administration.

After discussing the principles of democratic administration from a progressivist point of view, Hopkins concludes his discussion of "what is desirable school administration?" with the following realistic appraisal and constructive critique:

While all of these instances represent evidences of a movement toward more democratic administration, they do not go far enough. No really intelligent attack on the problem will be made until there is greater democracy in the management of the primary unit groups and
within the operating units of a school system. The participation which a teacher may have in the general management of the school through a permanent policies commission rarely works down into the actual classroom situation which he operates. While he advises on teacher loads, the school budget, salary schedules, tenure of office, and courses of study, the same old authoritarian learning goes on regularly day by day in every classroom in the system. The democracy has to be a way of life in each of the primary unit situations in which teachers and pupils work together, since this is the only way that the children can really experience it. This means that genuine democracy can never function until the authoritarian subject curriculum is modified to the extent that pupil needs and purposes will replace traditional subject matter, cooperative pupil management of situations will supplant adult management, pupil evaluation will replace external measurement, and pupil purposes rather than adult-made programs will furnish the basis for continuity.130

In their book, already referred to previously on a few occasions, Caswell and Foshay deal with aspects of administration as they necessarily relate to the program of the modern elementary school. Discussing school organization, they state general guidelines to school organization, administration, and supervision:

1. The function of organization, administration, and supervision is to provide conditions and services which make possible the most effective curriculum and teaching . . .

2. School organization and operation should be based on the participation of the entire educational staff, the parents, and pupils . . .

3. The individual school should be the operational unit in program development . . .

4. School organization should provide for the grouping of pupils in relation to the educational objectives to be achieved . . .

5. School organization should provide for extended association with and guidance to each child by a single teacher.131
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In a "Check List on General Characteristics of a Good Elementary School," two major headings and some selected subheadings are as follows:

**VIII. Are the personal and professional growth and security of the school staff fostered?**

B. Is there an organized program of professional study which is considered a part of the regular work of the staff?

C. Are significant achievements and contributions by staff members given recognition?

D. Does the entire school staff participate in a responsible manner in planning the school program?

**IX. Does the plan of organization and administration of the school foster democratic values?**

A. Do all members of the school community participate in the general operation of the school?

B. Is there a plan of student government in operation?

E. Are pupils, as they mature, gradually given increased responsibility for decisions?

If they have performed no other function, the preceding references have intimated that modern democratic administration is something more complex than the managing of a business at an efficient level—giving and getting responses to directives, not having a financial deficit, not wasting supplies, etc. The new philosophy is drastically different, the scope of activities far broader, and the methods quite novel as compared to the "old" concept of good administration. In his exposition of the progressive conception of administration, Brameld says of the
Perhaps the severest indictment made against typical administrative practices is that they tend to exaggerate such values as efficiency in business at the expense of values, such as growth, that are more educationally rewarding. Thus, schools are too often governed by strict lines of authority running from the superintendent at the top down through the descending levels of principals, supervisors, teachers to the students themselves at the bottom level. The progressivist principle of continuous interplay among all individuals and groups, which is the highest test of any democratic community, is violated by this kind of system. Students take orders from teachers, teachers from principals, principals from the superintendent. He, in turn, is responsible to the board of education, which, although nominally democratic, frequently represents only that small segment of the population that is willing to endorse "efficient" school administration.133

All descriptions of modern administrative practice, those that are attributable to the "new" school of thought, deal with the activities, methods, and processes appropriate to the fulfillment of the many diverse functions of the democratic educational leader. The "new" educational administrator's scope of function is as broad, almost, as the modern, multi-dimensional definition of the educational process. As witness, a work on "creative school administration" lists the following chapter headings:

1. The Nature of Leadership in Education
2. The Educational Leader and His Values
4. Leadership at Work in the Improvement of Teaching
6. Leadership in the Evaluation of Teaching and Learning
7. The Leader's Understanding of Creative Curriculum Development
9. Leadership in Planning the Creatively Designed Curriculum
10. A Developmental Approach to School Organization
11. Guiding Children's Progress Through School
of this opinion. The administrator must be willing to act on the basis of judgments derived from studying the available facts.

3. An inclination to act in terms of conscious value judgments. Educational leadership should be built upon sound principles of action that have been derived from a study of the role of the school in society, how children grow and develop, and the learning process. An educational leader so motivated avoids opportunistic decision-making as much as is possible.

B. Educational Background

4. Understandings, attitudes, and skills resulting from adequate general education. A general education should have provided the following: some knowledge of man, his history and his behavior psychologically, socially, economically, politically, and morally; some power to do quantitative thinking; skill in oral and written expression; some appreciation for music, art, and literature; and a set of values consistent with the ideals of our culture which tend to give his behavior consistency.

5. An understanding of the role of the school in the social order seems to be prerequisite to comprehending the place and potential power of the school in a culture. Such understanding should be basic to determining the needs of the people of any school community, of ascertaining means to meet these needs, and of deciding the place of the school and of other community agencies in achieving such ends.

6. An understanding of the instructional program and skills in curriculum development. To understand the instructional program the administrator must have a foundation in human growth and development, in the characteristics and values of our culture, and in the principles and techniques of learning. He must be able to give leadership to teachers and to patrons in the development of the curriculum.

C. Working with People

7. An ability to cooperate with other people in planning, executing, and evaluating courses of action and a disposition to use these abilities. Such a way of working must be based upon a fundamental conviction in its contribution to the achievement of the larger
goal and upon a belief that cooperation produces better solutions to problems, results in more effective implementation of discussions, and promotes desirable growth on the part of the participants.

8. An ability to understand one’s own motivations for action and how they affect his way of working with other people. To be an effective leader an administrator should have some conception of how other people see him and how this perception affects his relationship to them. The effect of the administrator upon others may depend greatly upon his own willingness to examine, evaluate, and rebuild his reasons for the way he works.

9. An ability to lead lay and professional people in considering the continuing improvement of the school and community; the ability to discover and promote such leadership in others; and a disposition to use these abilities. Leadership implies developing leaders. By such action on the part of the administrator, many people—lay and professional alike—become identified with a program and they learn the skills needed in responsible participation.

D. Professional Skills and Techniques

10. Understandings and skills in the task areas of educational administration. The competent administrator will operate in these specialized areas in ways which are consistent with the values implied by the other items in this statement.

11. Understandings and skills in the administrative process. The competent administrator will insure that the administrative process remains the servant and does not become the master of the administrator.135

As can be seen, the role of administrator as democratic leader is predicated upon a commitment to democratic ideals and practices. It is based upon research into the dynamics and processes of group life, the functions of leadership, and upon the emerging science of human relations, as well as upon the actualization in everyday educational affairs of Dewey’s interpretation of democracy. Some excerpts and section-headings from an essay entitled "Educational Leadership in a Free Society"136
may serve to concretize and dramatize a few dimensions of the evolving conception of democratic leadership:

The concept of "leadership" on the contrary takes on a different meaning from that which language gives it. It is an essential concept in setting up any theory of social dynamics or any theory, plan, and practice for the democratic administration of man's institutions and activities . . .

The leadership act skips about any truly cooperative situation. The titular leader remains in the picture, but his role is not that of dictating programs but rather that of evolving programs. The leader is a man who can release energy in other men; and this is true in the commercial world, in community life, in the educational profession, or in any other area in a democracy that one might choose to select. It is the failure to understand the nature of this shift that is causing many difficulties in the field of human relations. People want more freedom as they increasingly gain freedom. In some instances their demands seem to be a bit unreasonable. People are demanding rights without any thought of accompanying responsibilities. Whether their demands are just is not a question that can be discussed at this point. The fact is mentioned to show that people's attitudes are not the same as they were a few decades ago. The "boss" concept in which workmen deferentially acquiesced at the turn of the century is no longer acceptable to employees. The purpose of leadership today is to free energy, not to curb it. The person who can develop initiative and creative talents in others commands the respect of his fellow workers. People are operating as leaders in this period of economic and social adjustment when they reduce friction, remove barriers, dissipate emotional tension, develop confidence, and light the spark of imagination in their fellow workers. This is the content of leadership for today and for the immediate tomorrow.

Additional section-headings make some salient points, also:

"Democracy Needs No Followers . . . Manipulative Leadership is Pseudo-Democratic . . . Permissive Leadership Represents Progress Toward an Ideal . . . Educational Leadership Should Exemplify the Democratic Ideal . . . Every Professional Educator Has Many Leadership Roles . . . The Community-School Theory is
Based on the Leadership Concept... Creative citizenship and social leadership are functionally related and...
everybody must be educated in leadership... Much Confusion.
Exists as to the Nature of Democratic Educational Administration...
The Dynamic Leader Concept is a Threat... Management Often
Becomes a Goal... Teachers Often Demand Participation on an
Irresponsible Basis... The Need for Quick Decisions is Over-
stressed... Decisions Should be Based on Sincere Consensuses.138

According to Corbally, Jensen, and Staub, in their work on secondary school administration, the democratic leader represented by the forward-looking administrator:

... should be a person who feels a responsibility for assisting a group reach goals, some of which will be defined by the group and some of which will be defined for the group.

... should be a person who recognizes that for any given problem facing the group there will be intelligence from within and from without the group that will lead to better solutions than he can devise through the use of his intelligence alone.

... should be a person who can delegate appropriate responsibilities to group members and who can, consequently, also openly recognize the contributions of group members to group success.

... should be a person who can utilize group intelligence and, at the same time, accept personal responsibility for the progress of the group toward its goals.139

As with the "modern teacher," the use of authority vested in the administrator must be democratized:

Authority and its judicious exercise are not inconsistent with democratic principles. Democratic society has found it necessary to allocate authority to numerous offices and positions which it has created in order that the freedom and opportunities of individuals and groups may be guaranteed. It is necessary that the school administrator have
appropriate authority in order that the school system may have the necessary freedom of action. Without such authority the school administrator would be handicapped in providing the creative leadership expected of a person in his position. If he had no authority, he would be unable to be of most help to members of the staff in solving their problems. The administrator must, however, use his authority in such a way as to guard the rights of staff members as well as his own.140

Before proceeding further, it now seems appropriate to cite a caution which in no way questions the validity of the ideal of modern progressive administration but rather points to the possible practical limitations of "democratic leadership" as it comes face-to-face with the realities of the on-going administrative process. In their down-to-earth classic, Principles of School Administration,141 Mort and Ross state:

Lifeless democratic forms are worse than useless. They waste the time of all concerned and interfere with efficiency. The administrator must continually balance the benefits . . . with the basic purposes of the organization. Sometimes he must forego providing any opportunity for public participation or for staff participation142 and act according to the letter of the law in defining his powers and responsibilities. Seldom if ever can he make the democratic purposes the sole ones. His action must be the result of democratic demands and other controlling principles. He must hold the democratic purposes as ideals to strive for, but he must not forget that the organization for which he is responsible has its own prime objectives for which the attainment of the democratic purposes alone cannot atone should the prime objectives fail to be reached. He should do his job as democratically as possible, but he must do his job. Clearly the effective administrator is the one who can manage to avoid most bottleneck situations where autocratic action is necessary to achieve the primary objectives.143

Similarly, in another attempt to deal realistically with the day-by-day aspects of administrative decision-making,
Counts and his associates identify the following guiding principles:

First, the superintendent should know his school system and his professional staff. He should become acquainted with the policies of his predecessor and conceptions of administration and educational leadership prevailing in the system.

Second, the superintendent should know his community. He should know something of its history, particularly with reference to its attitude toward and its conception of (public) education. He should be a close student of its structure of prestige, influence, and power. He should know its leaders.

Third, the superintendent should establish a process of continuous communication with both teachers and the community. And this should be a genuine two-way process.

Fourth, the superintendent should strive to utilize all the resources of the teaching staff and the community in the development of policy. If the time should ever come when the voice of the critic is silenced, education might enter a stage of decadence. The wise man learns quite as much from his enemies as from his friends.

Fifth, the superintendent should advise the board of education to hold regular meetings devoted to the formulation of long-range policy.

Sixth, the superintendent should avoid conveying the impression that in his opinion he knows all the answers or that he is always right. Because of his special knowledge, experience, and responsibility, the proposals of the superintendent should merit and receive the respect of the members of his staff and the community. Such respect, however, can scarcely be demanded as a right in a democratic society.

Seventh, the superintendent should strive to cultivate the mature mind in dealing with hostile critics and opponents.

Eighth, the superintendent should cultivate the virtues and qualities essential to the rule of law and reason. Early in his career the superintendent should learn that very rarely indeed does history confront him with cut-and-dried choices between black and white. As a rule, choices must be made between varying shades of gray.
Ninth and finally, the superintendent should know himself . . . If the superintendent knows himself truly, he then is well on the way to knowing others. Such knowledge is indispensable to effective leadership.\textsuperscript{144}

As was inferred in the discussion of the historical development of progressive education, George S. Counts is usually associated with a fairly militant form of "socio-cultural reconstructionism," a radical expression of the progressivist credo. It is therefore interesting, but not overly surprising, that this very same effort to democratize educational administration has caught the imagination of the rather conservative essentialist school, also. In their introductory chapter, Hunt and Pierce say:

Many, however, see trends which give relevance to fears regarding the penetration of totalitarian influences. They cite attempts at restraint of freedom, growing restrictions of travel, centralization of authority in the federal government, and the increasing proportion of the individual's income required for taxes; and they point to the need for alertness of public schools to these trends.

It is the recognized responsibility and function of a public school system to maintain and perpetuate the values of the society of which it is a part . . . \textsuperscript{145}

The language and implicit assumptions of this statement about the direction and purpose of education are basically essentialist in nature. On the other hand, however, the following principles are stated as being fundamental to cooperative administrative practice:

1. All school administration is justified only by, and should be based solely on, the needs of the curriculum-instructional program.
2. The primary responsibility of the administrator is
to develop cooperatively with school and lay personnel an educational program that will serve the whole personalities of children and youth of the community.

3. The administrator is responsible for organizing an administrative framework for implementing and servicing the educational program.

4. The individual school is the basic unit for curriculum-instructional development and consequently is the focus of all administrative services.

5. The activities and experiences of successful democratic living, classified under major functions of living and organized according to established stages of human development, should be made the foundation of curriculum-instructional and administrative procedures.

6. Community understanding and support should be developed chiefly through making homes and community agencies associates of the school in the educative process.

7. Human relation procedures, such as the group process and the individual conference, should be used as mediums for achieving democratic leadership.

8. Training for school administration should be based on principles and techniques essential to practice of a profession rather than on acquisition of managerial information and skills.

9. The administrator should understand the role of the school in the American social order and his responsibility for guiding children and youth in the practice of democratic American values.

10. Administration should be focused on service to teachers and pupils in learning situations rather than on administrative matters designed for smooth and convenient operation of the schools.

11. Success in administrative service should be evaluated chiefly in terms of desirable changes effected in pupil behavior and of consistent growth in staff competency.

12. Administrative policy making should be decided by the community, operating through representative lay boards, with professional administrators advising about and carrying out the community's educational policy.¹⁴⁶

In summation, democratic educational leadership implies the putting into practice of all principles of democratic living as they pertain to the educational endeavor in its broadest sense. The modern administrator is a servant and enabler, exercising authority in a rational and responsible fashion and using the authority vested in him, in many instances, to carry
out recommendations and suggestions of the various groups which function at the different rungs of the educational ladder—students, teachers, specialists, consultants and supervisors, principals, board members, community leaders, parent associations, etc. His role is to stimulate, to inject his difference, so as to help education become deeper and richer and, in so doing, enable the educational institution to better realize its general and particular, its articulated and non-articulated goals. Throughout this entire process he still carries ultimate, though to some degree shared, responsibility for the educational outcomes of the entire learning experience. Finally, he is to be vitally concerned with the quality of group processes and interpersonal relationships at all levels, with the growth and self-fulfillment of all individuals involved in the totality of the educational enterprise.

It is no exaggeration to state that the multi-functional role of the modern administrator establishes an ideal most difficult to attain and one that will continually challenge educational administrators in all types of educational settings. Its comprehensiveness, though seemingly overwhelming, is the price that must be paid for a relatively consistent adherence to and implementation of the democratic process, on the one hand, and a reasonably efficient implementation of institutional objectives, on the other. This realization has become part and parcel of the thinking of enlightened leadership in the commercial world and is widely accepted, in theory at least, by most schools of educational thought, some of which would not
accept similar innovations in the area of methodology and curriculum development.

As was previously stated, supervision is being considered in the present context as a specialized segment of the administrative process. It would follow logically, therefore, that much of what has been accentuated in the portrayal of "modern administration" applies likewise to "modern supervision." Democracy, the centrality of group processes, thinking in terms of the application of principles to particular situations rather than enslavement to techniques and formulas, consultation, leadership, help rather than inspection and dictation are primary to the "new" approach to supervisory practice. Though early progressive literature dealt even less with supervision than with administration, the "new" emphases can be related easily and directly to progressively-oriented education as discussed heretofore.

In contrasting "traditional supervision" with "modern supervision," Burton and Brueckner state that "traditionally supervision was centered around the teacher and the classroom act, and was based largely on the thought that teachers, often being lamentably undertrained, need careful direction and training. Visiting the classroom, conferences, teachers' meetings were the bulk of supervision and, in many minds, were synonymous with supervision ... Traditional supervision consisted largely of inspection of the teacher by means of visitation and conference, carried on in a random manner, with directions imposed on the teacher by authority and usually by
one person." Modern supervision, on the other hand, "is far more fundamental and diverse." Its characteristics may be summarized . . .:

1. Modern supervision directs attention toward the fundamentals of education and orients learning and its improvement within the general aim of education.

2. The aim of supervision is the improvement of the total teaching-learning process, the total setting for learning, rather than the narrow and limited aim of improving teachers in service.

3. The focus is on the setting for learning, not on a person or group of persons. All persons are co-workers aiming at the improvement of the situation. One group is not superior to another, operating to "improve" the inferior group.

4. The teacher is removed from his embarrassing position as the focus of attention and the weak link in the educational process. He assumes his rightful position as a co-operating member of a group concerned with the improvement of learning.147

Democracy, with its implications in regard to individual growth and fulfillment as well as in regard to the importance of group processes, seems to be the pivotal concept of the "new" supervision as it is of the "new" education.

The supervisor of tomorrow will build his program upon the concepts that are associated with the word "democracy" . . .

Democracy indicates a particular type of relationship between individuals. The development of this relationship should always be in the direction of each man becoming his brother's keeper, in the sense that he accepts the social responsibility for those who have been less fortunate and who can profit through the exercise of his special abilities . . .

It is not enough to train youth to be more efficient consumers and producers; they must be trained to be better human beings. To attain such an end, learning experiences must be designed which avoid superficiality and yet meet the needs of all individuals. These experiences must be planned by teachers of high quality who continue to grow professionally under the direction of supervisors who are both proud and humble. The arrogant, encyclopedic type of person who masqueraded as a supervisor of public education
and attempted to tell teachers this, that, and the other thing must be relegated to the past. His place will be taken by the supervisor of tomorrow who will be inspired by the great responsibility that must be accepted by public educators, and who, with an appropriate spirit of humility, will attempt to accomplish his purposes through the use of the democratic procedures of consultation, persuasion, discussion and cooperation.148

Some principles governing democratic supervision are:

Democracy is a way of life and not limited to political forms ... Democracy's guarantee of political rights is not a universal equalitarianism ... Democracy emphasizes the worth of persons ... Democracy has obligations as well as rights; a democratic conscience must be developed ... Democracy emphasizes for the group the common goal as a social aim ... Democracy emphasizes a flexible, functional organization of the group with freedom for all to contribute ... Democratic authority is derived from the situation, not from power under the law. Democracy substitutes leadership for authority; recognizes that anyone may exercise leadership ... Democracy uses the method of group discussion, deliberation, and decision for solving problems ... Democracy utilizes experts ... Democracy emphasizes experimentalism.149

As has been implied if not explicitly stated thus far, modern supervision, as does modern administration, deals with everything that potentially contributes to the refinement of the learning situation so maximal learning, from all points of view, will have the opportunity to take place. Works on modern supervisory practice touch upon the following diversified subjects:

Stimulating Teacher Growth as a Means of Improving the Quality of Education ... Conferences—A Process in Supervision ... Observations—Modern Style ... Demonstrations May Help ... Group Work Has Advantages ... Records Have a Place ... Participation in Continuous Curriculum Development ... Action Research ... Working with Professional Education Institutions ... School Organization and Grouping as a Challenge to Growth ...
The Co-operative Planning of Supervisory Programs
The General Outlines of Group Process
The Evaluation of the Total Educational Program: A Co-operative Process
The Study of the Learner: Diagnosis of Learning Difficulties
The Study of Instruction
The Study of the Materials of Instruction and the Socio-Physical Environment
The Improvement of the Achievements, Interests, and Work Habits of the Pupil

It should be noted before concluding these remarks on supervision that group processes—conferences, workshops, task sessions, committee meetings, group research—are the typical structures for the bulk of modern supervisory practice; they represent "democracy in action," the participation of a group of individuals to deal with common issues and to explore mutual problems. Also, modern supervision, as is the case with modern administration, calls for the "democratic leader." Thus the professional education, competencies and abilities, personality characteristics, on-the-job experience, demands and challenges that were enumerated and discussed as part of the analysis of the image of the progressive administrator pertain also to his compatriot, the modern supervisor.
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Chapter III

American Society as the Milieu of Progressive Education

The period which spawned and popularized progressivism in education (and Progressivism in general) was one that seemed to hold great promise for man's conquest of the social ills besetting society. It is sad commentary but not surprising that humanity's fondest aspirations were not realized. All that has occurred to a groping mankind in the last seventy years, and that which especially has left its mark upon American civilization, has had its impact upon Jewish life in the United States and will be reflected, for better or worse, in American Jewish institutions, including that of Jewish education. The influence of this larger "environment" may not be felt consciously, but it is there and cannot be discounted. This is not to negate the role played by the variety of Jewish attitudes, values, institutions and folkways developed through the ages and transplanted in America. They, too, are a significant part of the larger "environment" of "life-space." However, in order to truly understand the current status of Jewish education and the challenges it faces in the future (especially as this applies to the influence--past, present and future--of educational progressivism upon the Jewish educational process) simple explanations will not suffice. Monochromatic solutions such as the traditionalist's suggestion that we "return to Torah and the Mitzvot," such as the Hebraist's plea for the revitalization of the Hebrew language amongst the masses, or the integrationist's formula of the "acceptance of a new reality" and "creative adjustment," are in themselves untenable
as panaceas for the malady affecting Jewish life and Jewish education. They may very well contain some element of truth and be capable of contributing to an operational design for assuring a dynamic and meaningful Jewish future in America. However, they are partial and biased, and they are outgrowths of historical circumstances which may no longer exist. We must recognize their worth but intrepidly look beyond them. We must examine our situation more deeply and broaden our vision in order to establish the basis for knowledgeable direction, tentative answers and further inquiry. Thus, the metamorphosis of American society has relevance as we study progressivism's impact on Jewish education. In so doing, we expand and deepen our universe of discourse as we study an educational phenomenon characteristic of American civilization.

Sociology

Any attempt at a description and analysis of American society during the period under consideration presents difficulties of quite some magnitude, some of which are common to all interpretations of events and tendencies, others which may be peculiarly unique to American culture. The very dynamism of our way of life makes the task even more arduous. An aspect of trend may change overnight as a response to the introduction of some new product of our ever-expanding technology. Every effort at introspection is open to much criticism, but an effort must be made in order to provide a context for the understanding of the institution of American Jewish education. The specific focus of this presentation will be on the evolving sociological (including psychological and economic factors of relevance),
ideological and philosophical currents that seem to exist and that may have some meaningful relationship to American Jewish life and to Jewish education in the United States.

In trying to grasp the essence of a civilization as distinguished from other civilizations, past and present, it is helpful to identify its uniqueness or difference. Just as all individuals differ in some respect, so all cultural complexes have some characteristics by which they may be differentiated from other cultural configurations. One authority on inter-cultural education makes the following observations:

1. Democracy is more than a political pilot light of the American people. It is that, but it is also a precious heritage of ideals and values. Among them, the following have become generally acknowledged in our society: (1) a commanding respect for human personality, regardless of age, sex, class, race, creed, or national origin; (2) the enlistment of individual freedom and responsibility in the maintenance of social order; and (3) the right of all groups, including minority peoples, to equality before the law and to free participation in the making of America.

2. The trend of American culture indicates a growing secularization of society. By secularization is meant the decreasing influence of institutional religion in American life, and the increasing initiative of individuals in determining their spiritual values and in shaping institutions accordingly.

... At the same time secular society deeply affects the church's core of human values, largely because of the influences of the scientific method, democratic ideals and leisure-time interests. Quite probably the public school has been the most important vehicle of this secular influence. Secularism, as a frame of reference for the activity of the American people, is "this-worldly" in orientation, embraces certain humanitarian values of the good life on earth, and resorts to human intelligence, integrity, experimental living, as means to accomplish these ends.

3. The pattern of American society is strikingly technological. More and more in recent decades the machine has supplanted hard manual labor in mastering the natural resources of this country, and in converting them to serve human needs.
4. Another trait of American culture is the social-status system in which individuals, families, and larger groups of people find their places in the community. A casual look at any community shows a relatively small group of well-to-do people living "on the hill," a large block of economically underprivileged and socially handicapped people settled "across the tracks," and a large middle class element spread out in the intervening social area. . . . The lower class usually includes "poor whites," dark-skinned peoples, and the more recent immigrant, foreign language, semi-skilled, laboring classes. These disfavored peoples of different racial and ethnic traditions frequently dwell in somewhat isolated "cultural islands" in the least desirable sections of the community. They are economically handicapped. The large middle class includes the thrifty, "respectable" business and professional people. . . .

American life has exhibited its conflicts as well as its virility. Emotions do not always coincide with what the intellect indicates is right; ethics and behavior diverge; in general, ideals represent aspirations and not norms. In an "action-centered" culture such as ours a wide gap between the ideal and the real might be expected to exist, a much wider gap than would be found in a relatively static, tradition-centered, authoritarian culture. However, the articulation and acknowledgment of a body of ideals and values and the conscious desire to realize them more and more so as to enhance society is a reasonable expectation (of the intellectuals and the leadership, if not of the masses) that one would have of a democratic, creative and humane civilization. There is growing evidence that this expectation may be becoming less valid in the America of the sixties.

In a comparison of two college classes, A. S. Eisenstadt observes that whereas the class of 1940 (his class) doubted the world around it, the class of 1962 doubts itself. The class of 1940 seemed to be living in an entirely different intellectual
and social climate than the class of the "atomic age." 8

The great accomplishments along with the comparative social apathy of American civilization present an interesting phenomenon for the historian and the sociologist to study. However, for the educator and the Jewish educator, an understanding of what has come about in America in the past fifty years is imperative if educational developments are to be understood and to be evaluated. One cannot, as the historian or sociologist can, take a detached view of the situation, its origins and its unfolding. The trends, changes, and existing conditions and problems are the context in which future educational effort must find direction and purpose. To further our comprehension of what has transpired, we should try to identify the various factors responsible for the development of the cultural traits enumerated above. The presence of the many paradoxes and divergences between ideal and behavior should also be studied. An attempt to explain the seeming lack of orientation of the present generation should be made. Answers to the following questions may also be come upon through close scrutiny: What was happening in America as progressive education was gaining professional and popular acceptance (if it ever did) and when it later became an object of great criticism and ridicule? What has been the sociological, ideological and philosophical environment in which the American Jewish religious-cultural group has grown and developed, has been assimilated or has become integrated, has become progressive in its Jewish educational thinking or has remained traditional in its educational philosophy
and thought?

One of the most basic changes that has occurred in twentieth-century America has been the urbanization and
industrialization of American life. Accompanying the growth of
cities and an urban way of life came the greater reliance upon
science and technology to provide improved products and more
efficient services to the American people. America is a civil-
ization founded on science and rooted in its achievements. Without
science the whole ribbed frame of American technology, and
with it American power, would have been impossible. America
itself was born at the beginning of the great age of European
science. As with urbanization, the greater acceptance of
science as a life-determinant has led to revolution and chaos
in the area of belief, value, attitude and behavior. Its most
serious impact has been its questioning of the authority and
basic assumptions of traditional (orthodoxy and fundamentalism)
religions and religious institutions and the ensuing repudiation
or at best "lip-service," by many, to moral codes and humanistic
values and ideals championed by all interpretations of Judeo-
Christian religion.

In America, pure science has been an instrument for
technological progress. In fact, technological development,
very much intertwined with the profit or defense motive, has
become the rationale for pure scientific research. It is no
secret that science is valued for what it has done and what it
may do in the future rather than for its method, its approach
to solving human problems and the type of rational and systematic
This continual focus upon certain applied sciences has led indirectly to a form of anti-intellectualism, which has become increasingly militant since the end of World War II.

... The fear of "geniuses," felt through most of industrial structure, scares off a number of men who value independent thinking and cherish their own cast of personality. But the managerial attitude is even more corrosive for the marginal men who may decide to go into industrial research and who develop their own inhibitions against original thinking once they find themselves in an atmosphere hostile to it.

While the corporate managers feel uneasy with scientific "geniuses," the community as a whole distrusts and even fears them ... This is part of a current of anti-intellectualism that has swept in recent years not only through America but through the whole Western world, largely as a consequence of the atomic crisis.

To summarize, even though the scientific-technological product is valued greatly today, the scientist, the scientific method, and the values of science are not beyond suspicion and have had far less impact than would reasonably be expected. However, one would have to admit that the effect of science and technology on social behavior, thought, action, purposes and values has been something more than one of "no impact." On the contrary at this juncture in history the scientific-technological revolution, projecting a world-view and set of values which diverges in many ways from the traditional Judeo-Christian orientation, has created many problems for man and has "opened his universe" to the point of utter confusion. Not only has "secular man" come to minimize the relevancy of traditional religious beliefs, practices and codes of behavior but he has been alienated from traditional life-activities, values, and
institutions, and has substituted for them a set of less humanizing, creative, less socially-productive and socially-oriented values and behavioral patterns.

Most Americans, especially the industrial and white-collar classes, have been alienated from some crucial life experiences—from the soil, from independent enterprise, from the ownership of tools, from the sense of craft and the dignity of work, from the feeling of relation to the total product. . .

The loss of a sense of independence in the productive processes has been replaced by a feeling of well-being in consumption and living standards. The pull of property is no longer in tools or productive land but in consumer goods; . . . these form the new soil in which the American has found new roots.

The values of income, consumption, status, and popular culture are a different set of values from those of soil and craft and small-scale productive property, and in that sense the whole ground tone of American civilization has changed under the Big Technology. But the point is that in their own way they are values, not emptiness or formlessness . . . That is to say that it is the machine itself that has cut American industrial, white-collar, and professional workers away from the machine and has transferred their interest and life-energies from the making of goods to the making of money with which to buy and enjoy the goods.14

It cannot be denied that science and technology have made great contributions to man's fight against disease and his struggle for a longer and more comfortable life. However, humanity tends many times to accentuate the negative at the expense of the equally dramatic (when viewed with historical perspective) if not sensational positive occurrences and contributions. Therefore, today science stands before the world accused (with much evidence available from Hiroshima and Nagasaki) of providing man with an efficient means for his self-destruction rather than with refined instruments for and dedicated devotion to man's mass physical and psychic salvation.
It is, therefore, not surprising that, in this atmosphere of conflict, disillusionment and fear resulting from cultural inconsistency, disorientation and extreme "lag," that the "liberal" who calls for the reliance on intelligence and reason and the application of scientific method, conclusions, hypotheses, etc., so as to extricate man from the web of his existential dilemma, has few listeners, aside from a handful of intellectuals, scientists, sociologists and anthropologists, philosophers and educators. As alluded to above, an undercurrent of hostility if not open warfare exists between many who are satisfied with enjoying and increasing the comforts gained from the outcomes of scientific and technological research and those who demand of science commitment and the tools to create a better world.

In conclusion, science, as an approach to understanding, enhancing, and directing the universe of man's creative existence can be liberating, progressive, and can make a contribution to the self-fulfillment of man. Consumptive technology, on the other hand,--the worship of the product without an acceptance and valuing of the process and the overall philosophic context of scientific effort, the exploitation of science to amass wealth--is a conservative and sometimes reactionary force in our society which can be stultifying, sterile and oppressive. Though the scientific outlook is in the main secular, it allows for religious orientation towards life if not supporting traditional, authoritarian beliefs and practices. The application of science becomes materialistic when it lacks philosophical
perspective, when it is neither humanistic or humanitarian but leads only to pleasure-seeking, status-enhancing, and comfort-providing—hedonism of the first order. Socially irresponsible productivity and consumer-oriented technology may be a greater enemy of the religious, spiritual life than science itself, which if it ever is able to develop substantially would most probably affirm the great religious truths promulgated through the ages. Science, undeniably, questions belief and the source of authority, but the abuse or de-humanization and de-spiritualization of technology may be the ultimate destroyer of religious values and the religious interpretation of life which places man above money, love above power, the spirit over the material, compassion over comfort, creativity and self-realization over conformity and the undisciplined pursuit of pleasure.

During the past fifty years, as a resultant of our increasingly higher standard of living and of the needs of an expanding, urban, technological society, America has become more and more "middle-class" in terms of the ethos and tempo of the society. In discussing the social characteristics of American society, investigators have come to focus more and more upon analyzing the traits, behavior patterns, psychology, and problems of the "middle-class." Though America has upper and lower socio-economic classes, the tone and tempo of American society is set by the "middle-class," the class of which the majority of American Jews consider themselves a part. Most Americans think of themselves as being "middle-class" (even the "lower-upper" or nouveaux riche and the "lower," laboring classes).
Part of the dilemma of newer elements in the "middle-class" and of even of industrial skilled and semi-skilled labor is the challenge presented by Big Business, the assembly line, automation, etc. It can be observed that in many instances "success at any cost" (lack of ethical behavior, lack of integrity and sincerity, lack of creative satisfaction, etc.) becomes the motive force behind going through the motions of the job, the reward being time and money to get pleasure and a chance for self-expression away from the job.

"Middle-classism" has generally supported quite vigorously the open society, the free enterprise system, our many democratic institutions, and the "American way of life." Nonetheless, the "middle-class" is far from "free" in terms of its personal and social development, probably far less "free" than the other two socio-economic classes.

The obvious defect of this conception is its negativism. It stresses freedom from the powers and principalities of organized government, but not freedom for the creative phases of living. It derives from the whole freedom constellation of the eighteenth century. . . . It underscored let live but forgot that in the jungle of the industrial culture let live without help live can be morally empty.

The real dangers of the American mode of life are not in the machine or even in standardization as much as they are in conformism. The dangers do not flow from the contrivances men have fashioned to lighten their burdens, or from the material abundance which, if anything, should make a richer cultural life possible. They flow rather from the nemesis of the dominant and successful by the weak and mediocre, and from the fear of being thought different from one's fellows. This is the essence of conformism.

Taking all things into consideration, one might say that Americans are free from many authoritarian impositions but are
subjugated by the subtle but powerful pressures of mass culture.

The "business spirit" is just another facet of American life that for many is demoralizing and enslaving. Many Americans, especially the "middle-class" considered in the broadest possible terms, are committed to becoming a success and in accumulating money.

To understand the importance of success as a goal, one must remember that for the ordinary American the test of an idea is in the end product of the action, the proof that something is valid lies in its being effective. He cares about success because he prides himself on living in an illusionless world and cannot let himself be bothered with futilities. Hence his homage is given to the best-selling book, the candidate who is elected by a "landslide," the stock speculator that makes a "killing." It adds to the American's stature to be associated with a going concern.

The only disaster is failure. But even failure is tolerated if it is used as a springboard for a "comeback" which is a success underlined by a dramatic reversal ...

In a society where the traditional goals have been undercut, the goal of money has an alluringly tangible and massive quality ... It is true that the American expectation is largely measured in money terms, and the "law of the fast buck" is a powerful force in American striving.

Power and prestige (status) are also important goals in the great "pursuit of happiness."

As for power ... American society ... is not power-starved but power-saturated. One source that feeds the power drives is the American emphasis on the life of action: the imperialism of action demands control over the actions of others ... 

One must agree that the drive toward prestige has done much to release American energies. But the price has been high—the hollowness of values in a system where life is lived in the mirror of how people rate you, and whether ... you are not only "liked" but "well liked." Life becomes thus a joyless and derivative affair, laden with endless anxieties in an endless prestige rat race.

Finally, happiness puts a premium on security:
The important newcomer in the five-goal system is the stress on security. Anyone studying the emerging personality pattern in America must note how the propensity for risk-taking has slackened, and how risk-cutting and security-seeking have come forward with new strength...

However, it is not economic security alone but a whole psychic security syndrome that is involved. Each new generation seems less geared to risk-taking and more bent on nailing down the future beyond chance and doubt...

According to Lerner, the ultimate life-objective, accentuated in the strivings of the "middle-class," is happiness.

As can be seen, many factors play a part in creating the image of the American with which the majority of American Jews can be identified. These diverse elements or forces not only influence overt behavior but, as has been mentioned from time to time, also impinge significantly upon values and attitudes, upon delimited thought-patterns and broader, more-encompassing ideologies. Many of these ingredients have previously been discussed, some in detail, others in passing. However, a few "missing links" must still be added to the chain so that the picture will be reasonably complete for the purposes of this study, namely: the situation and plight of the individual in a "mass culture," the impact and influence of the mass communication media on American life, and the emerging role of the American woman. Hopefully, dealing with these additional dimensions of evolving American life will serve to complete the framework needed to give meaning and context to the description and analysis of ideologies, movements, causes, and world-views which have made their presence felt during the period under consideration.

As has been commented upon heretofore, technological,
business-centered, urban society has tended to de-personalize the individual, to sap his individuality, to make him an appendage of "mass man" whose lair is "mass culture." Aside from within the family, how does the American, male and female, try to gain self-identity, a resultant of social experiences of differing intensities and of social responses of individuals and groups? How does he or she escape the loneliness and isolation that is the fruit of a fragmented, highly-specialized society?

A standard cliche about American society is that the Americans are "joiners" and "belongers." . . .

In the midst of constant change and turbulence, even in a mass society, the American feels alone. In a society of hierarchy, loneliness is more tolerable because each member knows his position in the hierarchy--lower than some, higher than others, but always known. In a mobile, nonhierarchal society like the American, social position does not have the same meaning as in a vertical scheme of deference and authority. A man's status in the community is a matter of making horizontal connections, which give him his place in what would be otherwise a void. It is this social placing of the American--in church, lodge, service or women's club, eating club, Community Fund drive, veteran's group, country club, political party--that defines his social personality. Through it he gets the sense of effectiveness he does not have as a minor part of the machine process or the corporate organization. Here he can make his way as a person, by his qualities of geniality and friendliness, his ability to talk at a meeting or run it or work on a committee, his organizing capacities, his ardor, his public spirit. Here also, he stretches himself as he rarely does on the job, by working with others for common non-profit ends.

It is this hunger for shared experience that makes the American fear solitude as he does . . . But for many Americans solitude is still too frightening, whether because they dare not face the dilemma of their own personality or because they recognize themselves more easily by reference to their association with others.

It is this aspect of democratic living, voluntary association, which has become basic and definitive of American society. The
psychically-satisfying experiences traditionally related to one's work, neighborhood, community, and even to some degree, family seem to have been expropriated by participation in voluntary associations, especially in urban and suburban America. Two other determinants of culture—the mass communication media and the "liberated" American woman—are worthy of consideration at this point. Just as mass transportation is so vital a factor—as both stimulus and response—in the unfolding of modern American civilization, so does mass communication, exemplified by television, play an immense part in our economic and cultural day-by-day existence.

In scarcely more than two generations the other big-audience media went through a revolutionary change much like that of the press; in the process they transformed much of American life. Most Americans associate magazines, movies, radio, and TV with the arts of living rather than with the molds of thinking, with entertainment and the uses of leisure rather than with attitudes and beliefs . . .

Revolutionary changes took place almost simultaneously in a number of big-audience media. What made them come where and when they did, fusing them into a continuous multiple revolution, was the convergence of three important forces. One was a big audience equipped with purchasing power, not confined to one class but including all of them. The second was the emergence of leisure time needing to be filled. The third was the contrivance of inventions which filled leisure by spanning the continent, pulling the far places of America together, assaulting and capturing eye and air—and doing it cheaply enough to make the new inventions accessible to all.30

. . . . One of the important transformations is in the area of social power. It should be obvious that those who control the images that reach into men's homes and also into their minds will have a good deal of at least indirect control over these minds as well . . .

The core problem is one of maturity. (Just as important as the consequences of TV for American society are, so is the impact of society on the art of TV.) Just as serious as the question of what TV does to children is the question of what children do to TV. It is not that the
programs are geared deliberately to catch them but they are shaped so as to appeal to the child's mentality in children and adults alike ... 31

The "ordeal of the American woman" is symbolic of the conflicts and challenges which arise in a free, open society as it struggles through a period of great transition. 32 The American woman is the great consumer and is on equal terms with American male in controlling America's wealth. However, the many diversified activities in which the American woman is expected to participate tend to make the fully-satisfied woman a rarity. 33

Before this socio-cultural analysis can be considered reasonably complete, note should be made of the increasing degree of anti-social behavior and social problems that are manifesting themselves in all classes of American society--divorce and family breakdown, illegitimacy, and abortion, crime, juvenile delinquency, alienation of youth from the "middle-class" family, drug addiction, alcoholism, etc. 34

One may deplore these dislocating energies, but they would seem to be an inherent part of a society in which the pace of life is set by freedom, competitiveness, and acquisitiveness, and they are part of the price the society pays for those forming principles. A society less free and less dynamic,--one of tradition and status, or one of totally state-directed power--may escape some of these dislocations but be beset by others. The whole impulsion of American culture is to raise hopes and claims in the individual and spur him on to fulfill the hopes and nail down the claims. At the same time it is too young a society to have developed a kind of inner discipline. 35

Finally the secularization of religion and the growth and impact of suburbia (both to be discussed more fully during the examination of physiognomy of the Jewish religio-cultural group) should not be overlooked:
Is America a religious culture, shaped by men who sought freedom of worship, with God constantly present in their minds even when the church has become formalized? Or is it a secular culture, with a "wall of separation" between Church and State, and with religion playing only a marginal role in men's daily lives? Each of these questions can be answered affirmatively, which indicates how deeply the religious ambiguity cuts into American culture. America is as secular as a culture can be where religion has played an important role in its origins and early growth and has been intertwined with the founding and meaning of society. It is also as religious as a culture can be whose life goals are worldly and whose daily strivings revolve not around God but around man.  

The suburban movement was an effort of the new middle classes to find a garment for their living that would express outwardly the changes that had already taken place inwardly in their image of themselves and in their relation to society. They no longer wished to be identified with the "city masses," nor could they stand the anonymity of urban life where the lonely are terribly lonely and no one knows anybody else who happens to live in the same big apartment house. They were the transients, living in an era of transiency, and therefore they were all the more seized by the panic of temporariness: thus they wanted a home of their own, whose mortgage they could at least in part pay off, with whose lawn and garden they could mix their sweat, and where they could putter in a toolshed or garden and have a garage with a car of their own that could carry them away from it all. This was class in action—that is to say, a class personality assumed in the act of striking new roots for itself.  

This discussion could not end without passing mention of the increased friction between the dominant white majority and the American Negro, the true "caste" in American society. The Negro has represented the great minority problem of the fifties and sixties, in the North as well as in the South. The struggle for equality by Catholics, Jews and the foreign-born has, in most cases, been waged successfully, with results acceptable to these minorities even if perfect social equality is still lacking. The colored peoples of America, whose difference is the greatest in the eyes of the white person, are now active,
militant and vociferous in their demands for political, economic, educational and social (housing in white neighborhoods, etc.) equality. This awakening—a resultant of many factors such as the struggle for independence and equality by colored peoples the world-over, the increased numerical strength of the colored minority (through natural reproduction, immigration from Puerto Rico and Cuba, etc.) and the higher educational level and sense of responsibility of their leadership—is currently shaking American society at its very foundations and is being viewed with great interest by the nations of the world. Quite forcefully and dramatically the American Black Man is challenging the "land of the free" to fulfill the great ideas and concepts expressed in our Constitution and Bill of Rights.

Ideology

Ideologies and ideological movements lay bare the inner strivings and the situational, as well as, the fundamental conflicts which a culture generates in its struggle for development and creative survival. At times ideological movements are mass phenomena, at others, only minority expressions. Though their primary origin is the response of people to certain socio-cultural conditions, there is little doubt that, in our world of international communication and travel and of the international press, thought currents and emotional moods not necessarily indigenous to America have insinuated themselves into the mainstream or into the marginal reservoirs of American thought and feeling. An ideology or cause, thus, may arise from a common, world-wide situation or disposition, or may be more "local" in its genesis.
Though ideologies, causes, moods, movements, etc. are initially responses to cultural conditions, they in turn may serve to stimulate action and win additional adherents. They give people something to fight for and fight against and in some cases may incite violence and a strong counter-movement by opposing factions in the society. In many cases they tend to sweep up people with only the leadership, if anyone at all, possessing an articulated conception of the movement or cause. At times they serve as a rationalization (for action and obstruction) of some deeper motive which remains unexpressed or non-expressable. A generally conservative civilization experiencing rapid technological change is fertile ground for the growth of mainly moderate, but, in certain instances, quite radical ideologies. A religio-cultural minority group in a democratic, open society will most probably be greatly affected by the prevalent thought-currents and prevailing moods of the majority culture of which it is part. The minority group may contribute, sometimes out of proportion to its numerical strength, to the growth and to the rejection of certain ideologies and causes. It may also be the object, for good or for bad, of certain ideological tendencies in a given society. From another vantage point, the life of the group, both collectively and individually, may be drastically influenced by internal (within the religio-cultural group) thought and emotive patterns, if its group-life is vital and meaningful. In a democracy of voluntary associations and freedom of inter-communication, it is difficult if not impossible for a minority group to escape being caught up in the ideological
currents and cross-currents that exist within its own group, on the one hand, and in those vying for allegiance within the framework of the majority culture, on the other. It is not uncommon for its "inner ideologies" (the minority group's) to stand out in bold contrast to the larger societal moods. Thus, the conditions for confusion, conflict and disorientation on the part of minority individuals come into being. At other times, the larger societal ideologies may serve to stimulate or reinforce existing patterns or emerging trends of thought and action within the minority sub-culture.

All in all, ideology is directly but sometimes subtly related to the general direction and particular trends of civilizational life. It may serve as indicator, response or motive-force. Thus, an understanding of ideological tendencies and causes supported by a society (or segments thereof) may help us immeasurably in comprehending the "psyche" and "personality" of a civilization and of the participants in it.

America of the 1920's, still recovering from the unsettling influences of World War I, presented an interesting matrix of movements and, in some instances, contradictory forces. The generally liberalizing tendencies of the period became more accentuated, and in some cases relatively extreme, in the climactic thirties, and, in the post-World War II period, some of the trends continued to thrive and to color the cultural milieu while others elicited strong counter-reactions and differing degrees of popular rejection.

Though in the twenties the nation was seemingly still
basically under the sway of a conservative economic philosophy as articulated by Harding, Coolidge and Hoover, it was in the mid-twenties that the Progressive Party with LaFollette at the helm polled some five million votes (1924). This was also the era that witnessed the struggle over prohibition with the repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment representing a victory for the liberal forces which were becoming more accepted among the general American public. The twenties was also a decade that engendered continued isolationism on the part of the United States as well as one that bred governmental corruption of great proportions, the governmentally-supported growth of Big Business and considerable racist and "anti-foreigner" agitation and legislation as diverse segments of our society took up the cause of "protecting white America."

In this period the "melting pot" theory still had popular support, though liberal intellectuals and sociologists had begun to question the basic premises and socio-psychological validity of the "theory," as early as the beginning of the second decade of the century.38

... The Israel Zangwill vision of America as a "melting pot"—a crucible into which poured metals from every country while "the great alchemist melts and fuses them with his purging flame"—was greeted with enthusiasm, but it was a dangerous metaphor since it implied that all the immigrant strains must be purified by being assimilated with something more "American." In World War I the fear cropped up of the "hyphenated American" who was not being melted, fused and purged rapidly enough. The "Red scare" that followed the war was directed against the foreign-born and, like the even more intense furor after World War II, it reinforced the whole agonizing doubt about nature of American identity. ...39

Viewing matters from the standpoint of the immigrant family, the children, growing up in an atmosphere of freedom, tried in many
instances to "escape" their parental heritage and thus become "more American." Strained parent-child relationships characterized the adjustment process of most immigrant families.

The tight family of the peasant community or of the Jewish tradition was subjected to the strains and dislocations of the new society; often it was fatally split, although those that survived found that the ties of cohesiveness were strengthened by the fact of their members having to face together an alien world. Most tragic of all, the immigrants often found that their own children—adapting more easily to the new ways, caught up in the new rhythms, accepting the new life goals, and eager to merge themselves with the new environment—drifted away and became alienated from their parents. Perhaps in order to wipe out the cleavage between themselves and their new fellows, they saw their mother and father through the eye of the "Americans" and came to think of them as outsiders and strangers—in short, as objects. The circle of alienation was completed. 40

In another vein, the twenties saw Freudianism shattering the Puritanical pretenses of American culture. In so doing the doctrines of Freud became a dominant intellectual force that came to influence many facets of life and everyday behavior. Thus, for instance, we witness the "child panic," as Lerner refers to the growing centrality of the child within the American family. 41

In addition, the feminine revolution, as part of the all-encompassing revolution in morals, manners and tastes, was a response to Freud's criticism of Western civilization and his call for the liberation of the inner drives and impulses of men and women so as to help them achieve emotional stability and mental health.

In the 1920's the American moralists were shocked at the "revolt of the younger generation," with new freedoms of smoking, drinking, petting and premarital sex. Some saw it as the end of the world, others a passing rebellious whim. Actually it was neither, but a phase of a continuing revolution in morals. . . . Armed with bootleg liquor, the young and the old flaunted the codes of the
Id, ego, neurosis, interpretation of dreams, complex, psychoanalysis, psychiatry--became common words that Americans, especially of the middle and upper classes, used to rationalize and explain their behavior, feelings and interpersonal problems. Art, a most sensitive area of human endeavor, also succumbed to the symbolism and "expressionism" stimulated by the Freudians, as well as to other moods on the contemporary scene.

Two other closely related ideological-philosophical currents also made their presence felt--secularist-naturalistic-scientism, and pragmatism. The conflict between formalized, institutionalized, fundamentalist religion as opposed to the scientific approach to life and human experience has already been noted. The great struggle between fundamentalism and Darwinian evolutionism was still being fought during this decade and was best exemplified by the famous Scopes' trial.

In theological circles and churches, the fundamentalist-modernist controversy ... came to a head as a result of advancing science. The most radical of the modernists, found chiefly among the Unitarians and Universalists, but also among other Protestants, ... either rejected the basic Christian theological dogmas as untrue or held that we can have no certainty about them. Other, but less radical modernists ... retained a few of the old beliefs such as that in the existence of God and in personal immortality. Against all of these, the fundamentalists have stood for the continued belief in all of the old-time "fundamentals" of the Christian religion. This group was unrelenting in the war against science at every point where it clashed with the traditional dogmas of formal Christianity. Their leaders attacked the modernist ministers and teachers, and organized many societies to carry on their work. They succeeded in having anti-evolution laws passed in a few states, one of them being Tennessee, where a teacher, J. T. Scopes, was tried in 1925 for teaching evolution. William Jennings Bryan, the chief prosecuting attorney and prominent fundamentalist, urged the view that the schools exist to teach not what is true but what the people want
them to teach. Scopes was convicted in spite of his able defense by Clarence Darrow, a leading modernist. Naturalistic-humanism, of the atheistic, agnostic and theistic varieties, was becoming more and more popular among intellectuals and the avant garde, but, to the fundamentalists, humanism, even of the Christian variety, was suspect and dangerous.

One of the striking facts about American history has been the linkage of the "religion of the fathers" with what Mencken delighted to call the "Bible Belt" mentality—a narrow view of life and morals, a belief in the literal inspiration of the Bible, and a reactionary code of political belief. The passion of the "Hot Gospel" and the archaism of the hell-fire-and-damnation-religion were put to work as a counterforce to the inherent humanism of the Christian teachings.

Nonetheless, scientifically-oriented reality-centered empiricism and a naturalistic-humanistic ethic made themselves felt in the secularization of religion and the increased secularism manifested in all aspects of American life.

The conflict between secular social goals and the religious conscience has colored both the religious and the democratic experience of America ...

In this spirit some of the pastors of every denomination have fought for racial equality and economic justice and have explored settlement work, adult education, and psychiatric pastoral counseling. Wherever this has happened, whether with Catholics, Protestants, or Jews, it has been attacked as a secularizing of religion. It is true that it has turned the main stress of religious energy away from the supernatural to the social, from transcending the human to the serving of human needs. It is also true that such a humanist emphasis has in many instances become theologically thin. It is easy for sophisticates to deride religious liberalism... Yet it has served the function of making religion a living part of the needs of the people and keep it militantly alert to the furthermost stretches of social possibility.

Finally, the philosophical counterpart of this growing liberal-empirical surge, pragmatism, gave to the ideology an aura of intellectual respectability, something which American
conservatism generally lacked.

The stretch from the turn of the century to the New Deal saw a movement of pragmatism that reached into law, politics, history, education, business, labor, sciences, and even art and religion. Its seminal minds in philosophy were Peirce, James, Dewey, and Mead. In economics Veblen maintained a withering fire against the abstractions of the English classical school and the Austrian "marginal utility" school, championing a home-grown attitude that studied economic institutions in their whole life context; and Wesley Mitchell applied his insights to the study of business cycles. In law, Holmes asserted that "the life of the law has not been logic; it has been experience;" 

. . .; and Brandeis developed the technique of shaping the judicial judgment less to the logic of chopping of "mechanical jurisprudence" than to the community experience. In history, James Harvey Robison and Charles Beard gave new vitality to the relation between social movements and the history of ideas, emphasizing the driving forces of class interest and the ways by which men rationalized these drives. In "progressive" education, Dewey stressed the growth and experience of the child as he "learns by doing."

Through these variations there ran the common thread of the "revolt against formalism" and against fixed principles or rules—that truth did not lie in absolutes or in mechanical formulas but in the whole operative context of individual growth and social action in which the idea was embedded. . . 49

The thirties was a decade of desperation and upheaval in America, as it was throughout the world. Many of the movements and trends in thought of the twenties became more apparent and widespread, and in some cases, more extreme and activist as they responded to the critical nature of the times. Whereas Facism and Nazism were European answers to the exigencies of history, America witnessed a definite turn to the "left" in regard to the Federal government and its socio-political philosophy. Liberalism, now allied with pragmatism, no longer represented a laissez-faire approach to government. It now looked toward responsible governmental intervention, and rational analysis and planning in regard to social problems as the key to
the future. Liberalism gained its greatest popularity in this period of domestic urgency and cataclysmic change, even though its relativism and piecemeal approach to long-range problems was being criticized and challenged by a militant, direction-conscious social reconstructionism of the "left,"\textsuperscript{50} and by tradition-centered, "anti-change" conservatives and reactionaries.

It is in the liberal intellectual tradition that American belief has characteristically expressed itself. Its credo has been progress, its mood optimist, its view of human nature rationalist and plastic; it has used human rights rather than property rights as its ends but has concentrated on social action as its means. It has made "expedient change" an integral part of its methods and has taken from science the belief in the tools of reason and the tests of validity. It has kept its fighting edge through the emotional force of the reformist impulse.\textsuperscript{51}

It was during these years of increased social consciousness that the comparatively radical New Deal and the institutionalization of the "welfare state" became permanent objects on the American social landscape.

Though opposition to what some called the "creeping socialism" of the New Deal and a serious questioning of its means and methods did exist, the concepts and innovations put into play by the Roosevelt administration in its more centralized approach to the governing of the populace reflected the desire of the masses for economic security and for help to those in need. The surge to democratize American life via peaceful reform was all-pervasive in this period and had enormous public backing. Social welfare and liberal thought came out into the open in this era as the dominant ideologies of the times.

In this pre-World War II decade, the liberalism of the epoch also facilitated the seeming victory of the theory of
"cultural pluralism" over the "melting pot" theory as an approach to the adjustment of ethnic minorities in American culture.\textsuperscript{52} Though immigration had been greatly restricted, some refugees from Hitler were allowed entrance, and thus they constituted a core of new immigrants.\textsuperscript{53}

The thirties also stimulated some intellectuals, disillusioned with certain inadequacies of the American way of life, to look toward international communism as the panacea to the world's problems. Communist sympathizers and card-carrying party members were more common the American scene then than at any other time, heretofore or thereafter. Socialism, in the organized, political form of the Socialist Party, actually lost ground in the Depression period since so many of its reforms and principles were incorporated into the New Deal which Big Labor supported to the hilt.\textsuperscript{54}

Social and economic conditions contributed to the continuation of racism and prejudice and discrimination toward racial and religious minorities. Facism and Nazism, the dictatorships of the "right," so popular as solutions to Europe's socio-economic problems in the thirties, had their impact on American life just as anti-Semitism was aided directly and indirectly by European totalitarianism and the deteriorated economic conditions in America.\textsuperscript{54}

The effects of World War II and of the "cold war" which has followed as well as the reactions of the American people to internal social and economic conditions set the stage for the engrossing saga of "America in the atomic and space age." Though the tone of the fifties was in some respects similar to that of
the twenties (the post-World War I era)—the upsurge of conservative thinking and feeling, the discrediting of liberalism with its emphasis on social change, the cultivation and pursuit of pleasure and luxury, the rebirth and increased popularity of reactionary, nativist, and isolationary causes and movements, the presence of Republican administrations in Washington (1952-1960, 1969-?)—many tendencies and attitudes that seem to have come to the fore have exhibited their own individuality and particularity and have had their roots in potentially "stabilizing responses" to the unsettling "hyper-dynamic" context of the times we live in.

War and nationalist fervor usually breed isolationism in a conservative, "well-off" country such as twentieth century America. This trend has assuredly become more accentuated in the last decades as disillusionment and pessimism in regard to the possibilities of real peace has grown. However, America's role as the greatest of international powers could no longer be denied nor changed from within though it could be challenged quite vigorously from without. It could no longer be contested that America's survival depended on the health and development of the "free world." Thus, America's generally strong support and belief in the United Nations, as contrasted with its suspicion of the League of Nations, is better understood. The world had changed and so, it seemed, had America.

Though the soil of America did not feel the ravages of war as did the soil of other nations of the world, American war casualties were considerable. The war became most personal when
husbands, fathers and sons were wounded, disabled or killed. However, from the economic standpoint, the war for all the havoc it wrought also brought its blessings. An unheard degree of prosperity, characterized by an inflationary spiral, erased the ravages of the Depression once and for all. The great conflict, as would be expected, mobilized all sectors of society and stimulated an enormous scientific and technological endeavor, the most dramatic product of which was the invention and perfection of "the bomb." The creation and actual use of this "ultimate weapon," the terrible human and material destruction—by weapons and armaments, by atrocity and genocide which the world suffered, the loss of American life, and the continuous struggle with Communism which commenced after the War—all this, compounded upon the normal conservative and anti-intellectual nature of American civilization and the expected post-war swing to neo-conservatism, contributed to the manufacturing of a mood of despair, pessimism and reaction in regard to the search for lasting peace and tranquility and to the rational solution by man of his problems through science and progress.

What were the specific ways in which this "new mood"—spiritual emptiness amidst material plenty in the land with the highest standard of living in the world—showed itself?

The deleterious aspects of the urban-technological revolution and the worship of "middle classism" have already been discussed in detail. One of the great misfortunes of the period, already touched upon and resulting from the combination of many different factors among which is the feeling of anxiety so ob-
vious around the globe, has been the refuge in uniformity of thought and conformity of taste and behavior.

Keeping in step physically or mentally is not a democratic ideal. Liberal education in a democracy demands the encouragement of individual thinking. But with the growing stress on military needs resulting from the cold war . . . the tendency has been toward regimentation instead of freedom, indoctrination instead of education, in the true sense of the word.

We must never forget that the state is for the citizen, not the citizen for the state.56

At no time in our history has cultural variety been as important to American democracy as it is today. This is an era in which we, as citizens, are in danger of losing much of our individuality under the impact of the standardizing forces in our society. We are increasingly coming to dress alike, talk alike and think alike . . . Valuable as the media of mass communication are in spreading information and certain elements of culture, we must guard against their tendency to put us all in a cultural Procrustian bed . . .

And this harmony in diversity which is the triumph of true democracy is also its great source of strength. Today, as always, the strength of an ethical society derives from its minorities . . . Democracy, on the other hand, respects and welcomes all contributions to the common weal, from whatever source and by whatever agent . . . Democracy has precisely the opposite concept, the opposite aim. Instead of contemptuously demanding conformity, democracy glories in diversity. Instead of falsely seeking strength through standardization and the elimination of protest, dissent or differences, democracy finds its strength in rivalries of opinion, the variations of conviction, and the weaving together of diverse strands of culture, tradition, and hope in a richly varied pattern of harmony.57

In addition, the early fifties will be remembered for the growing struggle waged for the protection of civil liberties. During these years the fear of Communism—from within and from without—in addition to the standardizing and controlling influences of our technological-material culture gained greater and greater force on the American scene. Bernard Rosenberg,58 in a study of attitudes of Americans in regard to Communism,
conformity and civil liberties, reported that, whereas most people are concerned with money and wealth, there is a noticeable degree of lack of anxiety about or apathy to the dangers of war, "the bomb," and the preservation of freedom. A characteristic attitude expressed was "we pay to have others worry for us."

This may be construed as a means of trying to escape the crisis of the times, a reaction to the "de-personalization of fate," to the realization that in many areas of living the individual cannot control his destiny. Coupled with this seeming indifference to and withdrawal from the dilemma of the times was the marked increase in political intolerance, anti-liberalism, religious conformity and lack of concern for the suppression of civil liberties, even among the educated. This study, made at the time of the "McCarthy hearings," indicated a very significant change in attitude and opinions when compared to similar studies made in 1943. An indicative finding was: "In this materialist-secular society, 60 per cent of the public favor removal from their libraries of books against religion, and 84 per cent would not allow the non-religious to teach in a college or university." On the other hand, 1954 witnessed the historic Supreme Court decision pertaining to school desegregation and the revitalization of the movement of the American Negro to actively fight for the civil rights afforded him by the Constitution.

The state of constant preparation and "readiness" for combat, ideological and military, which permeated American society since the beginning of World War II, produced what Lasswell refers
The final fact of war is likely to be less perilous than perpetual preparation for war. Perpetual crisis is likely to reverse the trend of historical development from progress toward a world commonwealth of free men, toward a world order in which the garrison-prison state reintroduces caste-bound social systems.

The internal consequences of militarization are gradual and far-reaching. Beginning as advisers of the civilian arm of government, soldiers and policemen gain stature even in states which possess strong traditions of civilian supremacy...

Hence it is inadequate to say that the dominant crisis of our time is socialism versus capitalism. More correctly, it is socialism and capitalism versus the garrison-prison state.

But a cold war is also a kind of war and, from the standpoint of the needs of a decent human society, a very destructive one. It carries forward the main objective of war, the imposition of the will of the victor on a beaten enemy, by methods of intimidation, espionage and propaganda with the threat of violence as its final reason, and the instruments at hand to make good that threat when the circumstances require it. To maintain the power position in which a cold war can successfully be waged and the attitude of mind that makes its prosecution the dominant concern of a civilized community to which all other interests are subordinated, is a taxing business. It costs a great deal economically, and it costs a great deal spiritually as well. For it perpetuates repressions, imperatives, and animosities of war as the settled policy for the preservation of peace. In so doing it profoundly alters the character of the peace we seek and the methods by which we seek it.

As intimated above, academic freedom, supporting unpopular views, having multiple loyalties, questioning the status quo—all aspects of the American thought-climate of the thirties—became suspect, as teachers lost their positions because of not taking loyalty oaths, as character was impugned by rumor and incidents from one's past, as "guilt by association" became tantamount to sedition and to even being a traitor in the eyes of many of the citizenry. Though a corrective process set in, it did not eradicate the scars of McCarthy and his confederates.
nor did it sap the strength of the resurgent "radical right."
The late fifties and the sixties were witness to the increasing popularity with "disenchanted" teenagers, having in many cases tacit if not open adult approval and encouragement, of such a group as the American Nazi Party; to the desecration of synagogues and cemeteries through vandalism and the painting of swastikas which became part of the American landscape; to anti-Negro feeling, which until 1963 came out into the open mainly in the South, but made itself felt and visible in the North as well as Negroes staged demonstrations, boycotts and sit-ins in their attack on educational, economic and social (housing, etc.) discrimination. The Negro riots of 1964, 1965, 1966, and 1967 only served to increase tensions and to produce, in many instances, a "white backlash." The call to "black power" (and its more militant spokesmen) served to consolidate the white community, including Jews who were then feeling the "black anti-Semitism" bred in the Negro "ghettos," especially in its struggle against "open housing" and school desegregation, implemented in many communities by the bussing of black school children and also the "reverse bussing" of whites into Negro communities.

Of late, the significant organized versions of the "radical right" have appeared in the John Birch Society and similar groups such as the American Independent Party (led by George C. Wallace) which polled ten million (13 per cent) votes in the 1968 presidential election. Among the tactics of groups such as the John Birch Society are censorship campaigns, the spreading of study and discussion groups, the distribution of
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Another ideological response to the crisis which faced us saw the always omnipresent undercurrent of anti-intellectualism present in twentieth century America becoming more prominent during World War II and in post-war America and taking on the garb of a "flight from reason."

The irrationalism which is the popular philosophy of the day is the appropriate expression of the state of mind this failure (our unsuccessful efforts at peace) has engendered and makes its own distinctive contribution to it. For it rationalizes our surrender to that failure as a kind of deeper knowledge of the ultimate limitations of human understanding and brings the resources of reason to the work of narrowing minds and deepening animosities in a disintegrating world... 64

The repudiation of reason was quite apparent in the early forties, and "moral relativism" found itself on the line of fire.

By 1940 the reaction against this philosophy was in full swing. It had suffered a fate which, for the relativist, is worse than refutation. It was out of date. Men were not notably more reasonable than they had been before, but they were more belligerent, and moral idealism came into its own again as an instrument of total war. If we are genuinely to be loyal to a cause that calls on us to sacrifice our private interests to a larger good, we must believe in it, in the moral authority of the ideals in which that good is made articulate, and the good faith of those who speak to us in their name. The vindication of the authority of such ideals as reasons is here a precondition for their reliable long run use as builders of morale. A philosophy that can offer such a justification seems pertinent, practical, profound. Even very important people hear it gladly. The time was ripe for the revival of ethical absolution, and ethical absolutism revived. 65
Blame for the "sterility and confusion of the times" was also put upon the shoulders of pragmatism. The James-Dewey tradition found itself being attacked for a multitude of sins. As would be expected, the "refutation of reason" manifested itself in the political-intellectual and religious arenas, likewise.

It is no longer considered important or exciting to assert that one is a liberal. Among the popular predicates of our time only such as these are deemed significant: "... is an existentialist," "... is anti-Communist." What has happened to the old idea that fighting social evils even on the most mundane level makes a crucial difference in our lives? Why is the liberalism of the thirties so unpopular and seemingly irrelevant today? Liberalism, we are generally and repeatedly reminded, is dying if not already dead.

The problem and program of liberalizing religion was, till very recently, exciting and important, challenging and relevant. It is easy to see why this should have been. Liberalism not only presented a sane, if not the sanest, political program, but is also allied itself with attitudes and beliefs most distinctive of the methods of science. It was, therefore, to be expected that men of religion should inquire about the conditions under which they could adopt the same attitudes in religious affairs, and seek to identify religion not with the traditional authoritarianism but with liberalism.

The solutions proposed were essentially two. One school took the major outlines of major religions for granted, and sought to introduce some changes from within. The other school seemed more radical. Members of this school inquired as to the possibility of making a fresh start. They almost wanted to make a religion out of liberalism.

Both programs were exciting and important, and much was said and can still be said in defense of them. But though this is true, the excitement about either of these programs seems, at the present moment, to be lacking. Discussions about liberal religion are but rarely carried on when they are it is with a stammer of embarrassment.

As the fifties have passed and the sixties have come upon us, two dominant world views seem to be competing for man's allegiance—on the one side stand the forces that champion social
and political democracy, social welfare, freedom of thought and of expression and multiple loyalties, progressivism and liberalism in all aspects of life, the perfectibility of man and the fundamentality of nature and reason, faith in science and in the future of mankind; on the other side stand the forces of cultural conservatism, unrestrained economic freedom and "rugged individualism," of faith in the supernatural and in metaphysical absolutes, of resignation to the "mystery and tragedy of life," of conformity and super-patriotism, emphasis on intuition and the irrational, of belief in man's sinfulness, distrust of science and of secular society. These two opposing camps seem to be in mortal conflict on the "American battlefield." "Unreason" (and its manifestations in all facets of life and thought), being the reactive and corrective ideology, is by far the more militant today and, in many areas, seems to be gaining more and more adherents in our "enlightened age."

In his pragmatic, scientific advance Western man was sure he was confronting and subduing an orderly universe. Reason and the mind could rule. Everything was predictable . . .

Thus religion was stripped of the symbols and curtains that guarded man from coming face to face with God . . .

Reason stripped religion of its irrationalities, and now reason is found to be wanting. It cannot grapple with the mighty forces in life which are irrational and unchanneled. They gather man in their embrace and demand of him that he submit, or know how to loose their hold . . .

Modern man is caught naked before God, because pragmatic reason, the forbidden fruit, was consumed before its limitation was understood. Reason is but a tool in search of God. He is understood better by feeling and experience, manifest in the revealed testimony of the sagacious ones . . .

The failure of man to understand is due to his relying
too heavily on scientific pragmatism...

...Awe, wonder, a sense of the holy, the capacity to feel and also the tool of reason can help us fashion rites and symbols from the past to clothe the nakedness of our spiritual impoverishment. Thus our quest into the area of the inexplicable and the phenomenal may commence anew.

Just as "reason" has been put on trial, so has "secularization" been condemned of late.

What is wrong with a secular culture? For those who have seen with the eyes of the spirit, a secular culture falsifies the world, for it ignores the highest level of significance in the drama of existence... Faith for living must be built of sterner stuff. It is significant that modern man with all his technical advances stands frightened at his fate. The commodity he seeks most is peace of mind. The most prevalent disease afflicting him is neurosis... We suffer from the inevitable consequences of a secularization of culture, fear of living.

Existentialism, as a philosophy of life and of religion, is now a most popular mode of thought, a most attractive response to the "over-secularization" and "over-rationalization" of our way of life, a most respectable solution to the "hyper-complexity of our impersonal civilization." To some, however, existentialism and other neo-orthodox formulas represent the perpetration of a hoax and an effort at delusion as they attempt to escape from rather than to grapple with reality and the complexity of the times.

Religion has never before in modern times faced the challenge now thrust upon it. The atomic age has ushered in a new interest in spiritual values, in theology, in the mysteries of the supernatural. A strange converging of circumstances has made it appear as if America were at present experiencing a religious revival...

And that morality is now identified with our present failures. It is no longer popular to speak of ethical relativism as the path to the better life. In its place now comes a return to absolutes, to law, to values that transcend
time and place. Enter then the theologians, harking back to Sinai’s revelation, eagerly unveiling a variety of neo-orthodoxies...

Fashionable theology today centers on man the sinner, man the atom, man in solitary dialogue with God, man in need of heavenly grace for personal redemption. Society, the community, are looked upon as false, vain and ephemeral. Religion’s business is confined to the salvation of the individual soul. Man can only despair of society...

Today’s theologian would also consider godless the suggestion that man can use his reason to improve the world into which he is born. It is now popular to be anti-intellectual, to deny reason its share in the human adventure. Over against reason is placed revelation, as the medium through which tiny man hears the intimation of the all-powerful, transcendent God...

What do the theological arguments reveal? Three things, at least. Scoffing at the social results of the "nineteenth century’s gospel of progress" and rejecting the possibilities of utopia, they resign themselves to the other extreme, preaching man’s incapability of improving himself. Looking at the moral monstrosities of the scientific age, they have been frightened by the prospects of freedom, and, in fear of its immoral and corrupt consequences, they turn their backs on both freedom and man. Denying man’s capacity at self-improvement and distrusting the motives of free men, they finally flee the world of things, to build the Godly society—which turns out to be no society at all, but a horde of individuals with every man under his own bomb shelter and none to make them afraid. Theology for the atomic age, indeed! Society has been atomized, split up into anti-social, self-concerned, fearful human beings.

No matter where one stands—in the rational-idealistic camp, in pragmatic-liberal camp, or in the existentialist camp—it must be admitted that a search for a renewed or completely original spiritual interpretation of life is going on, almost in the form of a desperate groping.

There is perhaps less meaning than meets the eye in the figures of American church membership. It is estimated that comprising over 60 per cent of the population, a larger percentage of the total population than at any time in the past century "belong". This represents a "return to religion" of some sort, but of what sort is far from clear. It could mean a new groping for faith as a compensation for the ugliness and danger of life. Or it might mean that in most American communities church membership is a
badge of social status, and that membership in them repre-
sents safety in a conformist, church-going society..."3

Concomitantly, a concern over the lack of spiritual values, or
indoctrination of such, in public education seems to have in-
simuated itself in the last decades into America's conscience
and consciousness. Bible-reading in the public schools, Federal
aid to parochial schools, "released-time" for supplementary re-
ligious education, etc. have become burning issues on the
American educational scene. 74

As indicated above, the struggle between scientific
experimentalism and the forces of responsible cultural change
versus absolutism and the forces of cultural conservation also
enlivened the non-religious education scene.

To understand this is to see in fresh perspective the
old battle of concepts that raged for a time between the
"progressive education" champions and the "Essentialists."
The way the issue is generally put is whether the community
is best served when the children are equipped with a precisely
drilled knowledge of the essential studies and tools (based
on the three Rs), or whether they learn best by relating
their learning to the culture and developing their capacities
for growth in the context of the living problems of their
day. 75

As this panorama of change, turbulence, rejection and
re-affirmation is reviewed and as radical groups and ideologies
of both the "right" and the "left" seem to be gaining strength
to the point that anarchy and rebellion (as preached by the Students
for a Democratic Societies, the Yippies, the Draft Resistance
movement and the various black militant groups dedicated to
change through violence, if necessary), and political assassina-
tion (John F. Kennedy, Martin Luther King, Robert F. Kennedy)
seem to have become significant characteristics of the "American
way of life," the complexity of the present situation seems somewhat overwhelming. However, viewing events in a developmental fashion and with historical perspective as well as looking at aspects of the whole and then turning to interrelationships tends to partialize the totality and make it more comprehensible.

In the context of the above analysis of currents and cross-currents and within the frame of reference established in this chapter, the American Jewish religio-cultural group—its characteristics, thought and behavior patterns—will be described in summary fashion (Chapter IV). General American progressive education, both historically and in the requisite areas of educational thought and endeavor, has been described and analyzed previously (Chapter I). Thus, the groundwork will have been laid for an investigation into the institution of Jewish education in America with especial emphasis upon the progressive tendency.

At first, aspects of the over-all Jewish educational process will be examined; then, they will be placed in socio-historical perspective as they relate to developments (during the period under consideration) in American life and in American Jewish life.
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Chapter IV

The Jew in American Society: Behavioral and Ideational Patterns

A most important element in this study must be an understanding of the American Jew—his status as a minority group member and his relationship to the majority culture, his institutions, communal structure and forms, his behavior and self-image, his attitude and relations with the State of Israel, and his diverse philosophies of Jewish life. One cannot attempt in this educational research project to present a detailed history of the American Jew during the first half of the 20th century. The effort to locate him, however, in the mainstream of American life, on the one hand, and within the flow and flux of Jewish history on the other, is a necessary step in the attempt to grasp his relationship with progressive education, both from the point of view of the professional Jewish educator and of the Jewish public. Needless to point out at this juncture is the connection between education and ideology as both motive force and rationalization. Thus, causes, movements, ideological forces—both secular and religious—must be fully comprehended in order to evaluate the development of the progressive orientation in American Jewish education, to whatever degree and of whatever quality it may have shown itself. A section dealing with these intangibles will be included after they are noted in general terms as participants in and products of the metamorphosis of Jewish life in the United States.

Sociology (Part A)

Much of what has been indicated in chapter III in regard to
American society is pertinent to appreciating the situation of the American Jew and the American Jewish community. Psychologically, self-definition requires identification with the "other" in order for differentiation to blossom forth. The "other" has been sufficiently dealt with in chapter III. Our main concern here is the degree and quality of uniqueness (as well as "sameness") exhibited by the American Jew in his interaction with the civilization heretofore discussed. With this purpose in mind, the present analysis must be viewed within the context of American life and thought as well as within the framework of modern Jewish history.

Today, the Jew in America is as "middle-class," if not more so, than any other distinguishable racial, religious or ethnic minority group in the United States.

Examining the classification of the Jewish labor force by occupation we find the major clusters to be around "clerical, sales, and kindred workers," "proprietors, managers, and officials," and "professional and semi-professional workers." The other classifications are apparently less significant for the Jewish population; on the other hand, population data for the United States show clerical work to be fourth in importance and professional positions seventh. Proprietorship ranks second generally... In more recent years proprietorship has been of first rank in virtually all of the Jewish population studies included here, with clerical occupations second and professional work in third position...²

In the 1930s about half of those American Jews who were immigrants were still workers; only a slightly larger proportion of the second generation were clerks, office workers, salesmen, and the like. However, fifteen years of prosperity from the end of the thirties to the mid-fifties have wrought great changes, and created the Jewish community we know today. The effect of these changes has been to raise the east European Jews--the
immigrants of 1880-1924, their children and grandchildren--more or less to the level previously achieved by the German Jews. These changes have wiped out most of the economic and occupational distinctions between the two elements, and along with other developments, have in large measure merged the two formerly distinct elements into a single community.

... Perhaps a majority of the younger generation is now composed of businessmen and professional men. This community of businessmen and professional men is better educated and as wealthy as some of the oldest and longest established elements in the United States...

... If we were to leave out such underprivileged groups... the Jewish advantages... would become less striking. If we were to compare Jews with Episcopalians and Presbyterians, we might find that the proportion of Jewish professionals was lower than that of professionals in these high status denominations...

... We have already shown how Jewish religion and culture and occupational experience fitted the Jewish immigrants for business and the professions; it should now also be pointed out that these non-manual occupations were expanding greatly during the period of the greatest Jewish immigration, and unskilled manual work and farming were employing a progressively smaller proportion of the labor force... Certainly this offered great opportunity to the Jews. But one had to be of the proper social and psychological constitution to take advantage of it--which the Jewish immigrants were. Hence, while America in general became more markedly middle-class in its occupational structure, Jews became even more so.

One of the great epics of American Jewish history is the rise of the masses from the "sweatshops" to middle-class rank. Its quantitative and qualitative aspects add up to one of the most notable achievements of any minority group in American history. Though Jews, as has already been intimated, may have had certain advantages over other minority groups in this struggle for higher-socio-economic status, their ascendancy was not without pain and frustration.

Another area of contact with American life--that of earning a living--was no less disappointing for the
immigrant. If he had any hope of making money or a comfortable living in the "golden country," he saw his dreams evaporate immediately on arrival. Although the percentage of skilled workers among the Jewish eastern European immigrants was considerable, they could not all be absorbed in their previous occupations: (1) peddling, and (2) factory work in clothing or other light industries. Either one meant hard work, poor pay, an activity which the worker was frequently unaccustomed to, and even, to a certain extent, degradation. At least at first, peddling involved carrying heavy packs, knocking at many doors, often being abused, and earning but a pittance. The clothing shops, and to some extent also the cigar "factories," often comprised dirty, overcrowded, badly lit and ventilated rooms, in which tens or hundreds of workers toiled in a speed-up system for fifteen or even eighteen hours a day. Earnings were little, payment being uncertain and irregular. 4

The tendency for American Jews to live predominantly in cities and to strive to provide a high level of general education for their offspring are also characteristics of significance. Demographically, these additional conclusions, obviously based on fragmentary data and scattered studies of varying degrees of reliability, 5 may be offered:

... It is clear that the Jewish population is, on the average, an older one than the general white population, and one that is replenishing itself at a rate slower than the general population. Yet it is fairly certain that Jews benefited from the recent spurt in the birth rate, although the growth in population for Jews was in all probability not as large as for non-Jews. It is also fairly evident that Jews are a predominantly urban people; those who go to the smaller towns evidently do so for the sake of a greater measure of economic independence. It may very well be that the latter, too, motivates to some degree the urge to have smaller families. Most of the indications are that Jews do tend to have fewer children than non-Jews.

On marital status, virtually all the data suggest that Jewish communities conform to the national pattern. There is some evidence, however, that the Jewish population has more widowed and fewer divorced and separated persons, although such a generalization is obviously affected by the proportion of older persons in the population, as is the case amongst Jews. ... 6
The preceding findings indicate a high degree of successful accommodation by the Jewish religio-cultural minority group to the American social structure and its overall social processes. This almost complete identification of the Jew with the dominant class of our society has had its price—just about every aspect of Jewish life has been affected by it. This was not always the case, however, since many Jewish families, as has been pointed out, were socio-economically lower class during the first decades of the century and retained a matrix of traditional eastern European Jewish values. This is not to imply that they may not have possessed characteristic middle-class values and the urge to become full-fledged members of the middle-class.

What is the relevance of the history of the new synagogue building to the movement of the age-grade generation system? The answer lies in the function of both the new and the old buildings as status symbols. The older building, in a lower class area, was associated with the phase of the Jewish community when it was concentrated in this area and was largely lower class in status. By 1932, however, the Jewish group was residentially scattered, and younger generations were, with few exceptions, in the middle class. If these young adults were to move into the community synagogue structure, it was necessary that it be housed in an edifice that had adequate status value.

The fact that Jews, as a group, were not only attracted by "middle-classism" but were eminently suited for the transition demanded of them by the emerging societal patterns must be taken into consideration as the development—-isolation, accommodation and acculturation; integration and assimilation—-of the American Jew is examined. All the positive and negative aspects of "middle-classism" discussed in chapter III must be kept in mind as this description unfolds. That traditional
thought and behavior patterns should be seriously questioned and, in many cases, rejected; that conflicts in values and mores should occur; that problems of marginality and self-identification should preoccupy the American Jew—all this is not surprising, especially when one keeps in mind the high degree of conflict and confusion present in American society in general.

On the one hand they seek further integration into the status-seeking segments of the larger American society; on the other hand, they want to preserve their group identity. The Jewish community structure reflects the difficulties the American Jews encounter in the efforts to compose the contradictions between these two tendencies. 8

Changes in family roles and relationships and deterioration of family cohesiveness, 9 an incidence of psychoneurotic disorders two-and-one-half times greater than that of the general population, 10 rising intermarriage rates, 11 increased numbers of Jewish juvenile delinquents, 12 a trend towards greater indulgence in "social drinking," 13 among many other similar phenomena in the social and psychological realms, seem to be indicative of the progressive and continuing acquiescence to "the tyranny of the majority culture." It is difficult not to view this natural and expected tendency with concern as one projects its outcomes upon the possibilities of creative Jewish survival in America. It would seem that, in his efforts to accommodate himself to his new environment, the American Jew has definitely become acculturated in all facets of his existence and has gone quite some way down the road to complete assimilation. 14 Being cognizant of the "lures" and pressures of modern American life (as described in chapter III), we can understand why any
ethnic group would tend to lose a good deal of its individuality as the years passed.

As the traditional image of American life has become blurred and confused, with the questioning and re-shaping of values and standards of behavior, taste, and thought, so we find the American Jew not impervious to the forces and trends at work in American society. The question then arises as to how (in what ways and to what degree) the American Jew has in the past and is continuing in the present to express his individuality and uniqueness. In what ways has he attempted to integrate his "difference" into the mainstream of American life? Finally, how is it that he has been able to retain his quasi-cultural singularity whereas other ethnic-cultural groups have not been able to do so?

All the factors of Jewish accommodation in the United States have been such that, when operative among other ethnic groups, they have had a disintegrating effect. These factors should have had the same effect for the Jews, had their development been governed by the same "laws" as shaped the history of the other ethnic groups in this country. . . For one thing, their greater capacity for merging with the general economic stream and for swifter upward social mobility should have evoked a decidedly stronger urge to dissolve their group within the larger American society. At the same time, the extreme social, cultural and religious fragmentation of the Jewish community should have weakened its resistance to the pressure of disintegrating forces. Had the Jew followed the same lines of development as the other white ethnic groups in the United States, their assimilation should have been speedier and more complete.

Has this been the case? Have they indeed become assimilated faster than other groups? Are they becoming assimilated at least to the same extent as others? Is the Jewish group tending, in the course of time, to disappear entirely? The answer to all these questions is--No. And therein lies the uniqueness of the Jews in America. This makes the Jewish community a singular phenomenon,
Unlike every other white ethnic group in the country. If this uniqueness persists, the Jews will prove to be the only ethnic group not to have lost its distinctive collective identity within the American melting pot.\textsuperscript{15}

The American Jew's uniqueness should not be taken to mean that he is innately superior or that he possesses "choseness." The basic attribute of the concept of "uniqueness," as utilized here, is the Jew's "difference" or "group individuality." In a democratic society, such as ours, "difference" is natural and positive, and apologetics are uncalled for and out of place.\textsuperscript{16} The problem of Jewish survival becomes, thusly, a question of how and to what degree can Jews, as a religio-cultural minority group, retain their "difference," legitimately and in the spirit of American democracy. The problems of anti-Semitism and the acquisition of full civil equality become, in this light, questions of how and to what degree has American society and its various cultural and religious sub-groups responded to the Jews' "difference." Have the Jews been completely and unequivocally accepted as equals with the "dominant" groups? Have they been victims of discrimination because of their different religious and cultural traits? Have they been maligned and vilified as "outsiders" and "foreigners"? Has there been a trend or direction in regard to the Jews' relationship to American society as-a-whole?\textsuperscript{17}

Anti-Semitism has always been present in the United States during the period under consideration,\textsuperscript{18} and full political, economic and social equality is still to be attained by the American Jew.\textsuperscript{19} During the period from 1904 to 1924, as a result of the great waves of eastern
European Jews settling in America, the increasing "visibility" of the Jews, in terms both of numbers and of distinctiveness of dress, behavior, domicile, and religious tradition, became a stimulus for anti-Semitic and discriminatory responses on the part of the white Christian majority.

If this sense of difference did not develop into violent hostility, the more subtle forms of anti-Semitism were already taking root in American soil. The forms of social discrimination established by the upper classes were spreading, and their repercussions were beginning to be felt in the professions. Jewish lawyers were barred from the leading law firms. Jewish doctors were refused places on hospital staffs. Jewish instructors were denied promotion on college faculties long after less able Gentile colleagues had gained recognition. Certain bank and bond houses were difficult of access to Jews, for success depended on social mixing after business hours. The man who could not cultivate a customer over a dinner table, or on the golf course, was simply not eligible for the job.

But the spread of anti-Jewish discrimination in the cities and the identification of the Jews with urban and financial America in the rural areas were ominous developments. Already, some astute observers were beginning to realize that an acute social crisis might turn latent prejudice into overt and serious hatred.

That crisis came with the World War. The hysteria and passions aroused by the war created an atmosphere in which dormant prejudice was transformed into active hostility. Blind hatred of the enemy led masses of people to suspect anyone associated even remotely with Germany or German things.

Anti-Semitism was given even greater impetus by the disillusionment of the post-war era and the fears of Bolshevism that the Russian Revolution had aroused.

As has been pointed out heretofore, the economic and political uncertainties of the inter-war period and of the post-World War II period kept anti-Semitism, both latent and organized, alive in American society. However, since the end of World War II, as a result of anti-discrimination legislation at local, state and federal levels, as a response to the legal
and educational efforts of such Jewish "defense" organizations as the Anti-Defamation League of the B'nai Brith and the American Jewish Committee, and with the growth of a vital concern for better inter-
group relationships among the various religious and racial groups in American society--anti-Semitism has had a decreasingly less demoraliz-
ing effect upon Jewish-Gentile relations and has become less widespread
and blatant than in the past. Though Jewish stereotypes and the religious
roots of anti-Semitism still exist, the Jew has been granted greater,
but not complete, economic and political equality. As Jews, both
purposely and unconsciously, have abandoned the traditional behavior,
dress, language and values transferred to America by the eastern
European immigrant, they have become more and more like the "dominant"
white Protestant in all facets of life. As the Jew has interacted and worked
with his Christian neighbor, he has gained greater acceptance if not
complete social equality.

Nonetheless, whether because of latent distrust of the Jew on
the part of the Christian or because of the desire of the Jew for ethnic
solidarity, residential isolation, or total acceptance (which can only be
had among his own co-religionists)--the Jew has, in most instances,
chosen or has been forced to remain apart, thus perpetuating an under-
current of suspicion and the lack of unqualified acceptance on the part of
many non-Jews. Even in "contemporary suburbia" discrimination and
anti-Semitism raise their head though assuredly in a less open form than
prior to World War II and the mass murder of the European Jew.
Although overt anti-Semitism is not a serious problem in suburbia today, one may intermittently detect latent indications of an unfavorable attitude toward Jews. It may show in a surly reply to an innocent question or in a real estate broker's attempt to divert a Jewish client from looking at a house for sale in a particular neighborhood. On occasion it takes the form of a teacher's comment to a pupil about "your kind." Dislike of the unlike is universal even if it is officially frowned upon. Yet nothing resembling the virulent, bitter anti-Semitism of pre-World War II days appears to exist in suburbia today.

Though the Jew's group-cohesiveness and attachment to traditional Jewish values and behavior patterns has been victim of the diverse influences and pressures present on the American scene, the Jew has managed to retain his distinctiveness if not his complete individuality. The existence of anti-Semitism--hidden and undisguised, social and organized--is not a sufficient reason for the continuation and increase of American Jewish creativity and communal effort, as minimal as this may be when viewed within the total scope of Jewish history. As vapid and sterile as Jewish life may seem, especially when compared to the eastern European shtetl or to the great periods of Babylonian and Spanish Jewish creativity, it still astonishes sociologists and advocates of "America as a melting pot." The "artifacts" of American Jewish creative survival may be categorized and classified for analysis' sake as those reflected in (1) the growth of communal institutions and community organization; (2) Jewish cultural productivity and educational effort; (3) the development of religious institutions and varieties of American Judaism; (4) the struggle to establish a Jewish state in Palestine and the reality of its presence in the American Jew's "life-space." Finally, there are less tangible manifestations of thought-patterns and ideological tendencies, on the one hand,
and varying modes of the Jewish self-image, on the other, which must be identified and discussed.

Since 1910, and even before, the evolution of the American Jewish community witnessed the increasing influence of the eastern European Jewish immigrant as well as the growth of many institutions created to fill a number of divergent needs. This period also can boast of tendencies toward more efficient and effective operation of agencies as well as toward the fostering of a better coordinated and organized overall Jewish community.

The influx of east European Jews after 1880 added to the complexity in community organization. The landsmanschaft synagogue was the first communal institution introduced by this group, and the early heder, or school, was usually attached to the synagogue. But, like their predecessors, the east European Jews quickly expanded beyond the synagogue. They established non-congregational fraternal associations, hospitals, orphan asylums and similar agencies. Economic needs brought trade unions and mutual benefit societies into existence.

It should also be noted that the term "east European Jews" embraces a wide variety of background and orientation, and that this has been reflected in American Jewish community organization. Natives of the Ukraine, of Lithuania, Poland, Galicia, Rumania, etc., naturally tended to perpetuate Old-World associations. What is more, European ideological differences, which became acute in eastern Europe at the turn of the century, were brought over into this country. There were religionists, secularists, Zionists, socialists, and not a few variants within these broad groupings, and each sought to close its ranks and attract new adherents by means of fraternal orders, relief agencies and educational projects.

These diverse influences did not remain static. European factors, themselves in a constant state of change, continued to be imported with every shipload of immigrants. At the same time, the dynamic force of the American environment was increasingly felt.
Americanized Jews faced novel problems and needs which necessitated the modification of old institutions or the creation of new ones.

The great variety of parallel and, at times, contradictory interests and needs, which the different layers of the Jewish population have experienced, account for the complexity of the Jewish communal structure of today...  

Religious institutions, as has been mentioned above, were most important to the expanding Jewish community. Though the early years of the period saw many small, neighborhood synagogues thrive and flourish, during the twenties a trend away from mass orthodoxy and the supremacy of shtetl institutions was quite obvious. Thus, the growth and increasing popularity of the Conservative and Reform movements became the major development in Jewish religious life as the religionist-secularist controversy raged and grew into a burning issue in American Jewish life.

These latter two movements, were organized (both at the rabbinic and lay levels) into national associations and could look with pride at a central rabbinic institution as their "fountainheads." Such was not the case, and still is not the case, with Orthodoxy which has provided a proliferation of synagogue, rabbinical and rabbi-training institutions for its followers. The Synagogue Council of America, made up of lay and rabbinical representatives of the major interpretations and movements of American Judaism, has come into being and has gained prominence during this period. 25

In the field of Jewish education, the heder, Talmud Torah and Yeshivah were the institutional prototypes transferred to the United States and developed by the east European Jew. Later, the three-day-a-week
congregational school and the day school became popular agencies for
conveying and transmitting the heritage. Also, the Jewish summer camp,
the Zionist or religious youth group, the "pre-school" nursery and Gan,
the systems and associations of community-sponsored schools (Talmud
Torahs, Sunday schools, Yiddish-secular schools, etc.), or inter-
congregational high schools and community-sponsored regional high
schools, teacher-education institutions and schools of higher Jewish
learning, bureaus of Jewish education, national religious education
commissions have come to dot the multi-colored Jewish educational
horizon. Community subvention, coordination, and planning of educational
programs and services have also become important on the Jewish
educational scene. 26

The all-encompassing Jewish community center, a social,
recreational and educational institution of a relatively secular nature,
mirrors in its development the changing needs of American Jewry. As
a settlement house or a YM-YWHA, Americanization and informal education
were of paramount importance. As the years passed and Jews became
acculturated, more middle-class and, even later, suburban, and more
accepting of their Jewish identity--group survival values became of
greater significance as did the enhancement of buildings, facilities, and the
variety and quality of services offered. 27

With the onset of the eastern European immigration, a multitude
of cultural institutions--newspapers, periodicals, the Yiddish theatre,
commercial publishing houses as well as the Jewish Publication Society,
YIVO and, of late, the National Foundation for Jewish Culture—came into being. Lately, the novel in English on Jewish themes has replaced the Yiddish and Hebrew literature that had been produced earlier. The great problem today seems to be to create a demand and a market for Jewish creativity in literature, art, music and the dance. The allure of Israeli artistic products does not obviate the problem of creating and sustaining indigenous taste and Jewish productivity in the arts. Another type of organization which came into being and became prominent on the Jewish scene was the so-called "defense agency" such as the Anti-Defamation League of the B'nai Brith. National fraternal orders such as the B'nai Brith, which was organized in the mid-19th century by German Jews, played a significant role, though one decreasing in importance, in the inter-war and post-World War II period. The Landsmanschaft, originally a vital and pivotal organization, also fell victim to changing community patterns and currents in the general and Jewish environment. Philanthropic and welfare agencies for immigrant aid, the sick, the aged, the care of disturbed and orphan children, the troubled family, the occupationally handicapped, and for overseas relief and the upbuilding of Erets Yisrael were supported and developed into an efficient and comprehensive network of self-help organizations and institutions. A proliferation of Zionist organizations—Zionist Organization of America, Mizrachi, Labor Zionist, Revisionist, etc.—blossomed forth and gained many adherents among American Jewry during the inter-war period. These organizations offered financial and political support to the emerging State of Israel as well as encouraging positive Jewish identification, cultural activity,
Jewish education, and even Aliyah on the part of the American Jew. 32

The following trends and developments in respect to the organized American Jewish community—structure, organization, growth of specific institutions, priorities and spirit, etc.—were visible during the period under consideration:

1. A sense of responsibility for fellow Jews in America and throughout the world was present.

2. The presence of dynamic leadership and the willingness of Jews to create and give willingly for the support of a multitude of institutions became evident.

3. The community picture was beclouded by the existence of a great amount of duplication of services and of institutional hostility and competition.

4. An emerging trend was the tendency to employ professionally-trained personnel to handle those duties and responsibilities which were once assumed by lay volunteers. There has been an ensuing improvement in the quality of service rendered which has resulted from the professional training and skill of those employed. At the same time, the layman has become more detached from the actual rendering of service and plays the less rewarding role of board member or patron.

5. Attempts, both successful and unsuccessful, have been made to coordinate communal activity for the sake of communal peace and cooperation, thus lessening duplication and serving the needs of the community more effectively and efficiently. The most successful areas
of achievement have been in the areas of fund-raising for community-supported agencies, control of agency finances by a central fund-raising agency and planning for expansion of facilities and services.

6. An important factor in the development of direction, priorities and the overall character of the organized Jewish community has been the increased affluence and influence of the eastern European Jew and his more affirmative ethnic-civilizational consciousness as well as his respect for traditional Jewish values and practices.

7. With the emergence of the eastern European Jew as a force to be reckoned with in the Jewish community, a slowly-progressing trend toward the democritization of communal planning and decision-making has been prevalent.

8. In the post-World War II years, the synagogue and synagogue-related national agencies and institutions have played a much greater role in Jewish community life than the comparatively more secular institutions such as fraternal orders, Jewish community centers, bureaus of Jewish education, labor unions, Yiddish communal schools, philanthropic organizations and Zionist organizations (especially since 1948), etc.

As is indicated in the above summary, the organized Jewish community is faced with many serious problems:

1. There is a need to place money and power in proper perspective as they come to influence values, planning for the future, Jewish survival, community needs and priorities.

2. The struggle between organized religious institutions and more
secular interests and institutions and between survivalist interests (Jewish education, etc.) and purely philanthropic interests is divisive and is the source of many obstacles hindering healthy community growth in the spirit of Kelal Yisrael.

3. The coordination and integration of metropolitan and suburban services and agencies is becoming an immensely important task as suburbia expands and Jews move from urban to suburban communities. 33

4. Intelligent, non-partisan planning to meet the needs of the entire Jewish community and supported by the total Jewish community is a desideratum.

5. The role of many private welfare agencies is being usurped by public agencies. That the Jewish community should continue to perpetuate services adequately handled by public agencies saps community strength and financial resources.

6. An adequate Jewish orientation for many professionals working in the Jewish community is still lacking. A significant number have no or little Jewish education and espouse a "non-committed" if not negative attitude towards creative Jewish survival in this country.

7. The concept of Tzedakah as mutual responsibility and self-help rather than of charity for the poor and unfortunate must be driven home especially in our affluent, depersonalized society.

8. The democratization of the community is still at an infantile level. Much must be done to educate those who contribute to its maintenance as to how and for what their funds are being utilized. Communal leaders must broaden their vistas, respect differences and loyalties and lead with vigor,
vision and humility.

With all the apparent weaknesses enumerated above it cannot be denied that the development of Jewish communal institutions and the attempts at organization and cooperative effort has been one of the most impressive manifestations of the will of American Jewry to survive and has influenced the entire tone and framework of Jewish life in America.

Probably the most crucial issue relating directly to Jewish educational efforts during the past five decades is that of how the Jew has viewed himself as a Jew in a free, open society. During the epoch in which the ghetto and its psychology dominated Jewish life, for most Jews points of reference in regard to self-identity were few, fixed and stable. A definite pattern of relationships with the outside world was circumscribed and, in most cases, adhered to. Deviants were looked upon in many instances as heretics and were often excommunicated or ostracized from participating in community life. However, with the dawn of the age of equality and individual liberty which followed, the world of the Jew became changed and ever-changing. Objects of identification became different and far more numerous. A degree of choice as to the quantity and quality of Jewishness one wanted to espouse became a freeing reality for some and a confusing reality for others. With choice came the need for decisions, the weighing of alternatives and the conflict of values.

How Jews felt about themselves as people and as Jews, about other Jews and about the majority group and other minority groups took
on added significance as factors to be taken into consideration in understanding the individual Jewish psyche as well as group attitudes and behavioral trends. Both the internalized and the objective attitude of the majority group toward Jews became factors in the search by Jews for fulfillment as individuals and as a people. In many instances, the free, mobile, seemingly egalitarian society as exists in the United States served only to accentuate the potential ambiguity of position of the Jew and to bring about an ambivalence of feeling toward himself, his heritage and way of life, toward fellow Jews and toward the non-Jewish majority.

It is to this dilemma, in addition to that of the transmission of the Jewish heritage, that Jewish education addresses itself today. It attempts, with varying degrees of skill and success, to help the Jew know why he is a Jew and why he should continue to be a Jew. It attempts to create within the young Jew an inner security in being a Jew and a healthy Jewish self-image. The dimensions of the problem of the American Jewish self-image, both individual and corporate, are many and varied. The implications of the varied alternatives for a self-image give to Jewish life both its many-sidedness and pluralistic nature as well as its ambivalence and divisiveness. To some, the picture has been so obscured and so incomprehensible that they have chosen to separate themselves from the Jewish community, officially by conversion, but most often, tacitly by rejecting totally their Jewishness.

As has been mentioned before, the confrontation of the transplanted "shtetl culture" by modern American life with its emphasis on technology and secular pursuits not only caused great strain and tension within the
immigrant family but threatened the survival of the traditional Jewish way of life--its values, beliefs and practices.

Contact with a virile and attractive civilization, far more attractive, certainly, than the civilization of Poland and Russia, rapidly dissipated old religious loyalties. Life in the big city, too, was much freer from religious supervision than it had been in the little shtetl of the Pale. Indeed, the very speed with which eastern European Jews abandoned all but nominal loyalty to Orthodox Judaism cast doubt upon the original genuineness of their personal piety; most of them probably were simply following the conventional mores of the society in which they lived.

The impact of American secularism was largely responsible, too, for the decline of religious observance among the second generation of Russian-Jewish immigrants. After the first World War organized religion in general suffered a perceptible diminution of strength in the United States. The churches were gradually abandoned for a variety of Sunday morning recreational activities. Agnosticism was common enough to go largely unnoticed. People who attended devotional services regularly did so more in response to social convention than out of religious conviction. In the case of immigrant Jewish children, Judaism brought reminders of the ugliness of the Old World.

The period from 1910 to the late 1930's was distinguished by the vitality of Jewish secular and quasi-religious institutions and movements--the Jewish communal school, the Jewish labor movement, the Yiddish Folk movement (Yiddish press, literature, theatre, etc.), the Federation and Jewish center movements, central community agencies for Jewish education, etc. Zionism, liberalism and socialism became expressions of Jewishness which were relatively secular in character. "Cultural pluralism," ethnic individuality and Jewish nationalism and peoplehood were the watchwords of the Jewish religio-cultural group, or at least of its survivalist wing. The quest for the adaptation of Jewishness, in all
its ramifications, rather than of Judaism, as a religious way of life, was the crucial problem in the minds of the survival-oriented leadership. Theology and religious commitment via synagogue attendance, daily prayer and home practices (Kashrut, etc.) were considered secondary by the majority of Jews to the broader commitment to the Jewish people through time and space--its history, historic homeland, its ethical and social aspirations, its literature, music and art, etc. The avenues and modes of expression of one's Jewishness were seen to be many and more or less of equal worth, except of course to the Orthodox and to the religionists of other interpretations of Judaism. Freedom and individual choice, rather than conformity and loyalty to a specific institution, as means, symbols and methods of positive Jewish identification, were accepted by most Jews during the inter-war period. It cannot be denied that secularism, if by secularism is meant the decreasing influence of religious values in daily life and the loss of prestige and "centrality" of the synagogue as well as the loss of the authority of Talmudic law, was the dominant "motif" of pre-World War II Jewish life. 38 The great enemy of the synagogue, as the sole repository of the Jewish religious spirit--as the religionists emphatically felt--was the secularism and materialism that had infested the American Jewish community. 39 However, the trend away from organized Jewish religion definitely came to an end with the onset of German anti-Semitism, World War II and the destruction of European Jewry (late 1930's and early 1940's).
The post-war period was one of rapid change and re-appraisal on the part of the Western world and of American society. The implications of genocide—the liquidation of millions by the Nazis, the actual use and potential destructiveness of the atomic and hydrogen bomb—seemed to demolish the faith and optimism in the goodness of man and the humaneness of society. By the mid 30's the American Jew had already become concerned with the effects of anti-Semitism on the Jewish group and upon the individual Jewish personality, but the destruction of European Jewry was a sobering as well as a shocking reality which seemed to bring to focus the problems pertaining to one's identification as a Jew in an open, seemingly secular, technological and business-centered, affluent society. The increased acculturation of the Jewish community as a whole, the preponderant number of Jews identifying themselves with the upper middle-class and its values, the growth of Jewish suburbia, and the rise of the State of Israel all contributed to a growing confusion as to the Jew's status in American society.

The most sociologically acceptable solution to the nature of Jewishness and its practice on the American scene was the Jewish version of the so-called "return to religion" that characterized the post-war Western world. What this "return" actually has meant and what motivations are behind this seeming re-affirmation of the central position of religion in Jewish life are still open to question and debate. The forms which this "return" has taken have had their disturbing or seamy side. Most sociologists and many theologians and educators have also recognized the superficiality of this widespread phenomenon and have seriously questioned
the piety and degree of religious commitment of those "seeking salvation." Nonetheless, increased synagogue affiliation and the greater number of children attending Jewish elementary, day schools and intensive supplementary high schools as well as those participating in Jewish youth groups, attending Jewish summer camps and spending a summer or a year in Israel was a fact that could not be denied and seemed to contribute positively to continued Jewish survival in America. Needless to say, the assimilated Jewish intellectual and the "unidentified" Jew found little solace in this "return" or "revival" and continued to stay away from the synagogue.

The chief benefactor of the "return" seems to have been the Conservative movement, though Reform and Orthodoxy have also benefited in terms of increased numerical strength. Semi-intensive Jewish education—the three day-a-week congregational religious school, the Hebrew-oriented summer camp, the religious youth group, the summer study-trip to Israel—became a definite compromise approach to Jewish education and an avenue of increased Jewish consciousness and identification as traditional Judaism has become viable to increased numbers via Conservative garb.

If statistics are to be used as an indicator, the secularist surge in Jewish life, beginning with the Haskalah and ending with the destruction of European Jewry, seems on the surface to have become contained by the forces of organized Jewish religion and those that champion the centrality of the synagogue in Jewish life. Nevertheless, as a counterpart of the American "religion in the secular society dilemma", an ambiguity and conflict still exists, and who is actually "winning" is still open to question. Whether or not the "new religion" and its related institutions are in reality
responsive to the emerging needs (not the current whims) of American Jewry is also open to question. The fact is that a high degree of narrowing identification and parochialism, as contrasted with the previously broader identification with Judaism and the Jewish people, has become evident. Institutional maintenance and lasting identification has become a most important, if not the most important goal, to American synagogue leadership. While the various movements seem to become more strongly entrenched and antagonistic toward each other and toward the "non-synagogue" Jew, the differentiating characteristics of the constituents are becoming more and more indistinguishable.

Differences of opinion as to the nature of Jewishness and priorities for Jewish survival have brought into being a plethora of "solutions" and "programs." Indeed, the heated ideological controversies are evidence of concern, at least at the leadership level. However, they also reflect the dilemma of American Jewish existence. It is the contention of the author that this "dilemma" and "controversy" and the proposed "panaceas" with their articulated and unexpressed presuppositions definitely influence all aspects of the Jewish educational process. Thus, a presentation of the major alternatives and philosophies of Jewish life is a necessity as one attempts to interpret the role of progressivism in Jewish education in the past six decades.
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Ideologies of American Jewish Life (Part B)

A definitive statement as to the genesis, meaning, purposes and significance of ideological trends in general and, more specifically, as they have become visible in twentieth century American society has already been made. The possible functions of ideological trends of thought as they pertain to a religio-cultural minority group, in this case American Jewry, have also been alluded to previously. At this point a question should be posed as to why ideological tendencies must be identified in studying the American Jewish educational process. Conversely, can the panorama of American Jewish educational endeavor be understood without taking into consideration the various ideological schools of thought at work in the American Jewish environment? The import of ideological stance vis à vis the educational program of the Jewish school is brought to our attention by Pilch and Ben-Horin in their anthology, Judaism and the Jewish School. Ben-Horin, in discussing the nature of the essays presented as they pertain to the philosophy of Jewish education, astutely and with candor recognizes the existing reality:

To formulate the function of the school qua school is the office of educational philosophy. American Jewish educators have paid little if any attention to this discipline. Instead, they have given us a variety of conclusions about Judaism known as "trends" or "versions" or "movements" and varieties of prescriptions for the schools' subject matter and method.

Despite the many hymns sung to education's role in preserving Judaism and rendering it worthwhile, it is not the school and the teaching profession which make basic policy decisions about the course of either our communities or our
of political Zionism and the subsequent, perhaps consequent, failure of Zionist ideologies and parties. Although secularism, religionism and Zionism have been the fundamental ideational patterns at work during this period, such a categorization must not preclude the intermingling of ideational strands into broader ideological positions such as:

(a) a unifying, broadly inclusive ideology that has made its presence felt in both the religious and secular realms, e.g., Zionism;

(b) secular ideologies exhibiting religio-spiritual characteristics, e.g., the Yiddish-Culturalist, Zionist-Socialist and Hebraic-Nationalist expressions of Jewish-nationalism as well as ideologies emphasizing socio-cultural characteristics, e.g., cultural pluralism, the culture of organizations;

(c) religious ideologies exhibiting secular influences to varying degrees:

(1) theistic-supernaturalistic varieties such as Orthodox, Conservative and Reform Judaism; rationalist religious beliefs;

(2) humanistic-naturalistic varieties such as Reconstructionism.

This point is of extreme importance in attempting to define progressivism’s impact upon Jewish education. It has been pointed out in chapter II that progressivism is not anti-religious or even anti-theistic even though it is unfriendly to authoritarian, absolutist, esoteric doctrines. Before proceeding to describe the three major ideological
stances being considered, an effort must be made to differentiate between the religious and secular Weltanschauungen, even though a continuum, with positions of polarity rather than an actual dichotomy, seems to afford a better diagnosis of the phenomenon.

With the onset in central and western Europe of the Industrial Revolution and the beginnings of democratic government as well as the ensuing emancipation of central and western European Jewry and the separation of church and state, the increased secularization of the life of most Jews in that section of Europe became an unavoidable reality. Science and reason became more and more the framework for interpreting man's existence and development at the expense of the omnipotence of a consummate, indefectable, supernatural God and unquestioning faith in His teachings. This is not to state that this transformation has been total and all-pervasive. What it does mean to imply is that a creative tension has come to exist between religious and secular worldviews in all societies in which religious institutions have been allowed to vie with secular institutions and values for the allegiance of the citizenry. Thus, while secularization has weakened the hold that traditional western religions have had over the masses, including the Jewish masses, it has allowed religious institutions to exist and, at certain times and in certain places, to grow and to flourish. In a society in which both the religious and the secular have validity, it is not surprising to note evidence of polarization of points of view and of subsequent strife as a reflection of the conflict of value systems within the society. This controversy and contention usually has found articulation at the ideological level and has been a concern.
of the committed leadership and the sensitive intellectual.

Taking all matters into consideration as Jewish secular ideologies are compared to Jewish religious ideologies, it is more proper to indicate configurations of differential emphasis and focus rather than patterns of strident opposition and complete disparity. As indicated previously, a continuum of schools of thought may best encompass the many variations that have competed for the loyalty of twentieth century American Jewry.

Jewish religious ideologies have at their core the concepts of God, Torah, and Israel. Various interpretations may view these constants somewhat differently, but they remain central and omnipresent in the religious worldview. All aspects of the life of the Jew—theological, ethical, ritual; personal, family, social, economic—fall potentially within the purview of the religious. The believing and practicing Jew can find meaning in life and a solution to problems of individual and corporate existence within the religious framework.

In addition, with variations reflecting the differential impact of secular attitudes, most (but not all) versions exhibit (1) a degree of authoritarianism and dogmatism in the area of belief, (2) a code or program of ritual and ethical practice, (3) a tendency to interpret life and death in the parlance of extra-natural and eternal verities, and (4) a tendency to deprecate or minimize the significance of science, reason and experience as keys to interpreting man's situation and to elevate faith, emotion and mystery as the clues to human salvation.

In contradistinction Jewish secular ideologies have at
their core the Jew as man, the Jewish community and the society of which it is a part, Jewish culture and the Jewish people. Some significant extensions of this worldview, though they may not be applicable to all Jewish secular ideologies, are (1) the validity of cultural multiversity, pluralism, and differences, (2) in some extreme cases, the championing of atheism, anti-religionism and anti-clericalism and in other cases identifying with socialist, communist and anarchist doctrines, (3) "Judaism" as Jewish religion being only one of many expressions of Jewishness, (4) the need for freedom of inquiry into the meaning of Jewish existence, (5) the acceptance of a rational, naturalistic, pragmatic, scientific, humanistic and democratic approach in finding meaning in contemporary Jewish life and in understanding its complexities, (6) a tendency to value highly the use of intelligence and experience as instruments to aid in bringing about human progress and the solution to the problem of creative Jewish survival, and (7) an acceptance of uncertainty, hypothesis, experiment and tentative solution as aspects of the continuing quest for Jewish self-fulfillment.

In the estimation of some, Zionism has been the most vital issue in twentieth-century Jewish life. As an ideology its antecedents go back as far as the Babylonian Exile in 586 B.C.E. However, as a modern, international, national-political movement its history has been relatively short—from the 1890’s (Herzl’s "political Zionism" and the ensuing Zionist Congresses) to the
establishment of the independent State of Israel in 1948. One historian goes so far as to assert that Zionism has been "the national religion of the Jews of America" during the twentieth-century.\(^9\) Zionism, as a broadly inclusive twentieth-century ideology, has exhibited a variety of goals and aspirations. Most tangible have been the strivings for the upbuilding of Erets Yisrael, the establishment of a Jewish State in Palestine, and, finally, actual physical re-settlement (Aliyah) in Israel of the American Jew, on the one hand, and the less threatening and more expedient relocation in Erets Yisrael of persecuted and homeless Jews throughout the world, on the other. The "ingathering of the exiles" and the "negation of the Galut (Diaspora)" themes have contributed to the emphasis on the personal, physical fulfillment of the Zionist ideal.

However, from the point-of-view of the American Jewish community, other, if somewhat more subtle, implications of Zionist ideology seem more significant. Zionism has represented that ideology which has contributed most to revitalizing the Jewish people. Taking its cue from Pinsker and Ahad Ha-Am rather than from Herzl and Nordau, American Zionism, as ideology in action, has stimulated the spiritual and cultural revival of the Jewish religious-cultural group. It has enabled alienated Jews to positively identify with their Jewishness and has, thus, fought heroically against inroads of mass assimilation and group-suicide. It has helped reestablish a feeling of Kelal Yisrael among the Jews of America and has encouraged the revitalization of the Hebrew and Yiddish languages and their literatures as well as of the Jewish performing and
plastic arts. In so doing Jewish ethnic-cultural continuity has been fostered. But, since these accomplishments are primarily secular in nature, it still remains to substantiate Zionism's status as a broadly inclusive ideology, one encompassing the religious as well as the secular expressions of Jewish life in America.

Though Zionism has been accused of being the secularized version of the Jewish religion, such an over-simplification does grave injustice to Zionist ideology. Zionism, as such, has never been anti-religious. In fact, it has manifested an affinity for the Jewish religio-cultural milieu whence it developed as an affirmation of traditional attitudes, as a reaction to anti-Semitism, and as a response to nationalistic strivings spawned in 19th-century Europe. In America, all versions of Judaism, with the exception of the extreme hasidic and the transplanted Agudist movements (Fundamentalist variants of Orthodoxy) and the radical American Council for Judaism (the militant anti-Zionist faction within Reform), have in one manner or another and at differing junctures in their development incorporated elements of Zionist ideology into their own particular ideal conceptions and practical programs for Jewish life in America.

In addition, as has been intimated, all secular movements, excepting the extreme assimilationists and some radical laborite groups, have espoused the Zionist cause, also. Though Zionism has been mainly a middle-class movement and has lacked an intellectual elan in America, it still has represented the one most unifying ideology on the American Jewish scene. It has overcome class and religious differences in the name of Jewish peoplehood and Jewish cultural variety and has served as a positive force to fill the void.
present during the inter-war period when "Judaism as religion" was at low ebb. What does the future hold for Zionism as a unifying ideology (and/or movement)? One authority states:

Whatever the reasons for this change of heart, it is sufficient here to record the fact that from the 1920s and 1930s to about 1950, there was a vital Jewish community in America, founded not in traditional religious faith, but in Zionist hope transformed into national religion. This was the nearest the American Jewish community has ever come to complete unity. What will replace Zionism as a focus of unification—indeed, whether another such focus will ever arise—only the future can reveal.

A prominent Zionist historian-sociologist predicts:

It is inconceivable to me that American Jewry will continue to maintain itself without the concept of peoplehood, or with a concept of Jewish peoplehood so limited as to preclude direct, individual and communal relations with Israel Jewry. Without Jewish culture patterns along folk lines, without a strong ingredient of Hebraic civilization in the face of the continued American and Christian acculturation and Jewish deculturation, Jewish survival in America becomes highly problematical. To such survival, Zionism as an idea and a movement has a great deal to contribute. It will have to change its methods, it will have to reevaluate and reassess its position. It will have to become a movement of criticism and protest. It will have to struggle for the equality of Jewish group life, Judaism and Jewish culture in American society against emancipationist delusions much as it has done in other places and other times. It will have to fight for its place in the American Jewish community, even in institutions it helped to create...

It must be admitted that Zionism as a broadly inclusive ideology and rationale for creative Jewish survival may have lost a good deal of its relevancy. However, it cannot be denied that it has contributed to the development of Jewish life in America and has profoundly influenced Jewish education and Jewish educators in the formative stages of Jewish education in America. In addition, there are many indications that Zionism as ideology and
program has had an important impact on many varieties of Jewish education in America—in regard to methodology as well as to content. Further reference to this point will be made later. However, its significance may well warrant a more detailed, systematic treatment as the subject for an intensive study to be included upon the agenda for American Jewish educational research.

In addition to the broadly-inclusive ideology of Zionism, other ideological positions, some seemingly secular in attitude and others definitely religious in character, have left their imprint on American Jewish thought and life during the last fifty years.

Six Jewish secularist ideologies which have had institutionalized or educational implications are of potential significance in this study—three of a laborite nature, two of an ethnic-cultural-democratic nature and one of a socio-communal nature. The major "internal" (within a given ideological position or among the various positions proposed) and "environmental" (related to alternative non-secular ideologies and institutions) issues include: the creation of a classless society vs. accommodation to capitalistic society, class vs. nation, politics vs. culture, spiritual-religious values vs. militant secularism, Zionism vs. Diaspora Nationalism, Zionism vs. Territorialism, pluralism vs. the all-embracing synagogue, Federation-welfare agency community vs. organized religious community. These conflicts appear to have been the pivotal ones in the development of American Jewish secularist ideologies, and evidence indicates that they have had
their impact upon Jewish education in the United States--its institutions, its organization, its objectives and its varied curricula. Because of the mass immigration of Jews from eastern Europe during the last decade of the nineteenth-century and the initial decades of the twentieth (until 1924), existing European laborite ideologies--socialist, communist and anarchist--were transported to and transplanted in American soil. Anarchist and communist philosophies and programs are of little importance in this study since (1) they were openly anti-Jewish as well as being anti-democratic and anti-religious (i.e., against organized religion), and (2) the majority of Jewish workers did not identify with them. In fact, even the ideology of unionism (another secular response to the needs of the time) was not received overly enthusiastically by the Jewish worker. The larger proportion of new arrivals tended to continue to be at least nominally orthodox or to find a spiritual home in socialist or labor-oriented organizations. "The majority of these workers were socialistically-minded. Socialism was not merely a political or economic theory to them, but also a faith, a Weltanschauung. The ideal of the cooperative commonwealth and the brotherhood of man captured the imagination of the Jewish multitude in America. It was destined to be both a great binding force in Jewish labor and a source of disruptive conflict."20 It should be noted that many Jewish workers were both secular in thinking and nominally religious in practice.21 From the educational vantage point, the most important organizations reflecting shades of secularist
ideology were the Workmen's Circle, the Jewish National Workers' Alliance and the Sholem Aleichem Folks Institute.

The Workmen's Circle, the Arbeter Ring, the oldest and strongest of the organizations, originally was founded as a fraternal order (1892) for new, eastern European immigrants. It was a direct descendant of the Jewish Nationalist Socialist movement, the Bund. It has always emphasized the support of the labor movement and unionism. The growth and popularization of the Workmen's Circle was to a great degree facilitated by the Yiddish-Socialist press (The Forward). In its turn, the Arbeter Ring has supported many humanitarian and cultural causes of both a Jewish and general nature. In addition, after World War I, it became seriously involved in Jewish cultural and educational activities, building a broad system of schools and cultural institutions. The objectives of these institutions were twofold: (1) to help bridge the gap between immigrant parents and their Americanized children, and (2) to give the young an appreciative understanding of socialism and Jewishness. Yiddish was the language of instruction, and socialism the political creed of the school. It was generally non-religious and anti-Zionist though the educational program in practice attempted to foster an appreciation of national-cultural values in consonance with the outlook of the Bund and, to some degree, with the orientation of Dubnow's Diaspora Nationalism. The ideological stance of the Workmen's Circle was negatively influenced, especially in its early years, by its hostility toward religious orthodoxy and the Talmud Torah movement as well as toward Labor Zionism (Farband
and Poale Zion) and its National-Radical Schools, the Folk Shulen. 23 An internal ideological struggle within the Arbeter Ring between the "right" (socialists) and the "left" (communists), caused the formation of a more communist-oriented splinter group in 1930, the International Workers' Order (I.W.O.). The so-called "Non-partisan Workers' Schools" (a splinter school system of the Arbeter Ring as of 1926) affiliated itself with the I.W.O., and the I.W.O.'s philosophy permeated the curriculum. 24

The Jewish National Workers' Alliance (founded in 1910), a fraternal order, was formed by the Zionist Socialists who were not at home with the Bundist approach of the Arbeter Ring. The Farband, as it was known in Yiddishist circles, was that organization which was initially most closely related to the European Poale Zion. In fact, the American Labor Zionist movement (consisting of the Farband, the Poale Zion, and Pioneer Women) developed from the Jewish National Workers' Alliance. The function of the Alliance was threefold: to provide mutual help for its members, to develop a system of "national" education for their children, and to support all efforts for national liberation and rebirth of the Jewish people. Whereas support of the American labor movement and unionism was expected of members of the Workmen's Circle, allegiance to the idea of a Jewish Palestine was required of the members of the Farband and Poale Zion. 25 The Labor Zionists were the first secularist group to establish schools, originally called the Nazional-Radikale Shulen, but later known as the Folk Shulen, the Jewish Folk Schools. The primary goals of the schools were national (the
Jewish child for the Jewish people) and socialist (preparation of the younger generation for the struggle for socialism).

Yiddish and Hebrew were taught, and an appreciation of Jewish spiritual values and major traditional practices had their place in the Folk Shulen.

The 1914 conference of the Nazional-Radikale Shulen, as a response to the stimulation of Hayyim Lieberman and against the objections of Dr. Hayyim Zhitlovsky, passed a resolution to the effect that "national radical education must instill in the children a sound view on Jewish religion which should be approached from a cultural historical standpoint. The teachers should endeavor to present to the children the national-ethical and poetic aspect of Jewish religion." The greater emphasis on Hebrew and spiritual-traditional values and practices as compared to the Arbeter Ring must be viewed as a logical extension of Labor Zionism's staunch championing of Zionism, its ideology and movement, and of its untiring efforts to rebuild Palestine through fund-raising, political activity and actual resettlement (personal Aliyah). It should be pointed out that, in contradistinction to the Workmen's Circle, political activity was focused on the Yishuv in Palestine and later on the State of Israel.

The third version of Jewish labor-oriented secularism was non-political and purely cultural in character. The schools reflecting this tendency separated themselves from the Folk Shulen because of differences in regard to the place of Hebrew in the curriculum and to the role of Zionism in Jewish life.
Their organization became known as the Sholem Aleichem Folks Institute. Emphasis was placed upon education and achievements relating to Jewish secular life and activity—Yiddish language and literature, Jewish folk creativity, and Jewish history—in order to meet the need "to acquaint our children with the treasures of Jewish culture and literature, new and old," so as "to assure the continuity of Jewish cultural life." In general, the approach of the schools was affirmatively Jewish from a nationalist point of view, though not Zionist, and definitely not as anti-religious as the original Arbeter Ring position.

Although matters of faith have been purposely excluded from the curriculum and religion has been valued differently by each of these three secularist ideologies, the secularist camp in the Forties began to reflect more visibly the influence of the changing nature of American Jewish group life. The ideological distinctions among the three groups became less pronounced, and the three organizations as a movement commenced to take a more central position in reference to the place of Judaism, Hebrew and Jewish spiritual group survival in American Jewish life.

To be more specific, the Workmen's Circle has come to emphasize more and more the national aspect of Jewish life and the need for Jewish group continuity. In 1948, it was stated officially that Workmen's Circle schools were to be Jewish-national in character with all Jewish literature from the Bible to modern Yiddish and Hebrew literature having an important place in the curriculum. Furthermore, the educational and national value of traditional Jewish holidays has been recognized as has
been the validity of certain traditional customs of which the Bar Mitzvah seems to be the most significant. The Sholem Aleichem Folk Schools now include the teaching of a number of Jewish rituals in their curriculum. "The new Declaration of Principles... adopted in May of 1953, defines as one of the objectives of the school the stimulation of a desire to preserve and perpetuate those elements of the Jewish tradition which are in harmony with Jewish life in America."29 Today, Labor Zionists promote an affirmative though liberal approach to Judaism. They consider the teaching of Bible and the observance of certain religious practices as indispensable to a sound Jewish education. The study of Hebrew has been intensified in formal and informal educational enterprises. Labor Zionists have been enthusiastic supporters of the Jewish day school, especially of those with strong Zionist and liberal religious orientations.

In general, secularist ideology based on varying degrees of irreligion seems to have been abandoned by the three school systems. The leadership of the schools seems to have come to the realization that Jewish life without a Jewish pattern, that of Jewish religion as been discussed Jewish education in the being a Jew without living a Jewish life is not feasible nor desirable. Three major developments have contributed to the changes in educational approach of the secular schools which in turn reflect the current coloration of secular ideologies: sociological factors that have changed the structure of the Jewish community in the United States, the growing acculturation of the Jewish population and the bankruptcy of secularist ideology
institutional sense of the word, to be orthodox—if I were to use American parlance, I should say it is unnecessary to be a fundamentalist—in order to recognize the inseparable significance in our future folk education of the cultural embodiments of the Jewish religious genius. 32

Bezalel Sherman has summarized the dilemma of Jewish laborite secularist ideologies as they have struggled to survive in a changing American Jewish environment:

The view that Jews could or would constitute a nationality in the United States with Yiddish as its vernacular and secular Jewish culture as the basis of its group cohesiveness could be maintained only so long as the Jewish immigrant community represented an enclave, as it were, in American society. When this view became shaky, the theory of cultural pluralism was seized as a crutch to support it. But to no avail: . . . The survivalist elements within the Jewish labor movement have been compelled to come around to a position regarding the relationships between Jewish religion and Jewish peoplehood that approximated the secularism of American democracy. The latter, it should be pointed out again, was based on cooperation with religion in clearly defined areas. 33

Pragmatism, democracy as Dewey conceived of it, and the sociological theory of cultural pluralism have contributed to the development of a Jewish ideological position that may be described as democratic-ethnic culturalism. Compared to the floundering religious life of the twenties, rich and variegated political, cultural and philanthropic activity caused a number of Jewish thinkers, in particular the philosopher and liberal Horace M. Kallen, to propose "that the future of Jewish life in this country should be built on all the varieties of Jewish expression that had come into existence and not only on Judaism. Kallen envisaged a community in which Jews would be educated in
Jewish history and culture, Jewish political movements would flourish, Jewish art and culture would be encouraged, Jewish philanthropy would take care of special Jewish needs, and religion would be only one of the possible expressions of Jewishness." Terms such as "secularism," "Hebraism," "orchestration," "inquiry," "choice," etc., permeate his writings.

The role of Jewish education is to provide for inquiry into the variety of expressions of Jewish life and then to free the student to choose those loyalties that will aid him in gaining self-fulfillment as a Jew and thus contribute to the struggle for Jewish survival. Kallen envisions the need for Judaism as religion, as one form of Jewish expression, to become part of a Jewish life which is becoming more and more secular.

Against this, there does arise the question of what superficially educated could give to his people. For Judaism has been alienated from the Jewish people... They practice Judaism by proxy. The Gabbaim and rabbonin to the contrary notwithstanding, the Jewish way of life is no longer a religious way of life, Judaism is no longer identical with Jewishness, and Jewishness is no longer identical with Judaism... I prefer to say, Hebraism is a focus of modernity. It is the Jewish way of life become necessarily secular, humanist, scientific, conditioned by the industrial economy, without having ceased to be livingly Jewish... Judaism will have to be reintegrated with this secular, cultural form of community which is Jewishness if Judaism is to survive... It would seem appropriate at this point to cite the Hebraic-Zionist or Hebraic-Nationalist point of view, an approach which was articulated by many individuals in the periodical, HaDoar. As can be seen, this position was not only the possession of Hebrew educators but was also popular among large
groups of transplanted Hebraic-Zionist intelligentsia. The Hebraic-Nationalist point of view was a creation of the eastern European Haskalah. This ideological position is directly related to the development of spiritual-cultural Zionism, the Hebrew School movement in Russia and Poland, the Heder Metukan and, in the area of methodology, the "natural method" (Shitah Tivit) of teaching Hebrew. This posture, relatively secular in nature, had its impact on many teachers who taught in congregational and communal Talmud Torahs in the United States during the third, fourth and fifth decades of this century. One of the most respected spokesmen of the Hebraic-Nationalist school was Nissim Touloff. His position becomes clear in the following passages:

As against this, there does arise the question of what a Jew, so superficially educated could give to his people—not from his pocket but from his soul. In other words: To what extent will a person so educated feel that he belongs to an historical community, rich in feeling and ideals, which has expressed its spirit and yearnings in enduring cultural creations? To what extent will he be prepared to identify himself with the community and become a partner in its national-spiritual destiny—one which calls for loyalty not of the hour but of the ages? ...

Now an education "for the ages" requires an entirely different attitude towards the problem before us: It is based on the spiritual development of our people in the past and its desirable development in the future ... Education for ongoing generations requires, among other things, a sound, hard knowledge of our great national creations—and very definitely in the Hebrew original.

Once again I take this occasion to stress the fact that any separation of content and form in matters of national literary creations is an error...
A Judaism based on translated democratic passages and superficial religious ceremonies has no validity and will evaporate in the end. It is a self-deception which "works" for a while as a means of quieting the confused conscience. It is not a means of saving the dispersed of Israel from national extinction. Only an education which is rooted in a great national creation and in the new pioneering creativity in Erets Yisrael can save us from this danger of extinction.  

Since the late 1940's, much of the ideological ferment of earlier years seems to have been superseded by the "culture of organizations," the ultimate secularization of Jewish life. In the opinion of many this has become the "ideology of the established Jewish community." Ideological commitment is fulfilled by supporting institutions and belonging to organizations. Thus, ideology is not really an individual concern:  

Another consequence is that the organization and its program reduce and often eliminate the need for individual ideological concern. The organization provides an ideology which one may assume when he joins it. (And let us recall here that one cannot join the Jewish community in the United States, only the Jewish organizations which function as a quasi-community.) This is neither unique nor necessarily bad. A culture that cannot provide ideology through institutional means and which must depend on constant individual ideological re-evaluations is in serious difficulty. However, in the American Jewish community this has had the effect of stifling criticism and re-evaluation within the community and of producing hostility against those who practice it outside the community.  

Earlier, this ideology was referred to as "socio-communal" in nature.  

This categorization would seem to assume an articulated position. However, since none exists, the label of "quasi-ideology" might be a proper designation. No matter how it is described, its potency, all-pervasiveness and contemporary appeal have made it the ideology of the American Jewish masses of the
last two decades. As Weisberg points out:

The search for community and identity among most American Jews is a very practical undertaking and the genius of the Jewish community is organization. Jewish life in the United States is expressed primarily through a culture of organizations. To be a Jew is to belong to an organization. To manifest Jewish culture is to carry out, individually or collectively, the program of an organization. . .

It won't do to object that the activities which most concern the community are only a continuation and extension of traditional community interests, or that the causes which are served are only contemporary expressions of traditional Jewish values. Of course, they are that, but to argue in this way is to miss the point. In fact, they may well be the Jewish culture of the United States. Communal organization and its maintenance has been a central preoccupation of Jews for a very long time in a variety of Jewish communities, but the programs of the organizations and the activities involved in sustaining them did not previously suffice for or pre-empt Jewish culture.\textsuperscript{40}

Weisberg cites four major reasons for this development: the maturing of the American Jewish community and the more complex and sophisticated apparatus that has developed; the enormous burden of overseas responsibilities accepted by American Jewry and the consequent organizational machinery which was created; the rapid growth of religious institutions and organizations; the middle-class character of the American Jewish community.\textsuperscript{41}

The ideology of "the culture of organizations" has also had a significant impact upon American Judaism.

One would expect that matters would be quite different in the field of religion. . . Nevertheless, while there are obvious differences between the religious and non-religious community ideologies, the former are not successful alternatives to the latter. In fact, they have become increasingly only another manifestation of the culture of organizations . . .
The independent theologians have emphasized authenticity, commitment, piety, humility, awe and a large number of familiar and unfamiliar virtues. The Jewish community has not been able to subscribe to them. The new theologies have been at most pulpit theologies and have not become serious ideologies in the community.

In the community, emphasis is also not on a discipline of religious behavior affecting the ordinary as well as the extraordinary aspects of existence, but on the discipline of organizational obligation and institutional responsibility. One behaves regularly as an American, believes as a Jew, and hopefully what he holds in the latter will affect what he does in the former.

Finally, why has this socio-communal ideology gained so much popularity?

There were major breaks with tradition thirty and forty years ago of course, but not, I suspect, with such an absence of guilt or with the organizational means to substitute communal activity for religious discipline that we have today. Moreover, the intellectual and emotional demands of the culture of organizations are not burdensome. They are precisely what appeals to the leisure-consumption-status orientation of most American Jews. There is no agony, no turmoil, no anguish. Community ideologies, like middle-class life in the United States, seek to overcome doubt through activity and loneliness through organization. Angst, despair, even inconclusiveness, are not part of the ideology of the community.

In describing Jewish religious ideologies on the American landscape, it is a temptation to equate ideology with movement. Though, at first, this approach seems to have some validity, it would rule out the legitimate role of the nuances and permutations of popular ideologies as well as "non-movement" and "inter-movement" constructs. Thus, the impact of these latter ideological variants on Jewish education and on the progressive character of American Jewish education, whatever that might be, could not be ascertained. It therefore follows that it is necessary to
It is quite appropriate that the ideological matrix of Orthodox Judaism be presented initially. Since, to its adherents, it represents "authentic Judaism," that form of Judaism affected least by the winds of change and the vagaries of mind and spirit, it might be reasonable to expect a degree of unity within its camp. Relatively speaking—such is the case. A basic set of beliefs and postulates can be set forth without great difficulty. Nonetheless, even within the ranks of this seeming ideological monolith but organizational monolith, diversity of interpretation with its practical and educational implications exist. The most important set of beliefs of Orthodoxy concern the nature of God, the expression of His Will and His relationship to man. Jews believe in One God. He is Eternal, Infinite, Holy and of the Spirit. He is the Ultimate Unity. God is both immanent and transcendent, the God of all mankind but above mankind—supernatural in the fullest sense of the word. He is the Creator of all things, the Supreme Law Giver, the Source of all ethical and moral law. He is omnipresent, omnipotent, just, merciful, faithful, of immutable will, constant—the Quintessence of perfection, the Absolute of absolutes. In sum, He is the extra-human Source of all existence, knowledge, truth and value. The true conception of God can be found in the Torah which, in the words of Samson Raphael Hirsch, is "an eternal code set up for all ages by the God of eternity."
The Written and the Oral Law, which combined constitute the Torah, were revealed supernaturally to mankind at Mount Sinai, though the Oral Law has progressively developed after this one and only authentic revelation. The revelation at Sinai makes the Torah, both the Written and the Oral Law, a product of Divine authorship, an expression of God's will and concern for man as He functions as Supreme Lawgiver. These and other fundamental beliefs or postulates of Judaism are summed up in Maimonides' Articles of Faith which, together with the Bible, the Talmud, the rabbinic commentaries, the Shulhan Arukh of Joseph Karo, and the Responsa, serve as the direction-giving sources for the "Torah-true Jew." Though the Divine and authoritative nature of the Torah and the rabbinic interpretations and codes should leave little room for metaphysical speculation about God, during all periods and in all places the true essence of Godhood has been the subject of exploration, especially by the mystic and the rationalist.

Man is created in God's image, and man is, therefore, a product of Divinity. Man is God's crowning creation and exists to obey God's will. God's will is expressed in the Torah, and it is incumbent upon man to fulfill all six hundred and thirteen mitzvot emanating from the Torah and set forth systematically in the Shulhan Arukh. These mitzvot and their elaboration and interpretation constitute the halakhah. The halakhah must be lived and acted upon by all Jews who consider themselves Orthodox or "Torah-true," and who firmly believe in the Divine justice and righteousness of God, the Creator.
An understanding of this fundamental principle in Judaism gives us true insight into the nature and purpose of mitzvot, the commandments a man must fulfill. When a Jew fulfills the positive and negative commandments of the Torah he is, in a sense making the following pronouncement: "I am not the complete master of the world or of myself; I do not possess unlimited authority over the things of creation, and, therefore, whatever I do or fail to do with the things of creation depends on the will of the owner of creation—God Himself." This attitude, translated into action through the fulfillment of mitzvot, reaffirms man's belief in the governorship of God and in the sanctity of creation. It indirectly brings him to a state of holiness. 45

Man's most important goal is to strive for holiness, to live the life of complete piety. Traditionally, holiness implies freedom from every wickedness and ugliness motivated by man's reverence and love for God. 46 However, although man strives for holiness, because of his being only human, he will most assuredly sin during his life and seek penitence. If he truly repents, God's mercy will allow for Him to forgive man, and man will "become a new creation." 47

A major, if not the supreme, institution of Jewish life is the family. Orthodox Judaism places great emphasis upon the holiness and purity of the family and upon the Divine aspects of family relationships with special emphasis on the respect for woman's individuality and the reverence due her 48 as well as upon the significance of the spiritual and observant home. 49 Just as one's family relationships are an expression of the Divine, so do man's relationship with his fellow man, within the Jewish community and in society in general, reflect God's will. The denouncing of injustice, oppression, tyranny, social inequality and prejudice as well as of exploitation of the fatherless, the widow, the stranger, the slave and even the criminal is an expression
of Judaism's striving for a social order permeated with the spirit of human equality and freedom, with respect for the sacredness of human personality and for the fact that all men are the children of God. 50

A major correlative of all the concepts and institutions discussed up to this point is prayer and the synagogue. "The synagogue, which from time immemorial was the center of Jewish religious life, embodied the religious consciousness of the community. The synagogue, as regards worship, is not a place for private meditation; it is the place for community worship... The synagogue, the projection of the Jewish concept of community, served as a means of hallowing the holy Name." 51 Included in the domain of prayer by the Orthodox are public worship, private meditation, blessings, and Talmud Torah (study) as a form of worship.

Orthodoxy, in its various forms, also considers of import some ancillary but still significant concepts such as the Land of Israel, reward and punishment, salvation, the Messiah, resurrection and the "chosen people." Though positions differ in regard to interpretation, as will be indicated below, all of Orthodoxy includes these concepts as part of its semi-official doctrine.

The Land of Israel is the Holy Land, and Jerusalem is the Holy City. The Holy Land is the eternal possession of the Jews, the land in which God will ultimately judge all nations. How and when the Land of Israel is to be restored to its former glory is an area of contention between "fundamentalists" and "modernists." Prior to the establishment of the State of Israel, still opposed by some ultra-Orthodox extremists both in Israel and the United...
States, a characteristic statement was made by a representative of Neo-Orthodoxy, a statement which definitely did not literally posit the restoration of the People of Israel to the Land of Israel on the coming of the Messiah:

Out of the agony of the War there arose politically the old hope for the restoration of Zion, and, as a miracle recalling the deliverance of the Jewish people in ancient times, there has arisen the hope for the Jewish National Home... Millions of Jews... are straining every nerve to establish—yes, in our own days—that centre of human life which shall save the remnant of Israel... In the hopes centering in the resettlement of the Jewish people in its homeland there are eschatological visions of the Kingdom of Heaven, and in the tragedies experienced in the rebuilding of the Jewish nation some even in these rationalist times discern the pangs of the Messianic age.52

A statement which ties together the concepts of the Messiah, salvation, immortality (resurrection in its narrowest sense), reward and punishment and the Land of Israel typifies the modern, American, Orthodox rationale of these hallowed beliefs.

The divine responsibility for the creation is the guarantee that the purpose of man’s formation in freedom and for responsibility will not be ultimately thwarted. That is the root of the messianic faith. God’s intention for man, as revealed in the encounter and by His law, will be fulfilled. It is the messianic promise, inseparable from history...

The assurance of the messianic fulfillment in history is beyond any doubt. The most convincing indication of its coming is the survival of Israel. The survival of Judaism and of the Jewish people in all ages, in conditions of utter political and material weakness, in spite of continuous discrimination and persecution, and in defiance of an endless series of the most barbarous and sadistic attempts at their extermination, baffles all explanation. It is the mystery of all ages. The return of Israel to its ancient homeland in our days, as Israel maintained for numberless generations that it would do, is the incomparable historic event of all times...
Indeed, before the day of fulfillment and universal salvation arrives, many will have suffered because of the sins of others, many will have fallen by the wayside. What of them? . . . One can answer only by saying that the concept of divine justice demands that on the day of universal fulfillment they too must be vindicated and justified individually, just as they suffered individually. Divine justice, which is one of the ways in which we have conceived God’s care for man, is the postulate of immortality. It requires that in the act of final redemption all generations that were ever born be redeemed. Even the dead must live to share in the realization of the promise that alone justifies the travail of all times.53

(italics my own)

This formation should be compared to the "Maimonides Code," the creed of the fundamentalists, in the light of its spirit, its implications and its language:

I believe with perfect faith that the Creator, blessed be His name, rewards those that keep his commandments and punishes those that transgress them.

I believe with perfect faith in the coming of the Messiah, and though he tarry, I will wait daily for his coming.

I believe with perfect faith that there will be a resurrection of the dead at the time when it shall please the Creator, blessed be His name, and exalted be the remembrance of Him for ever and ever.

The "chosen people" concept has also elicited a more contemporary interpretation from the modernists as opposed to their more fundamentalist co-religionists:

Basic in Judaism, particularly in the relation of the Jew to God, is the concept of the election of the people of Israel, or "Israel as the Chosen People." Does this concept imply that Jews subscribe to the theory of racial superiority? Quite the contrary, such thoughts are foreign to the Jewish mind. The Jew, following the premise that all creation belongs to the Creator, believes that as a man, i.e., as the highest form of creation, he has entered into a covenant with God, his Creator. He promises to develop a greater measure of dedication and a greater sense
of belonging to Him. The covenant is fulfilled only in the observance of the Divine law. To that purpose is the Jew dedicated and chosen.54

As has been asserted heretofore, American Orthodoxy seems to be an amalgam of various strands of "traditional Judaism." The basic beliefs and conceptions, described in modernistic and Neo-Orthodox language to be sure, have been set forth above. It remains to identify in a more detailed fashion the most important versions of American (twentieth-century) Orthodoxy so that their educational impact and stance can be described and be referred to at a later time if and when they seem relevant to the major focus of this study.

The major fundamentalist, non-Westernized variant of Orthodoxy, hasidism, especially of the transplanted Habad school of the Lubavitch dynasty, has taken on an aggressive, conversionary character in America. Although Lubavitch propagandistic and educational techniques are becoming more and more sophisticated, and the enthusiasm of its adherents is unmatched, Habad literature, in the main, consists of variations of old Kabbalistic themes, symbols and terms with little attempt to take note of the modern world. Some excerpts from an interesting series of publications will help elucidate this point.

At the end of The "Tzemach Tzadek" and the Haskalah Movement, written by the late Lubavitcher rebbe, Joseph I. Schneerson, the following supplement (#3), translated by Z. I. Posner and published by the "Kehot" Publication Society, is instructive:

"..."
of belonging to Him. The covenant is fulfilled only in
the observance of the Divine law. To that purpose is the
Jew dedicated and chosen. As has been asserted heretofore, American Orthodoxy seems
to be an amalgam of various strands of "traditional Judaism." The
basic beliefs and conceptions, described in modernistic and Neo-
Orthodox language to be sure, have been set forth above. It
remains to identify in a more detailed fashion the most important
versions of American (twentieth-century) Orthodoxy so that their
educational impact and stance can be described and be referred
to at a later time if and when they seem relevant to the major
focus of this study.

The major fundamentalist, non-Westernized variant of
Orthodoxy, hasidism, especially of the transplanted Hasidim
school of the Lubavitch dynasty, has taken on an aggressive, con-
versionary character in America. Although Lubavitch propagan-
distic and educational techniques are becoming more and more
sophisticated, and the enthusiasm of its adherents is unmatched,
old Kabbalistic themes, symbols and terms with little attempt
to take note of the modern world. Some excerpts from an inter-
esting series of publications will help elucidate this point.
At the end of The "Tzemach Tzedek" and the Haskalah Movement,
Revealed Torah is called water. When one studies Torah "for its sake," properly, there is "good water." When someone studies Torah for ulterior purposes, or evil ends, then it becomes a "deadly venom." Chassidus is fire. Worship with Chassidus is like the boiling in a pot. The gross evil of "evil waters" and the refined dross of "good waters" are both purged. That was the contribution of the Baal Shem Tov and the Mizrichter Magid with their school of Chassidus in general and my grandfather with Chabad Chassidus in particular. 56

Rabbi Joseph I. Schneerson, who died in 1950, was succeeded by his son-in-law, Rabbi Menachem Mendel Schneerson, representing the seventh generation of Chabad.

The role of emotion is central in the Chabad approach. Posner, in his introduction to his translation of On the Teaching of Chassidus by Joseph I. Schneerson, differentiates between two types of particular soul powers: intellect and emotion. Of the emotion-powers he says: 

The Emotion-Powers are the conclusions and results of the Intellect-Powers. Chabad Chassidus, being largely devoted to the study of G-d, insists that intellectual achievement per se is inadequate. The mind must carry out its conclusions in the heart (the seat of emotions, as the brain is the seat of the intellect), in the arousal of emotions indicated by the subject under study. ... The emotions in turn must affect actual deeds, that one act in the light of his understanding and feelings, continuing the unbroken sequence of mind, heart and deed.

The term Chabad is descriptive of the principle of this school, that through systematic intellectual progression one may control, even radically alter, his emotions, and, correspondingly, his deeds. 57

Thus, the hasid, of the Chabad-Lubavitch persuasion feels that he is part of the community of Israel by identifying with it emotionally--by eating with the "tsaddik" or by praying or merry-making with other hasidim. Hasidim serve God in joy, sink their
individuality with utter abandon in the total community of Israel, which is assured of salvation by the unbreakable word of the Covenant. Ultra-traditional modes of behavior and practice are expected of the true hasid as he battles courageously to avert Western contamination and acculturation within American society. This disdain or fear of the secular reflects itself in its educational programs which minimize non-traditional learning and, where possible in some cases, eliminate secular studies altogether from the curriculum.

Another significant stream, transplanted from the Lithuanian Jewish environment, was the rather extreme, supernaturalistic Kabbalism of the Mussar movement. The European founders of this school of thought and behavior were Rabbi Hayyim of Volozhin and Rabbi Israel Lipkin of Salant. That interpretation of the Mussar school which tended to appeal to the sentiments of love (rather than fear) and aspiration and to set up the ideal of the perfect personality as the goal of piety was the one most successfully transferred to the American scene. "The self-sufficient supernaturalism of the 'mussar' school, in all its dry dogmatism and scornful repudiation of the great wide world extending beyond its narrow tradition, constitutes even today the living ideology of many 'Yeshivoth,' from 'Torah V'Daath' in Brooklyn to Tels in Cleveland." In the mussar movement, reason is replaced by the "spirit of Holiness" or the gift of prophecy in interpreting Torah as the Torah-scholar takes on the cosmic function—"the uplifting of the low forces of matter in the human soul and in creation generally, bringing them back to their roots." Miracles
are matter-of-fact happenings in this literalistic version of Orthodox. The supernaturalism of the Mussar school inevitably leads to an idealization of the past which is carried to an extreme as the legendary lore of the Talmud is taken at face value, as the line of demarcation between the natural and the supernatural becomes blurred, and as "the mysterious intricacies of the hypothetical higher links in the chain of being presumed to have been known by the ordinary men and women of the past."

The spiritual heir of the European Mitnagdim and of the pietistic emphasis of the Mussar school is the revered spokesman of "modern orthodoxy," Dr. Joseph B. Soloveitchik, of Yeshiva University. Dr. Soloveitchik's erudition in the systems and concepts of western philosophy and contemporary religious thought is quite formidable. Though a champion of pure, halakhic Judaism, Dr. Soloveitchik has not withdrawn into an ideational ghetto (at least not in theory) and seems willing to do battle against the inroads made by materialistic-secular culture and by all forms of "liberal" Judaism. He talks of God, prayer and halakhah in the following terms:

Prayer likewise is unimaginable without having man stand before and address himself to God in a manner reminiscent of the prophet's dialogue with God. The cosmic drama, notwithstanding its grandeur and splendor, no matter how distinctly it reflects the image of the Creator and no matter how beautifully it tells His glory, cannot provoke man to prayer... Prayer is basically an awareness of man finding himself in the presence of and addressing himself to his Maker, and to pray has one connotation only: to stand before God. To be sure, this awareness has been objectified and crystallized in standardized, definitive texts whose recitation is obligatory. The total faith
commitment tends always to transcend the frontiers of fleeting, amorphous subjectivity and to venture into the outside world of the well-formed, objective gesture. However, no matter how important this tendency on the part of the faith commitment is—and it is of enormous significance in the Halakhah which constantly demands that man translate his inner life into external facticity—it remains unalterably true that the very essence of prayer is the covenantal experience of being together with and talking to God and that the concrete performance such as the recitation of texts represents the technique of prayer and not prayer itself. 60

A partial exposition of "modern" Orthodox thinking has already been set forth in the citations from Belkin, Berkovits and Soloveitchik. These "modernists" consciously separate themselves from the "ultra-Orthodox" or "fundamentalists." One "modern" Orthodox spokesman claims:

True, within the ranks of Orthodox Judaism there are many to whom the modern scene and western thought constitute no challenge. These elements are to be found principally among the recent immigrants to the United States. And they often intimidate the more progressive Orthodox elements who recognize that Jewish law was always dynamic and that Judaism never required an ostrich-like indifference to currents of thought . . . The tendency to canonize each and every view of the past with absolutely no critical or historical evaluation is strong among the "rightists." Some of them even favor the social and economic isolation of Orthodox Jews. They propose the establishment of Orthodox Jewish communities with Sabbath-observing vendors of the necessities of life, Sabbath-observing professional and service personnel, etc.

The position of these "rightists," however, is not typical. Most American Orthodox Rabbis are not isolationists.61

As has been implied, American "modern" Orthodoxy, from an ideological point of view, sees itself as the "middle ground" between the "fundamentalists" and those who feel the need to "adjust" Jewish law and life to the modern situation.
The revealed nature of halakhah is fundamental to "modern" Orthodox ideology. Though theological questions are important, halakhah—its origin, development and implementation—seem to be the prime subject of "modern" Orthodox inquiry.

According to Leon Stitskin the "purposeful" approach to the contemporary evolution and observance of halakhah must be supported. This approach demands adherence to a formalized code of behavior so that one's life might be invested with cosmic and divine dimensions. Also, the observance of mitzvot must follow from a metaphysical construct and set of values. Thus, halakhah and mahshavah must be integrated "into a unified whole in order that the timeless and essential insights of our faith be articulated in the idiom of our generation."

Rackman asserts that the "purposeful" approach is both dynamic and conservative and is based on an unwavering faith in the self-sufficiency of the Law.

It does not exclude Halakhic creativity or changes, flexibility, and growth in concept and method to meet the most perplexing of the problems that trouble religious minds. But it insists that such evolution must be organic, i.e., it must be a further unfolding of historic continuity and develop authentically out of tradition . . . That is why Orthodox Jews move slowly in their Halakhic creativity—with the same turmoil of soul that characterizes the authentic religious experience, but with firm faith that where the basic values of Judaism still live, the Law will suffice to meet the requirements of life.

The only authentic Halakhic approach must be that which approximates the philosophy of the teleological jurist. The teleological jurist asks: what are the ends of the law which God or nature ordained and how can we be guided by these ideal ends in developing the Law? He uses the historical method but it is not his only concern.
The teleological approach is to be found at its best in the work of Dr. Joseph B. Soloveichik of Yeshiva University. For him, the Halakhah is an a priori idea system... it postulates a world of its own, an ideal one, which suits its particular needs. To begin with, therefore, any rejection of the revealed character of both the Written and the Oral Law constitutes a negation of the very essence of the Halakhah.

The "Neo-Orthodox" position, that associated popularly with the Western European Orthodox thought of Samson Raphael Hirsch, does not differ essentially from the dogma and practice of the fundamentalists, and, in some ways, is more rigid and conservative than the position of "modern" Orthodoxy. Though it seems to be a distinctly new interpretation of Jewish tradition, reflecting genteel norms, universalist aspirations and a this-worldly emphasis, it does not reflect a more reasonable spirit than fundamentalism but rather considers traditional teachings and institutions as divinely revealed and immutable. Notwithstanding its lack of flexibility, Neo-Orthodoxy presents a potentially viable religious ideology. In some ways it is similar to the spirit and the doctrine of the more traditional wing of Conservative Judaism represented by Louis Ginsburg, Louis Finkelstein, Boaz Cohen, Ben-Zion Bokser, etc. The writings of Jung, Hertz, and Goodman cited earlier in this chapter are typical of Neo-Orthodox views.

An extensive re-statement of the Neo-Orthodox position was put forth by Isaak Breuer in his Der Neue Kusari. Breuer's views are discussed by Agus in his critique of American Jewish Orthodoxy. However, a recent discussion of American Orthodoxy by Shelomoh Danziger is more descriptive of the current Neo-Orthodox
ideological posture. He differentiates Neo-Orthodoxy from the isolationism of the extreme fundamentalists such as certain groups of hasidim and from the integrationist tendencies of modern Orthodoxy represented by such men as Dr. Irving Greenberg of Yeshiva University and Eliezer Berkovits. He accuses modern Orthodoxy of risking "integration into the very fabric of the American community while clinging (or attempting to cling) to Orthodox teaching and practice."

The third path is that of non-integrated adaptation, which is the Hirschian approach as I understand it.

According to this method, Orthodox Jews live their own communal life, which is unintegrated religiously, socially, culturally, and psychologically. Within this community, however, there is an awareness of the intellectual and cultural trends of the nation and of the world, and a conscious reaction to these currents. The reaction may be positive or negative, an acceptance or rejection of the surrounding norms. But even where the contributions of the wider milieu are accepted, they serve only as cultural raw material for the implementation of Torah life through Orthodox forms of expression...

But I nevertheless deeply feel that the moment we Jews think of ourselves as part of the American Am, instead of Am Hashem (and one cannot belong to two Ammim), we have started the process of disintegration and final assimilation. We must be an American Am Hashem, not Jewish members of the American Am...

Fundamentalists we are indeed in the original sense of the word. We hold the thirteen Ikmarim to be fundamental to Torah Judaism, without the self-defeating interpretations of Jacobs...

Before leaving ideological considerations within Orthodoxy, mention must be made of the influence of the mystic, Rabbi Abraham Isaac Kuk, the late Chief Rabbi of Palestine. He was in the main responsible for the Mizrahi interpretation of Zionism, so intrinsic a part of American Orthodox ideology. In
many a sense, he was the spiritual leader of the "liberal wing" of American Orthodoxy though he resided in Palestine.70

Though the Hasidim and other Hasidic groups as well as the fundamentalists of the Agudist variety represent a significant and vocal minority within Orthodox ranks, the majority of American Orthodox Jews identify themselves with the "modernist" or "neo-Orthodox" versions of Judaism. To the leaders of the latter groups, the study and observance of halakhah presents itself as their greatest challenge. Most Orthodox congregations now have English-speaking rabbis who preach in English. English translations of the liturgy of Siddur and of the Pentateuch are now the rule in most Orthodox synagogues. In many respects American Orthodoxy is flexible in practice and definitely reflects the influence of Western culture and American society. A goodly proportion of Orthodox synagogues allow family pews and use a microphone on the Sabbath and the Festivals. The "women's section," the mehitasah, and the bimah in the center of the synagogue are becoming less and less prevalent. Today, one does not have to adhere to all 613 mitzvot to be considered part of the "Torah-true community," all ideological statements to the contrary notwithstanding. Many Jews consider themselves nominally Orthodox and state that they subscribe to the belief in the literal revelation of the Law. However, they are hardly observant in the accepted meaning of the term.

Most American Orthodox Rabbis admit that for at least another generation or two most American Jews will not be observant. Nevertheless, they want these Jews to appreciate their moral obligation to support the
totality of their ancestral heritage as Jews that it may be transmitted intact to later generations whose knowledge of Judaism and whose spiritual climate may be more conducive to the development of Judaism in consonance with its historic philosophy and pattern rather than as a compromise with Jewish illiteracy and the materialistic, "sensate" values of the present era . . . Our posterity should not be prejudiced by us and receive from us only truncated conceptions or patterns of Jewish thought and practice. With this approach, most Orthodox Rabbis are urging even the non-observant to identify themselves with Orthodox synagogues and send their children to Yeshivoth. . . .

In this regard, recognition must be given to the modern Orthodox rabbinate and especially to the Young Israel movement for their concerted attempts to fortify Kashrut observance and supervision, to re-affirm the sanctity of the Jewish family by construction of modern Mikvahs, and by their fostering of re-intensified Sabbath observance. The Young Israel movement has helped dignify religious services, create social and economic opportunities for observant youth and develop a substantial program of adult Jewish education. A spokesman for American Orthodoxy summarizes the situation as follows:

It is to Dr. Soloveichik, his co-workers and students, that American Orthodoxy looks for the ideological content, the techniques and the conclusions required to stem the tide of defections to other groups by making it abundantly clear that Halakhic Judaism is eternal and has naught to fear from the challenges of western thought, present and future.

Orthodoxy wants to stimulate the renascence of Torah learning on American soil. Orthodoxy feels that until Jews are learned they cannot be pious.

It does not believe that the modern contribution to progressive revelation can come until the modern age recaptures basic religious experience . . . Yet, there is evidence, as we face the atomic era in human history, that there will be a resurgence of religious values . . . In such an atmosphere, Judaism will thrive. Particularly will Halakhic Judaism thrive as more and more Jews seek
It seems almost axiomatic that American Orthodoxy---hasidic, Mussar, halakhic, Neo-Orthodox, Mizrahi-Zionist---would support and do everything to promote maximal Jewish education. The significant institutionalization of the concept and mitzvah of Talmud Torah has been the day school or yeshivah. To many of Orthodox persuasion, the success and effectiveness of the school has become more crucial than that of the synagogue. Though the heder, the congregational supplementary school and the communal Talmud Torah have been part of the history of Orthodox Jewish education in America, it is the day school that has made, and is expected to make, the greatest contribution to the development of Orthodox Judaism on American soil. The programs of these schools vary as to language of instruction, the emphasis on Hebrew, the inclusion of "secondary" Jewish subjects, the hours and days of instruction, the place, amount and approach to the secular subject-matter taught as required by state law, and to the interpretation given to certain phases of Orthodox doctrine. However, the overall purposes and philosophies are similar. The schools exist in order to transmit in as complete a form as possible, both quantitatively and qualitatively, the Jewish heritage---Bible, Talmud, Tosafot, and the Codes---and to induct the student into the authentic, "Torah-true" religious community via exposing him to religious personalities and experiences so that he will carry out God's will, be committed to a deep and abiding faith in Him and His works and be a living witness to His name.
Conservative Judaism is probably the fastest growing Jewish religious movement in America. The "return to religion and to the synagogue," the predominant middle-class nature of American Jewry and the combination of modernism and traditionalism inherent in the Conservative approach have contributed to its increasing popularity. As one attempts to analyze contemporary manifestations of Conservative Judaism as well as its development in the United States, it is difficult not to arrive at the following conclusions:

1. Conservative Judaism, historically, has attempted to be a totalistic, all-encompassing movement, hesitant to articulate a definitive, ideological position.

2. Its eclectic nature has allowed for the development of a variety of ideological positions within it, some almost in complete opposition one to another.

3. It has been a rather pragmatic movement, reflecting most quickly and profoundly sociological and ideological changes within the American Jewish community and in American society in general.

4. Instead of talking about "Conservative ideology," one must discuss "Conservative ideological tendencies" and "the process of development of a Conservative ideology."

5. In alluding to the gradual formation of an ideology and its significance on progressivism in Jewish education, one must keep in mind the four levels of the Conservative power structure:

   a. The "Establishment"—The Jewish Theological Seminary (a very traditional institution in the Conservative hierarchy because of its relative isolation from the people), the Teachers' Institute, etc;

   b. The Rabbinical Assembly—The national organization of the Conservative rabbinate, the majority of whom are graduates of the Seminary;

   c. The United Synagogue of America—The organization
of synagogues **officially** identifying themselves with the "universal synagogue" as projected by the Seminary; all member institutions must adhere to the United Synagogue's positions on matters of institutional ethics and observances; educational standards as established by the United Synagogue Commission on Jewish Education and matters of general policy that come under the jurisdiction of the United Synagogue (not all Conservative synagogues are members of the United Synagogue, but the preponderant majority are);

d. The individual congregation in a given community—
it is community controlled by its own officers, board and committees, and a rabbi and other professional personnel are employed.

It should be noted that the professional and rabbinic leadership of Conservative Judaism, either affirming the various interpretations of the concepts of Jewish peoplehood and "catholic Israel" or expediently compromising with the needs and inclinations of the "constituents," has in many instances allowed itself to be led or to be "unled" by the laymen—the individual congregations and the United Synagogue. Generally, ideological ferment has been of little concern to the masses of Conservative Jews who are concerned mainly with institutional maintenance and are content to construe Conservative Judaism as the "middle road" between Orthodoxy and Reform. In 1948, Rabbi Simon Greenberg, currently Vice-Chancellor of The Jewish Theological Seminary and an acknowledged spokesman for Conservative Judaism, commented on the situation:

> While the Conservative movement has its "right" and "left" wings and a goodly number of variations between these extremes, there is a dominant climate of opinion which gives character and cohesion to the movement as a whole. Conservative Judaism is writing its own definition of itself not in a debating society, nor in the mind of some
philosopher, nor even in the resolutions adopted by committees or conventions. It is "defining" itself, as does every living, vital movement through the institutions it is creating and, more particularly, through its school curriculum. It will thus continue to define and redefine itself.\textsuperscript{75}

Marshall Sklare, in his critical study of Conservative Judaism (1955), interprets the situation somewhat differently:

It is not surprising that the Seminary group has given little encouragement to efforts looking toward theological clarification. Should a Conservative ideology develop and a cohesive movement emerge, lay people would take over control of the Seminary and administrators and teachers would lose their semi-independent status... In 1946, the United Synagogue established a "Committee on the Philosophy of Conservative Judaism." This was done partly, at least, under the inspiration of its director, Rabbi Albert I. Gordon, who represented those advocating a strong and cohesive Conservative movement on the national scene... The committee did not hold any meetings under the administration of Rabbi Simon Greenberg, his successor. Greenberg represented neither the layman or the practicing rabbi... but rather the schoolmen—he is the Vice-Chancellor of the Seminary. To date, the United Synagogue has not pursued an independent course, nor has it given voice to all shades of lay and rabbinical opinion.\textsuperscript{76}

Goaded on by their own insecurity and lack of anchorage and by Sklare\textsuperscript{77} in the sociological sector, Mordecai M. Kaplan in the philosophical-ideological sector\textsuperscript{78} and by Louis Katzoff\textsuperscript{79} and Herbert Lerman\textsuperscript{80} in the educational sector, the Conservative "Establishment" and certain groupings within the Rabbinical Assembly, the Educators' Assembly and the United Synagogue have of "late"—since the late 1940's—attempted to articulate a "consensus ideology" and to implement this ideology on the national educational front (the Ramah camps, the Leadership Training Fellowship, the Solomon Schechter Day Schools, the
Melton Research Center, certain congregational schools, etc.). This effort has been intensified within the last ten years.

In addition, the tendency for modern Orthodoxy and contemporary Reform to move towards a more "central" position has presented the stimulus for ideological formulation so that the Conservative movement would have a "unique identity." The attempt to more positively present an acceptable ideological stance has definitely caused an increase in tension among the Conservative rabbinate and among other professionals associated with the movement. The more liberal elements within the Conservative movement and those who identify with it outside of the movement per se, are faced with the fact of narrowing theological-ideological horizons with an obvious and anticipated turn to the "center-right" position. This judgment will be documented and discussed in greater detail at other points in the study since it is of considerable significance in understanding the impact of progressivism on Jewish education.

In order to better evaluate the metamorphosis of Conservative ideological tendencies the following areas will be examined in summary fashion:

1. The historical development of Conservative Judaism in America;

2. General features that have helped to distinguish the Conservative movement as a unique interpretation of American Judaism—concepts, attitudes, practices, etc.;

3. Ideological positions and their rabbinic spokesmen. Conservative Judaism must look mainly to Zechariah Frankel and, to a lesser degree, to Leopold Zunz as its seminal minds. The "positive-historical" approach to the whole of
Jewish tradition—that combination of traditional spirit and modern knowledge considered adequate to meet the needs of the new age yet firmly attached to the past—served to differentiate Frankel from the Neo-Orthodox spokesman, S. R. Hirsch, on the "right" and from Holdheim and Geiger, spokesmen of Reform Judaism, on the "left." In America, an attempt was made by the disciples of Frankel to remain within the more traditional wing of Reform Judaism. However, this abortive effort failed with the acceptance of the Reform rabbinate of the Pittsburgh Platform in 1885 influenced by the radical thinking of Kaufmann Kohler. In 1887, Alexander Kohut and Sabato Morais broke completely with Reform Judaism, and Morais founded the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York City. In 1902 Solomon Schechter, who was the spiritual and intellectual heir of Frankel, assumed the position of President of the Seminary. Schechter strengthened the Seminary, founded the United Synagogue in 1913, appointed Mordecai M. Kaplan to the post of Dean of the Teachers' Institute, and began to articulate and implement some of the major principles of Conservative Judaism.

Schechter definitely opposed forming another sect within Judaism to compete with Reform and Orthodoxy. His was a totalistic approach, placing emphasis on the validity of an eclectic ideology and theology. Bentwich, in his Schechter biography, comments:

"Schechter maintained a critical attitude towards the Bible but also a belief in divine revelation... he rebelled against the rival of revelation in the shape of history. In fact, he had not a logical system or a philosophy of Judaism but an immense and romantic love of it."
Schechter had a deep respect for "the will of people" as the determining factor in establishing a "normative Judaism."\textsuperscript{83}

Schechter's definite predilection for traditional practice—reverence for and adherence to the halakhah—can be seen in the following passage from Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology.\textsuperscript{84}

The law thus conceived as submitting all the faculties and passions of man to the control of the divine, whilst suppressing none, was a source of joy and blessing to the Rabbis. Whatever meaning the words of the Apostle may have, when he speaks of the curse of the Law, it is certain that those who lived and died for it considered it as a blessing. To them it was an effluence of God's mercy and love.\textsuperscript{85}

Also, his theology was definitely traditional—theistic and supernatural with even a seeming appreciation for the mystical.\textsuperscript{86}

Additionally, Schechter was a strong advocate of the retention of the Hebrew language and was a Zionist, being mainly influenced by Judah Halevi, Samuel David Luzzatto, Nahman Krochmal and Ahad Ha'am.

From Schechter's death (1915) until the end of World War II (1945) Conservative Judaism grew quantitatively if not in clarity of ideological position. However, its growth then was in no way as spectacular as its growth since the end of World War II. The background for understanding the factors contributing to this period of relative "slumber" and then phenomenal popularity can be found in the preceding sections of this chapter and in chapter III. Nonetheless, a few salient points should be mentioned here:
1. The inter-war period (1918-1946) was a period of increased acculturation and upward mobility for the Jewish masses. Defections from religious Orthodoxy were great.

2. The popularity of secular ideologies and the theory of "cultural pluralism" reached its peak and began to subside in the thirties.

3. "Congregationalism" began to gain strength in the thirties as the predominant form of Jewish community organization at the expense of "community-oriented" cultural and educational institutions and ideologies. The Conservative congregational supplementary school and the Reform religious Sunday school were in the process of becoming the dominant elementary educational institutions as compared to the communal Talmud Torah and the Yiddish secular school.

4. The philosophy and program of Reconstructionism, a dynamic, religiously-oriented philosophy, captured the imagination of many of the Conservative and Reform leadership and intelligentsia as well as of many leaders in Jewish education and in the Jewish Center field.

During this period principles of Conservative ideology as a development of Schechter's position were elaborated upon. However, this occurred rather spontaneously—a product of attempts at differentiation, affirmation and innovation which were part of the movement's continuing search for identity. In 1949, Rabbi Louis Katzoff, in his study of the philosophy of the Conservative congregational school, wrote:

The philosophy of Conservative Judaism does not enjoy the same definiteness of meaning as the other two schools of thought. To this date, the leaders of the Conservative movement are still groping for a clear definition of Judaism, and though several of them have attempted a crystallization of its philosophy, the movement as a whole has never adopted a uniform set of principles. It is difficult to determine whether the reason for this lack of articulation has been due to the youthfulness of the movement or to the deep-seated differences of philosophy among its members. Probably both are correct...
Many critics regard the fact that the Rabbinical Assembly does not possess a clearly stated philosophy as a significant drawback. The greatest objection is that Conservative Jews do not know exactly where they stand on the various questions of theology and observance. It is claimed that there is a contradiction in terms when the movement speaks of loyalty to tradition and yet permits departures from that very tradition in synagogue ritual, when it declares allegiance to the Torah and the Mitzvot and yet permits free discussion of divine revelation and the need for a conscious reconstruction of the law.

The spokesmen of the movement, however, claim that this indecision is an evidence of strength. To freeze its thinking into a definite and inflexible mold, they state, would stultify any further progress, especially at a time when Judaism is going through a period of transition. Having escaped from the pattern of European ghettos into a world which is beset with perplexities not only in religious, but also in social, economic and political thinking, the Jews have not as yet evolved a definite solution to the problem of present day adjustment. The Conservative movement, in attempting to probe this dilemma and to avoid the excesses of radicalism, must therefore resolve the issues thoroughly before committing itself to any single philosophy.87

Notwithstanding the conscious hesitancy on the part of lay and Rabbinic leaders of the Conservative movement to state basic principles of Conservative ideology, some attempts, of late, have been made to do so. In 1954, Agus, in his work cited so often previously, Guideposts in Modern Judaism, was able to say:

The full implications of the movement have not yet been revealed. However, it is already clear that it contains vital ideas which lend it coherence, relate it to the noblest trends of thought in the past and open it to the influence of the best minds of the present. While these ideas are not stressed in equal degree by all Conservative rabbis, they do constitute a consensus of basic convictions that is more significant than the variety of emphases among the marginal adherents to the movement.88

He then proceeds to discuss ten motifs, factors and trends:
1. Repudiation of the Literalistic Conception of Revelation

2. The "Positive-Historical" Viewpoint

3. The Nationalistic Motif

4. The Motif of Anti-Sectarianism

5. The "High Synagogue" Motif

6. The Factor of Neo-Mysticism

7. The Contribution of Rationalism

8. The Emergence of Existentialism

9. The "Reconstructionist" Movement

10. Issues and Practice in the Conservative Movement (mainly the problem of Law or Halakhah)

The second, third, and fourth principles have already been mentioned as part of the exposition of Schechter's views. The various trends enumerated and the problem of Jewish Law (#6, 7, 8, 9, 10) will be discussed shortly. However, some elaboration on the two remaining points is appropriate here.

Agus states his interpretation of the Conservative movement's view of revelation as follows:

"Along with Reform, the Conservative movement does not teach that every word in the Torah and every statement of the Oral Law were literally pronounced by the Deity. The naive picture of revelation as consisting of the "Lord dictating and Moses transcribing" is taken to be more than a symbolic representation of the process of Divine inspiration, that is itself beyond the power of human comprehension. "The Torah speaks in the language of men" as the rabbis put it, and, as our understanding deepens, we must learn to disentangle the human, the conditioned, and the temporary elements from the Divine, the absolute and eternal truths."
An enduring emphasis in Conservatism is the high estimate of the importance of rituals and time-honored symbols in religious life. After a century and a half of unidirectional rationalism, the modern world was reminded that the human personality was rational on the surface only and that symbols of word and deed frequently reached the depths that concepts could only point to. This realization was included in the ideology of American Conservatism, which was taking shape even as students of religion turned their attention from logic and metaphysics to depth-psychology and social anthropology.

Thus, in Conservatism, the prevailing tendency is not to abolish ceremonial practices, but as far as possible, to revitalize them and even to create new ritualistic channels for the articulation of religious feeling. Worship with covered heads and in "tallith" and "t'fillin," the Dietary laws and the distinctive rites of each festival are cherished.

Discussing revelation, "Catholic Israel" and the "Universal Synagogue," Schechter states:

It is not the mere revealed Bible that is of first importance to the Jew, but the Bible as it repeats itself in history, in other words, as it is interpreted by Tradition. This Synagogue, the only true witness to the past, and forming in all ages the sublimest expression of Israel's religious life, must also retain its authority as the sole true guide for the present and the future.

Another consequence of this conception of Tradition is that it is neither Scripture nor primitive Judaism, but general custom which forms the real rule of practice. Holy Writ as well as history, Zunz tells us, teaches that the law of Moses was never fully and absolutely put in practice. Liberty is always given to the great teachers of every generation to make modifications and innovations in harmony with the spirit of existing institutions. The norm as well as the sanction of Judaism is the practice actually in vogue. Its consecration is the consecration of general use, or, in other words, of Catholic Israel.

The major problem that has challenged Conservative Judaism in America is how to interpret, re-vitalize and affirm the authority of Jewish Law in a manner that will allow the
law of divorce. Of note is the fact that when a majority and a minority opinion are both reported, members of the Rabbinical assembly can follow either decision.

Lerman (1962), after examining the various interpretations of Conservative Judaism put forth by the spokesmen of the major ideological positions within the movement, stated that, in his opinion, a consensus actually seemed to exist in reference to the validity and importance of the following principles:

1. The concept of peoplehood (as opposed to theology) with its emphasis on the folk elements of Jewish tradition and the way of life of the Jewish people is the core of Conservative Judaism.

2. Conservative Judaism is one of the three major versions of Judaism in America.

3. Jewish life is characterized by both continuity and change. Beliefs, law, rituals are transmitted but, in concurrence with the positive-historical school, Jewish tradition is not static but evolutionary in character. The dynamic nature of Jewish tradition characterized Jewish life in the past and should continue to do so in the present and future. Thus, the chain of tradition will be preserved.

4. The striving of the Jewish people to evolve a way of life revolving around and emanating from Torah in its broadest sense is of prime significance. Though the Bible is central to Torah, all of Rabbinic literature—Halakhah, Aggadah, Talmud, the Codes, the commentaries—as well as the Siddur, Jewish philosophy and literature and all forms of Jewish artistic expression (the dance, the song, drama, art, etc.) are bonafide sources of Jewish tradition. Hebrew is indispensable for Jewish life based on Torah (as defined above). It is "the cement that binds."

5. Conservative Judaism is dedicated to "modernism," the attempt to interpret Jewish tradition by the scientific study of sources and by using the most refined methods of historical, juridical and sociological research. An "open mind" and recognition of the intellectual climate of the day is required.
6. Conservative Judaism is not monolithic but rather pluralistic. It is hospitable to a variety of viewpoints ranging from Orthodoxy to Reform and even to positions bordering on secularism. It is anti-ideological in character and does not define itself through "platforms." "Every Jew, with the few exceptions noted below, can find a rightful place within this middle-of-the-road movement."

7. Conservative Judaism exhibits tolerance for many viewpoints. It is a liberal movement and respects "freedom of inquiry."

8. Only those against toleration of divergent interpretations of Judaism and against freedom of inquiry are to be excluded from the "ranks." Also, extremist groups such as the American Council for Judaism and the Orthodox fundamentalists have no place within the movement.96

During the period, 1915-1945, the most outspoken, vociferous and influential ideologue allied with the Conservative movement was Mordecai M. Kaplan. Even though Reconstructionist naturalistic theology, the product of Kaplan's creative synthesis of tradition and scientific, liberal, humanistic modernity, was accepted in toto by only a handful of the Conservative Rabbinate, the influence of many of his ideas upon practicing rabbis and Conservative-oriented Jewish educators was considerable.97 The latter assertion regarding Jewish educators will be documented in a later chapter. His position as founder and Dean of the Teachers' Institute of the Jewish Theological Seminary and then as Professor of Homiletics and the Philosophies of Religion at the Seminary, the fount of Conservative Judaism, until 1960 (he is now professor emeritus), placed him in a powerful position to mold the minds of the practicing rabbinate of the Conservative movement and of the instructors at the Teachers' Institute and
of the teachers and educators who had been students at the Teachers' Institute or who were in some way affiliated with the Conservative movement. Since it will be shown that Reconstructionism exhibits many progressive tendencies, the historical relationship between Kaplan and the Seminary (and the Conservative movement) and their current "separation" is of much significance in understanding the influence of progressivism on Conservative Jewish education, past and present.

As might be expected, Kaplan's overall theoretical position has never been accepted (and on many occasions was attacked vehemently) by most of the members of the Seminary faculty and academic leadership group. His relationship with the movement became more and more academic and functional in nature as he founded the Society for the Advancement of Judaism and stimulated the development of the Reconstructionist movement (with its own periodical, The Reconstructionist), a movement cutting across the lines of demarcation between Conservative and Reform Judaism and including, officially and unofficially, a great number of Jewish educators, Jewish scholars and academicians, communal workers and laymen.

As has been noted earlier, the post-World War II period found Conservative Judaism beginning to articulate an indigenous ideological position more clearly. With the tendency of the Seminary leadership and of many members of the Rabbinical Assembly to publicly favor neo-traditionalism or neo-mysticism as the emerging Conservative theoretic theological and ideological tendency and, thus, to repudiate a more "left-of-center" position,
the Reconstructionist movement has become a more autonomous and independent movement and has wielded less and less influence within the "Conservative Establishment." Because of these historical circumstances and the fact that Reconstructionism, by its own definition, was not to be considered part of the Conservative movement and was quite critical of it, Reconstructionist ideology will be considered in a separate section.98

Once Reconstructionism is eliminated from the ideological matrix of Conservative Judaism, even if Reconstructionist influence is present to some degree, the remainder of the Conservative ideological-theological positions can be considered as variations of theism. Though they may differ as to the meaning of revelation, the interpretation of the idea of God, the immutability of Jewish law and the respective roles of mysticism and rationalism, they do agree on the supernatural nature of God, the reality and importance of the revelatory experience and the fundamental significance of halakhah as authoritative Jewish law. All agree that religious acts and religious experiences are of greater import than religious dogma. All, to one degree or another, affirm (1) the centrality of the synagogue as the institution in Jewish life, (2) the importance of prayer as well as of ritual and ceremonial observances, (3) the need to provide as an intensive Jewish education as possible for all age groups, (4) the primacy of the Hebrew language, and (5) the validity of the "positive-historical" approach to Jewish scholarship as the key to the dynamic development of a traditionally-oriented Judaism.
Professor Louis Ginzberg, renowned talmudic and rabbinic scholar at the Jewish Theological Seminary of America from 1902 until his death (1953), along with Prof. Louis Finkelstein and Saul Lieberman, have represented a position which has strongly defended the immutability of Jewish law but which, in theory at least, allowed for the possibility of its progressive development.

For an adherent of this school, the sanctity of the Sabbath reposes not upon the fact that it was proclaimed on Sinai, but on the fact the Sabbath idea found for thousands of years its expression in Jewish souls. Practical Judaism on the other hand is not concerned with origins, but regards the institutions as they have come to be. If we are convinced that Judaism is a religion of deed, expressing itself in observances which are designed to achieve the moral elevation of man and give reality to his religious spirit, we have a principle, in observance of which, reforms in Judaism are possible. From this point of view the evaluation of a law is independent of its origin, and thus the line of demarcation between biblical and rabbinical law almost disappears.

Statements of principle and belief by Ginzberg, Finkelstein, and other theists in the Conservative group have been augmented in the last twenty-five years by the pronouncements and extensive presentations of men of a more "neo-traditionalist" or modernistic spirit. These men, and others like them, exhibit a certain degree of eclecticism, mixing at times their "traditionalism" with rationalism, neo-mysticism and elements of Reconstructionist ideology (not theology). Jacob Agus, who is a well-known and highly respected member of this group, stated in 1954:
In the past decade, thoughtful observers were frequently more impressed with the divisions inside the Conservative movement than with the overall character and ideology of the United Synagogue. It was commonly assumed that the "right wing" of Conservatism shaded off into liberal Orthodoxy, that the "left wing" represented a blend of Reform with nationalism, and that the "center" consisted of the steadily diminishing company of the hesitating and the unconvincing. Actually, the past generation has witnessed the steady rise of the "center" group within the movement, leading to the evolution of a vigorous and scholarly interpretation of Judaism that bids fair to set the dominant pattern for the future.100

On his own behalf, Agus says:

Thus, God as the field-building pole of being is approached through the highways of reason, aesthetics and ethics. We think of Him as the Self of the Universe, related to our self, in its field-building capacity, as our self is related to the material world. Yet these ways of cognizing are only formal, belonging more to philosophy than to religion. Basic as these avenues are, they constitute only the substructure of religion. For it is in attachment to God and His will that religion is born, and once this attachment is discovered, a new level of aspirations and feelings is opened up for the human personality.

It is in prayer that religion is born. In the beginning is the self's immediate reverence before the Master of the Universe, its abasement before the Majesty of its source. It is not the believer in God who prays, but it is the worshipper who believes. The polarity of being has its correspondence and reflection in the life of the soul, which moves rhythmically from aggressive self-assertion in the world of reality to passive self-surrender to the Maker of this world.101

Lerman says of Agus: "An appraisal of Agus' overall view shows it to be integrated and well thought through. He certainly represents the modern synthesis of reason and faith accepted by a majority of Conservatives more than does Kaplan."102

Robert Gordis, a scholar, respected spokesman and prodigious writer, is another leader of the "center" group referred to by Agus. Two citations from his many works may be
helpful in understanding his point of view. Evidence of Theism as opposed to humanism or naturalism can be seen in some of his writings:

To recapitulate, Revelation is a never-ending process, suffering all the vicissitudes of human life because human beings, weak and imperfect and varying widely in their profundity and insight, are creative partners in the process. Moreover, the process does not end with the Mishnah or the Gemara, or with Saadiah, Maimonides... It also follows that not every stage is equally creative and fruitful. One may venture to hope that the varied efforts in this direction being made in our day may prove to be among the instruments of divine Revelation, and that these contributions will ultimately enter the mainstream of living Judaism.

Moreover, in assigning to God only the factors of good in the universe, religious humanism has no answer with regard to the origin of reality as a whole. One of the most distinguished exemplars of this school of thought therefore maintains that "the metaphysical conception of God, which depends upon one's ideas of ultimate reality is not, or should not be, the subject-matter of religion" (Mordecai M. Kaplan, A New Zionism, p. 114). But as the words which we have italicized indicate, most men do expect to find a theory of the universe in their religious outlook. From our entire approach, it is clear that we regard the cognitive function of religion not only as legitimate but as basic.

However, a respect for reason and science and a questioning of the complete efficacy of the mystical can be discerned as one inspects Gordis' position closely. In general, "eclectic centrism" best describes Gordis' overall theology. Reason and mysticism both are facets of his theistic interpretation of Judaism.

For me the religious view of the universe is true, that is to say, it stands in closest correspondence with reality. I find it buttressed increasingly by scientific discoveries in physics and chemistry, biology and psychology. The world was created and is maintained by God, who is at the same
time the source and the symbol of moral perfection. The love of God—which comprehends the quest for truth, the appreciation of beauty and the eternal struggle for righteousness—therefore remains the only worthwhile goal of human life.

The residuum of mystery is the touchstone of the truth of our conception of God. Modern humanist cults make much of the fact that traditional theism must leave many problems and contradictions unresolved. That is not a drawback but an advantage. For any conception that man may evolve about God and the world which "solves," or at least answers all problems, is ipso facto wrong...105

Though Gordis and Agus have been the most prolific writers and exponents of the "centrist" version of Conservative theism, other articulate theists, some more traditional and some more "modern," have been Simon Greenberg, Ben Zion Bokser, Theodore Friedman, Max Kadushin and Max Artz, among others.

The embodiment of the "neo-traditional" ideological position is now evident in the theological-biblical approach proposed by the recently founded Melton Research Center of the Jewish Theological Seminary, established in 1960. The biblical scholar, Dr. Nahum Sarna, now with Brandeis University, and the theologian and instructor in the philosophy of religion at the Teachers' Institute and of the Seminary College, Rabbi Fritz Rothschild, were designated to present the biblical and theological "consensus" of the Melton Faculty Seminar. Dr. Sarna, in The Heritage of Biblical Israel, the source book for the Genesis Bible Project sponsored by the Center, states:

Biblical man, despite his undoubted intellectual and spiritual endowments, did not base his views of the universe and its laws on the critical use of empirical data. He had not, as yet, discovered the principles and methods of disciplined inquiry, critical observation or analytical experimentation. Rather, his thinking was
imaginative, his expressions of thought concrete, pictorial, emotional and poetic. Hence, it is a naive and futile exercise to attempt to reconcile the biblical accounts of creation with the findings of modern science. Any correspondence which can be discovered or ingeniously established between the two must surely be nothing more than mere coincidence. Even more serious than the inherent fundamental misconception of the psychology of biblical man is the unwholesome effect upon the understanding of the Bible itself. For the net result is self-defeating. The literalistic approach serves to direct attention to those aspects of the narrative that reflect the time and place of its composition, and to obscure the elements that are meaningful and enduring, thus distorting its message and destroying its relevancy.106

Rabbi Rothschild, in an essay included in the appendix of the Teacher's Guide to the Teaching of Genesis, published by the Melton Research Center as the product of its "action-research" programs in the Ramah camps and in selected Conservative congregational and day schools throughout the country, states:

Wherever a metaphor is elaborated in the form of a coherent story we shall feel free to call it a myth. The term is not used pejoratively as referring to fictitious accounts; it merely indicates that the story, although couched in terms of empirical happenings, is metaphorical and refers to the divine reality which by its ineffable nature cannot be described in direct first-order language ...

To value but not to worship nature is the upshot of biblical thought. And since—unlike Rembrandt or any finite artist—God is always active, one must never presume to judge Him on the basis of His past works and to assume that He has spoken the last word and that all the evidence is in. The mystery in the inexhaustible center which we call the Divine essence expresses itself in new and creative ways as long as the world goes on. But the metaphor of God as the supreme artisan prevents us from identifying the finite work with the infinite Maker.

The more comprehensive and suggestive root metaphor of God as the King or Ruler shows the Creator not only as the source of power, will and skill, but also as the source of care and concern for His creatures ...
The scandal of religious metaphor is the use of the finite human categories for the Infinite Divine reality. The necessity for religious metaphor is man's inability to apprehend the infinite except through such human and finite categories.107

A critical analysis of Rabbi Rothschild's statement and of others published by the Center point to the presence of the emerging "center-right" position and to the possible influence of neomysticism. More will be said about the Center's educational orientation in a later chapter.

The most influential and revered spokesman of neomysticism within the Conservative movement has been the theologian, Abraham Joshua Heschel. His influence on Conservative theological thought during the past twenty years has been wide. Heschel's eloquent statements about God, revelation and Israel's fate are typical of his neomystical stance:

The statement, man speaks, describes a physiological and psychological act: the statement, God speaks, conveys a mystery. It calls upon our sense of wonder and amazement to respond to a mystery that surpasses our power of comprehension.

They are spiritual facts which are wholly irreducible to verbal expression and completely beyond the range of either imagination or definition...

Souls are not introduced to a range of mountains through the courtesy of a definition. Our goal, then, must not be to find a definition, but to learn how to sense, how to intuit the will of God in the words. The essence of intuition is not in grasping what is describable but in sensing what is ineffable. The goal is to train the reason for the appreciation of that which lies beyond reason. It is only through our sense of the ineffable that we may intuit the mystery of revelation... Israel exists not in order to be, but in order to cherish the vision of God. Our faith may be strained but our destiny is anchored to the ultimate. Who can establish
the outcome of our history? Out of wonder we came and into the wonder we shall return.108

It should be mentioned at the end of this section on spokesmen for the current ideological trends within the Conservative movement that other non-movement thinkers have exerted a profound influence upon the "semi-official" and official spokesmen of the movement. Recognition should be given to the impact of the thinking of Martin Buber (neo-mysticism or neo-hasidism), Franz Rosenzweig (existentialism) and Hermann Cohen (rationalism) as well as to the existentialist and neo-mystical thought of Will Herberg, Soren Kierkegaard, Paul Tillich and Reinhold Niebuhr.

Notwithstanding the turn toward the "center-right" position, the influence of neo-mysticism and contemporary Protestant theological thought, and the turning from the liberal, humanistic, naturalistic and sociological formulations of Reconstructionism at the Seminary (Seminary College, Teachers' Institute, The Melton Research Center, Ramah Camps, etc.) and at the rabbinic level, ideological debate as was mentioned earlier has not generally excited the Conservative laity and in many instances has been actively discouraged both by the laymen themselves and the Seminary.109 In 1955 Sklare arrived at the conclusion that ideological considerations were of secondary importance if not frowned upon in many instances.110 However, additional evidence did force Sklare to admit that "ideological clarification does intrude itself now and then as a problem in Conservatism. What are the forces that encourage
or inhibit this tendency? Trends in social stratification among Jews, the development of denominational rivalry, the present status of Zionism, the influence of the Seminary group, and the ambivalence of the laity and the functionaries are among the relevant factors. In 1948, one lay leader, Julian Freeman, expressed his frustration in the following words:

No amount of talk will dissipate the fact that there is confusion throughout our movement. Some people insist on saying "don't bring it up in public--time will help out." Well, the Conservative movement is about fifty years old. Some of us are getting pretty well along in life, and we want a scheme for living today.

As commentary on this statement, Sklare, basing his overall judgment upon the evidence he had gathered as of 1955, concludes:

In summary, although a few attempts have been made by the rabbis to develop a distinctive Conservative ideology and to obtain consensus, such endeavors have met with only very limited success. They have hardly been able to describe what is actually in existence in the Conservative movement, or to relate present realities to theoretical principles. The functionaries have not succeeded in spreading the few ideas which they have evolved among the laity. The concepts which they have presented are largely improvised. They express the needs and training of the religious specialists rather than of the mass of Conservative Jewry. The "ideology" has not as yet reached the stage of justifying--with any degree of sophistication--various institutional imperatives, although this is its present aim.

As the comments by Julian Freeman imply, the major facet of lay ideological concern that existed, and still exists today, is the area of Conservative practice vis-à-vis Orthodox and Reform practice. As has been noted heretofore, pressure has been brought to bear upon the Rabbinical Assembly
to clarify the Conservative position in regard to certain halakhic problems. Before leaving the discussion of Conservative ideological development it is necessary to indicate the "uniqueness" of official Conservative practice—elements of traditional practice which are affirmed and "deviations" from Orthodox Jewish practice which have become normative (in theory at least) for most Conservative Jews and Conservative synagogues. This presentation should help concretize the amorphous nature of "Conservative popular ideology." This "popular ideology" most probably in turn has influenced the objectives, content and method of important aspects of Conservative Jewish education more deeply than have the major ideologues of the movement as well as the recent attempts at the national level (The Seminary, The Teachers' Institute, The Melton Research Center, the Ramah Camps, The United Synagogue Commission on Jewish Education, etc.) to chart the ideological, theological and methodological metamorphosis of Conservative Jewish education. However, efforts at the national level are becoming more and more sophisticated, and they seem to be influencing the current and future direction of Conservative Jewish education much more significantly than in the past.

Conservative worship, in the domain of form, is notably different from traditional Orthodox worship in three areas:

A. The status of women—

The overwhelming majority of Conservative synagogues seat men and women together. This is known as "mixed seating," or the family pew system. The adjustment of woman's position is an outstanding feature of the Conservative synagogue as well as the
most commonly accepted yardstick for differentiating Conservatism from Orthodoxy. This change is taken by the woman as symbolic of her new status, and was regarded by both sexes at the time of its adoption as a concession of crucial significance.

It should not be inferred that women in Conservatism are accorded perfect equality with their spouses. Although the sexes do sit side-by-side during worship and the women take part in all responses indicated in the liturgy, they are still excluded from certain worship activities.

B. Decorum, order, and leadership of the service by the rabbi and cantor so that it proceeds with dignity and without interruption is expected at all times.

C. In order to be consistent with American-Protestant norms of behavior, which have come to influence Conservative practice much as Protestant theology has come to influence Conservative theological thought, "commercialism" in the form of appeals and soliciting donations or carrying on auctions for honored participation in the Torah-reading service has been discouraged though by no means completely eliminated.

The program of worship emphasizes High Holiday, Festival and Sabbath participation, though a daily minyan, especially to allow for the reciting of Kaddish, is encouraged. The wearing of the skullcap, the tallit and tefillin (at appropriate times) is also considered normative. The late Friday evening service and emphasis on the Bar Mitzvah, Bas Mitzvah and Confirmation ceremonies are also hallmarks of the Conservative program of worship. Junior Congregation services and Youth services (for teenagers) are the vogue in many Conservative synagogues.

The content of worship, or the ideological framework of the prayers, services, and rituals, has generally not deviated radically from the Orthodox pattern as is the case with Reform Judaism. In most instances
Conservative synagogues employ either the Orthodox prayer-book or the one of the United Synagogue. The main changes in the United Synagogue Prayer-Book consist in the elimination of a petition for the renewal of the sacrificial system. By holding a service at which the traditional text is used, by glossing over objectionable portions or having them read or chanted in Hebrew, and by stressing English readings whose content is definitely modern in emphasis, it is possible to satisfy a wide audience.

Another characteristic of Conservatism, also essentially an adjustive technique, is that the prayers are not translated literally. As is the case with certain Biblical concepts and forms of expression being viewed as metaphor, myth and "speaking in the language of man," so prayer is considered symbolic and poetic in nature. As would be expected "reinterpretation," with its sanctification and retention of traditional forms and metaphors, has been the "way" of Conservative Judaism. Radical revision and reconstruction, as found in the Reconstructionist versions of the Sabbath and High Holiday prayer books, has not been accepted.

In the area of general observance, the dietary laws, both within and outside of the synagogue (in public and in the home) are supposed to be adhered to as an affirmation of tradition. The observance of the Sabbath has also been a major concern of Conservative Judaism, witness the statements by the Committee on Jewish Law of the Rabbinical Assembly and the takkanot in regard to the use of electricity and riding to the synagogue.

All leaders of Conservative Judaism admit that only a
small, if not a minute, percentage of its adherents practice Judaism as the official Conservative position would have it.

Blau, in agreement with Sklare, summarizes the situation (1966):

The Conservative Jewish identification is, if the distinction may be allowed, more ethnic than religious. It emphasizes a feeling of "Jewishness" rather than a practice of Judaism. Certain customs tend to be stressed as evidences of "Jewishness" while others, equally grounded in tradition, are disregarded. A special aura of sanctity attaches to food customs and dietary laws... In the homes of many members of Conservative congregations some of the dietary laws are observed, while others are disregarded; many who maintain fairly strict observance in their homes make no pretense of conforming to the dietary laws when they eat in restaurants or in the homes of others. There is a high percentage of holiday observance. Hebrew schooling, to some degree, for children is felt to be virtually obligatory, but the participation of the parents in Jewish cultural activities is far less common.

The individual variation in the extent of adherence to the standards of traditional practice is very wide. So, too, is the variation from synagogue to synagogue within the Conservative movement.

As part of our summation, mention must be made of the "synagogue center," the original invention of Mordecai Kaplan, but the practical institutional innovation of the Conservative movement.

The conception of the integral organic nature of Judaism has found expression in the emergence on the American scene, under the aegis of Conservatism, of an institution unique in Jewish history—the Synagogue Center. The appropriateness to the American environment of the philosophy it embodies is attested to by its rapid spread. Yet, it must be granted that in its programmatic scope which seeks to embrace the many-faceted aspects of Jewish living, it stems directly from the Conservative conception of the nature of Judaism and Jewish living.

The Synagogue Center, being at the core a religious institution, fits perfectly into the pattern of American life. Its religious services, its religious classes and
even its recreational and social activities, are the outgrowth of the desire to strengthen loyalty to an historic faith. The faith that is Judaism embraces the totality of life and hallows even its "secular" aspects. Hence it is perfectly legitimate for the Synagogue Center to include in its program not only worship and religious instruction, but also recreation, dramatics, art and music. This is definitely not the case with the Jewish Community Center, which unites Jews not as a religious social organism but as members of an ethnic or cultural minority. Any such form of segregation clashes with the pattern of American life and therefore is neither desirable nor dependable as a means of perpetuating our collective identity.121

Although, or because, it sacrifices the exclusively religious for a more totalistic approach, including the "ethnic," the "Jewish," and the "secular," it has been a great success in meeting the needs of Conservative Jews.

Educational activities of the United Synagogue and the Jewish Theological Seminary have already been mentioned from time to time. However, since the educational efforts of Conservative Judaism represent a significant contribution to American Jewish life, and since Jewish education is the paramount focus of this study—its major institutions and projects should be listed and described so that the scope of the Conservative movement's educational activity can be fully recognized. The educational validity of some of these diverse efforts, their relevancy in reference to the needs of American Jewry, and, above all, the positive influence of or negative reaction to progressive thought and method manifested in these programs will be examined, in some cases, at a later time.

A. The United Synagogue Commission on Jewish Education—responsible for the creation and publication of texts and educational materials, coordinates regional educational and experimental programs,
involves itself in curriculum development for
the congregational school at the national level,
sets standards for congregational schools (years
of study prior to Bar Mitzvah, etc.), encourages
more intensive Jewish education via the congre-
gational school, the regional and central inter-
congregational high schools, the foundation
school and day school.122

B. The Teachers' Institute of the Jewish Theological
Seminary—
educates prospective teachers and educational
administrators, involves itself in pioneering
and innovating in the field of Jewish education.123

C. The Melton Research Center of the Jewish Theological
Seminary—(as stated in the Introduction to Sarna's
The Heritage of Biblical Israel: Genesis)124

"The Melton Research Center was established at the
Jewish Theological Seminary of America in 1960 by
Mr. and Mrs. Samuel Mendel Melton of Columbus, Ohio.

"Since its purpose is to discover ways and means to
improve Jewish education in the United States, the
Center was designated a department of the Seminary's
Teachers Institute. The faculty of the Jewish
Theological Seminary devoted considerable thought
to the purposes and direction of the Research Center ..."125

"The Research Center has been working on several
projects, and hopes to initiate others in the near
future. Those under way included the development
of new text materials and methods for the classroom,
studies on the goals of Jewish education, monographs
on theories of value education, and experiments
attempting to translate this theory into practice. ..."

D. Camp Ramah—camps that provide exposure for selected
students of Conservative congregational schools and
high schools to an intensive Hebraic-religious
atmosphere during the summer months. Study, recre-
ation and Jewish living as interpreted by the pro-
fessional leadership of the Conservative movement
characterize the program. The camps are staffed by
rabbis, educators, teachers and Seminary students
as well as by counsellors with appropriate Jewish
background and Conservative orientation. The in-
fluence of the Seminary and the Teachers' Institute
is considerable at these camps, and experimental
work stimulated by the Melton Research Center takes
place at many of these camps. There are many camps
throughout the country, and Ramah has become one
of the most effective and popular educational projects sponsored by the Conservative movement."

E. "The Eternal Light"—a radio and television series bringing the message of Judaism to millions of Americans (sponsored by the Seminary).

F. The Jewish Museum—an endeavor of the Seminary which displays ritual, art objects, and examples of Jewish art.

G. The Institute of Social and Religious Studies—a project which provides a forum for the exchange of religious and philosophical insights with clergymen of other faiths and for discussion of contemporary socio-religious problems with the general academic community (sponsored by the Seminary).

H. The National Academy for Adult Jewish Studies—provides services similar to those of the Commission on Jewish Education to the adult education programs of congregations.

I. Department of Youth Activities—directs national organizations such as (1) United Synagogue Youth (for teenagers); (2) Leaders' Training Fellowship for youth with the ability and interest in becoming the future leaders of the movement; (3) in past years, the Young People's League (now non-existent) for young adults; (4) Atid for college young adults affiliated with the Conservative movement (sponsored by the United Synagogue).

J. Visits and Educational Programs in Israel—summer experiences for younger and older teenagers in Israel combining study and touring of Israel; the recently proposed program for young adults to give an extended period of service to the State of Israel similar to the Peace Corps and the Vista programs sponsored by the United States government.

K. The Solomon Schechter Day Schools (and other United Synagogue Day Schools)—The Conservative movement is now encouraging the formation of day schools throughout the country in its efforts to provide intensive Jewish education. It has established an organization of Solomon Schechter Day Schools with a coordinator employed by the United Synagogue Commission on Jewish Education: Attempts to solidify the system
of schools, to help the schools integrate the latest innovations in general education and Jewish education into their programs, to support the schools in dealing with the practical problems of financing, administration, teacher and student recruitment, lay leadership, planning physical facilities, etc., are now in progress.

In conclusion, three voices, one from within the Conservative movement and two from without, all of whom have previously been cited, will serve to help summarize the present status of the Conservative movement and prognosticate as to its future:

If Conservatism has had an "historic mission" in terms of preventing the complete alienation and religious disorganization of the East-European-derived Jew, that task has been completed. Perhaps, Conservatism will not rest upon this accomplishment but will come to play a new and as yet unforeseeable role in the Jewish life of the future.127

On both the religious right and left, profound re-orientations are taking place. The recent changes in American Orthodoxy, in practice if not in theory, are quite apparent. Within Reform, ideological shifts have long been at work. These are unmistakable signs that the mood and the current of ideas abroad in the American Jewish community seem to be veering towards a Conservative position. If such should be the case, then Solomon Schechter's oft repeated claim and hope that Conservatism represented not a sect, but rather the mainstream of Judaism, will have been validated and fulfilled. If not, Conservatism will have made its contribution in the form of creative personalities, ideas, scholarship and institutions to the American Judaism of the future.128

The breadth of the areas demonstrating the inconsistencies of statement and practice in Conservative Judaism makes clear that it is an adaptation peculiarly fitted for survival in a pluralistic environment. Somewhere within the complex phenomenon of Conservative Judaism any person who wishes to identify himself with the Jewish people can find a position blending tradition and innovation in precisely the proportions acceptable to him. Thus, Conservatism, with all its backings and fillings, its avoidance of dogmatic positions, its uneasy balance of lay and rabbinical elements,
its pragmatic character, may have supplied precisely the compromise position, the broad middle of the road needed to offset the conditions faced by Judaism in twentieth-century America.129

Reform Judaism, or Liberal or Progressive Judaism as it is referred to by many of its spokesmen, developed in central Europe in the early decades of the nineteenth century. Its rationale might be looked upon as a form of religious response to the growing reliance upon human reason and to the application of the tests of universal and eternal value and contemporary relevancy as the major criteria by which men of this period sought to judge and evaluate current beliefs and practices as well as age-old traditions. However, its genesis is better understood from a sociological vantage point, sociological determinants preceding the practical innovations and ideological formulations. Reform Judaism originated as a mode of adjustment to secularism and modernity, as a unique and relatively radical approach to Judaism which was supposed to serve to inhibit defections from Judaism by the German Jewish intelligentsia who were thirsting for the political and social emancipation promised by the advocates of Enlightenment and Reason. The guiding spirit of this "adjustive thrust," though most decidedly not an advocate of Reform Judaism as it later developed, was Moses Mendelssohn.

The educational efforts of Moses Mendelssohn were, in part, directed toward eliminating one side of this difficulty. His program called for a much more effective mode of teaching Hebrew, in order that the prayers and the Bible when read or recited in Hebrew might be intelligible to the participants. In this connection it must be recalled that Mendelssohn was a firm traditionalist with respect to the maintenance of the ceremonial law. He did not
want to change the synagogue service, but to change the worshippers.130

Although in the 1820's a Reform congregation was established amid considerable controversy in Charleston, South Carolina,131 the major theoretical and practical innovations of "classic Reform" had their origin in Germany. During the 1840's and onward, leaders of German Reform, both rabbinic and lay, transplanted their institutions, practices and germinal theoretical constructs in the New World as a by-product of the migration of German Jews to America.

The history of Reform Judaism in Germany—its experiments, its confrontations with the fundamentalists and with the "liberal orthodox" (Zechariah Frankel and the "positive-historical school") is described in detail by David Philipson in The Reform Movement in Judaism.132 The politics and polemics that split asunder the Jewish religious community in Germany are not important for the present discussion. However, note should be made of the lasting contributions in the field of Jewish scholarship of Abraham Geiger,133 as well as those of Leopold Zunz134 and other members of the group of scholars known as the Verein für Kultur und Wissenschaft des Judentums; of the logical and pragmatic approach of Samuel Holdheim and his practical innovations; of the philosophical framework developed by Samuel Hirsch at first in Germany and later in America.135

A few distinctive changes in practice and belief introduced by the German Jewish reformers, originally in Germany and then continued in America, were:
A. The synagogue-- The sermon was delivered in the vernacular; choral singing to the accompaniment of an organ with non-Jewish singers participating was introduced; prayers were translated into the vernacular; much of the traditional cantillation and some Hebrew prayers were eliminated as the service was shortened; references in the liturgy to the return to Zion, the personal Messiah and the re-establishment of the sacrificial cult were excised from the prayer book; greater decorum and the elimination of the selling of mitzvot (the traditional honor connected with the reading from the Torah) became prevalent; the allowing of "mixed seating" or family pews took place; the introduction of the Confirmation ceremony to replace the Bar Mitzvah service also became widespread.

B. General Practice-- The second day of the holidays was not observed; the dietary laws and many other rituals and ceremonies were discarded.

C. Belief-- A relativistic view of Jewish law was proposed so that most rituals and practices (Mitzvot Maasiyot) could be eliminated without doing harm to the theological and ethical essence of Judaism; the concept of a personal Messiah was replaced by the idea of a Messianic age; a universalistic interpretation of the concept of "the chosen people" replaced the traditional nationalistic belief; all
claims to a homeland and nationhood were denied. From the 1840's to 1885 American Reform continued to struggle to refine its ideological position as it took firm root on American soil. During this period of expansion the major internal problem was to define the nature and degree of modification of traditional ritual and ceremonial practice deemed appropriate for a "rational religion" in a free, democratic society. Continued experimentation with new and revised manners of ritual expression took place as Reform congregations grew in size and number and spread throughout the country. In America, the liberal religious ideology and movement represented by Reform Judaism was characterized by the freedom and autonomy granted to each rabbi, congregation and individual to choose those practices and beliefs that suited their tastes. The problems of consensus and organization still remained to be solved.

As has been already intimated, during this period Reform tended, in general, to be militantly anti-traditional and liberal, emphasizing the ethical, the universal, the rational, the intellectual, the modern and the scientific aspects of life at the expense of the ritualistic, the legalistic, the ethnic, the emotional, the mystical, the "unquestioning faith," the "past-oriented" aspects of life. To the more radical leaders of Reform Judaism, such as Dr. Einhorn and Rabbi Samuel Hirsch of Knesset Israel congregation in Philadelphia, any compromises with Orthodoxy which would be detrimental to the cause of Liberal Judaism were to be seriously questioned. In this
atmosphere, the attempts of Isaac M. Wise to facilitate a union with the more traditional Jewish elements represented by Isaac Leeser, Sabato Morais and Alexander Kohut and the plans to convene a synod to decide on matters of Jewish practice were to be in vain. As the years passed, constructive efforts to bring about some degree of unity with the more conservative groupings within American Judaism—the creation of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations (1873) and the Hebrew Union College (1875) as examples—became doomed to failure. Confrontations between Reform leaders such as Kaufmann Kohler and the more "conservative liberals" such as Alexander Kohut became more heated and inevitable notwithstanding all efforts to avert them by Isaac M. Wise. A conference of rabbis of all shades of opinion held in Cleveland in 1855 was divisive as liberal and conservative viewpoints clashed. However, a conference of Reform rabbis only was held in Philadelphia in 1869, and "the first public statement made by a body of reformers on this side of the Atlantic" was made. Seven basic principles were adopted as well as resolutions reforming marriage and divorce legislation. The 1871 Cincinnati conference served to give impulse to the founding of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations. Some significant developments in the area of Reform practice took place during this period among which were the gradual abolition of the wearing of the skullcap and tallit in the synagogue, the further development of the Confirmation ceremony so that it became a basic institution of Reform practice and the inauguration of late Friday evening services.
The commencement banquet in honor of the first class of rabbis to be graduated from Hebrew Union College (1883), ostensibly a rabbinical school for all branches of Judaism, will be remembered for its serving of shrimp. Morais and Kohut immediately disassociated themselves from the Reform group and founded the Jewish Theological Seminary of America in 1886. This "separation" was the final blow to Wise's attempt to keep Reform from becoming a distinct sect and likewise was a victory for the radical reformers who now felt strong enough to formulate a definite set of principles that were to establish Reform Judaism as a unique religious ideological faction in the American Jewish community. The defection of the "conservatives" set the stage for the "radicals," led by Kohler, to become spokesmen for the movement represented at the congregational and lay level by the UHAC (Union of American Hebrew Congregations). At Pittsburgh, in 1885, the rabbinical leaders agreed upon a non-binding and non-authoritative but yet extremely influential and widely-accepted set of principles:

1. ... We hold that Judaism presents the highest conception of the God-idea as taught in our Holy Scriptures and developed and spiritualized by the Jewish teachers, in accordance with the moral and philosophical progress of their respective ages ...  
2. We recognize in the Bible the record of the consecration of the Jewish people to its mission as the priest of the one God, and value it as the most potent instrument of religious and moral instruction. We hold that the modern discoveries of scientific researches in the domain of nature and history are not antagonistic to the doctrine of Judaism, the Bible reflecting the primitive ideas of its own age ...  
3. We recognize in the Mosaic legislation a system of training the Jewish people for its mission during its national life in Palestine, and today we accept as binding only its moral laws, and maintain only such ceremonies
as elevate and sanctify our lives, but reject all such as are not adapted to the views and habits of modern civilization.

4. We hold that all such Mosaic and rabbinical laws as regulate diet, priestly purity, and dress originated in ages and under the influence of ideas entirely foreign to our present mental and spiritual state. . . . Their observance in our days is apt rather to obstruct than to further modern spiritual elevation.

5. We recognize, in the modern era of universal culture of heart and intellect, the approaching of the realization of Israel's great Messianic hope for the establishment of the kingdom of truth, justice and peace among all men. We consider ourselves no longer a nation, but a religious community, and therefore neither a return to Palestine, nor a sacrificial worship under the sons of Aaron, nor the restoration of any of the laws concerning the Jewish state.

6. We recognize in Judaism a progressive religion, ever striving to be in accord with postulates of reason. We are convinced of the utmost necessity of preserving the historical identity with our great past . . . . We acknowledge that the spirit of broad humanity of our age is our ally in the fulfillment of our mission, and therefore we extend the hand of fellowship to all who operate with us in the establishment of the reign of truth and righteousness among men.

7. We reassert the doctrine of Judaism that the soul is immortal, grounding this belief on the divine nature of the human spirit, which forever finds bliss in righteousness and misery in wickedness. We reject as ideas not rooted in Judaism, the beliefs both in bodily resurrection and in Gehenna and Eden (Hell and Paradise) as abodes for everlasting punishment and reward.

8. In full accordance with the spirit of Mosaic legislation, which strives to regulate the relation between rich and poor, we deem it our duty to participate in the great task of modern times, to solve, on the basis of justice and righteousness, the problems presented by the contrasts and evils of the present organization of society.\footnote{141}

For better or for worse, the "Pittsburgh Platform" was long regarded as the quasi-official creed of Reform, both by members of Reform and by its antagonists (not until 1937 was a new set of "guiding principles" adopted). However, not even Kaufmann Kohler, the author of most of the Platform, considered it credal in character. His \textit{Jewish Theology}\footnote{142} makes not one
reference to it.

Notwithstanding the disavowal of the credal character of the Pittsburgh Platform by the leaders who drafted it, its issuance contributed to unifying and giving direction to the Reform movement during the decades following its adoption. "Classic Reform," reflecting attitudes spawned as a result of Judaism's confrontation with eighteenth century liberalism as well as with the ethos of Enlightenment and the promise of Emancipation, had become firmly implanted. It reflected an optimistic faith in universal progress and human brotherhood, in the supremacy of reason as well as in the principles of ethical monotheism. The turn of the century witnessed the increased solidification of Reform as ideology and movement. In fact from the point of view of its becoming "the new American Judaism," as its champions would have had it, it probably reached its zenith during the 1890's and 1900's. During the first twenty years of the twentieth century American Reform remained popular but its rate of ascendency began to decline for reasons to be discussed shortly.

The achievements of Reform from 1885 to the 1920's were highlighted by the creation of the Central Conference of American Rabbis (the C.C.A.R.), the writing and publication of the Union Prayer Book, and the formation of the American Jewish Committee. Stimulated by Dr. Wise, Dr. Philipson (the historian of the movement) helped organize the C.C.A.R. in 1889. Since its discussions, controversies and pronouncements as stated in its Yearbook and in other publications are so indicative of the
ideological trends and tendencies that have appeared within
the Reform movement, its historical development and its mode
of operation should be made mention of in passing:

Unlike the preceding conferences of rabbis in Germany
and in the U.S., which failed to achieve permanency, the
C.C.A.R. became a continuing assembly, meeting annually
and carrying on its tasks uninterruptedly through its
officers and committees. To create continuity in Reform,
the C.C.A.R. took the resolutions of the preceding Rabbinic-
cal conferences as the basis of its activities. The C.C.A.R.
has acted as a deliberative rather than legislative body.
As a clearing house of Reform Jewish thought and practice
and as a forum for the discussion of the problems of world
Jewry, the Conference has helped shape the patterns of
Jewish life. Learned papers of theoretical and practical
character have been presented at its annual meetings, Com-
mittee reports on religious and social questions of Jewish
and general nature have been submitted with recommendations
for action. The decisions and pronouncements of the Con-
ference are formed by the free, democratic process of open
discussion. The majority opinion, while forming the basis
of action, does not coerce the minority nor even the individ-
ual member. In some instances the Conference has reversed
its former position. Former minority opinions now and then
won the recognition of the majority in consequence of the
changed viewpoints of the membership and the reconsideration
of the issues in the light of altered circumstances.146

The institution of Sunday morning services to replace
or to supplement regular Saturday Sabbath services147 in a good
number of congregations emphasized the inherent tendency during
the beginning stage in the evolution of American Reform to adopt
Protestant forms rather than to persevere with Jewish traditional
forms in a predominantly Protestant culture. This tendency
toward imitation, in addition to the extreme liberalism and
rationalism subscribed to by many Reform rabbis and interested
laymen, definitely was influential in the victory of the Olat
Tamid over the Minhag America in the struggle to establish a
prototype for the Union Prayer Book. The approach of "classic
Reform," reflected vividly in the early editions of the *Union Prayer Book*, should be contrasted with the philosophy of Schechter and the Conservative "positive-historicists." Beryl H. Levy goes to the heart of the problem:

> Of course, a less directly rational approach to liturgy would have allowed for congenial re-interpretation, appreciation of symbolic values and latitude for mythological and metaphorical expression. But the spirit bred by Reform, in its nobler expression, was nothing if not morally earnest, and attention to the lyric aptness, historical reverberations, or imaginative stimulation of a ritual form was not to be expected.148

It must be noted that this overall adulation of "the spirit of the times" and the predilection to assimilate the forms and spirit of liberal Christianity, when taken to its logical extreme, led in some cases to conversion to Christianity, to a definite attraction to Unitarianism and Christian Science and, in another instance, to the founding of the Ethical Culture Society in 1876 by Felix Adler, the son a Reform rabbi.149 Nonetheless, at no time did even the most radical rabbinic faction encourage intermarriage150 nor suggest the elimination of the circumcision of male children born to Jewish parents, although the operation was allowed to be performed by a doctor rather than by a mohel.151 The desire for group survival and an inclination to keep in tact the peoplehood of Israel, no matter how diluted, remained firm, if seemingly subdued, in most instances.

Kohler's *Jewish Theology, Systematically and Historically Considered*, in some respects the Reform complement to Schechter's
Studies in Judaism and Aspects of Rabbinic Theology, appeared in English in 1918. Universalism and the sense of mission about in Kohler's work. Also, he asserts that the belief in God is basically more important than the traditionally co-equal concepts of Israel and Torah. All aspects of Judaism are to be judged by the extent to which they contribute to the ethical enhancement of humanity. Kohler conceives of God as the ideal and inspirer of all morality. God is the supreme Creator and possesses self-conscious will. The implications of this belief are that the world is not governed by blind necessity, that it is not without purpose and meaning and that it is not soulless. Of prophetic idealism, so central in "Classic Reform" ideology, Kohler rhapsodizes:

In contrast to this, Israel's prophetic ideal of a humanity united in justice and peace gave to history a new meaning and larger outlook, kindling in the souls of all truly great leaders...of mankind a love and longing for the broadening of humanity which opened new avenues of progress and liberty...154

Kohler is openly critical of the traditional concepts and implications concerning revelation. He asserts that traditional Judaism states that "the idea of gradual development is precluded by its conception of divine revelation, by its doctrine that both the oral and the written Torah were given at Sinai complete and unchangeable for all time."155 In contrast, he argues: "The divine revelation in Israel was by no means a single act, but a process of development, and its various stages correspond to the degrees of culture of the people."156 Kohler believes that man intuits his knowledge
of God and His will by using practical reason and by the activity of his conscience. He (Kohler) emphatically denies the reality of miracles as God's altering the order of nature. This is a primitive belief. The one and only real miracle is the whole cosmic order. The concept of Torah as ritual law and ceremonial code is an anachronism—it served a purpose in the past but generally should be dispensed with today since it confuses internal holiness with external piety. In summation, Kohler's theology can be classified as a version of positive theism colored by an optimistic liberalism and respect for reason in matters of faith. However, it is interesting to note that he agrees with Hisdai Crescas' criticism of the excessive rationalism of Maimonides:

Nevertheless, we must admit that Crescas shows the deeper insight into the nature of religion when he observes that the main fallacy of the Maimonidean system lies in founding the Jewish faith on speculative knowledge, which is a matter of the intellect, rather than love which flows from the heart, and which alone leads to piety and goodness.

Kohler's stand against intermarriage, his emphasis on stimulating the Jewish home to be permeated by the spirit of God, in conjunction with his affirmation of Israel as the People of God indicate his firm conviction in the peoplehood of Israel, in the validity of their religious uniqueness and in the importance of efforts to aid the Jewish people survive as a distinct entity. Some of his formulations may have been radical and, in the light of history, naive, unrealistic and unwise, but his sincerity and dedication to Judaism cannot be questioned.
During the period, 1920 to 1937, most students of Reform Judaism (as well as of Conservative Judaism) would agree that the major concern of variations of Liberal Judaism was organization, expansion, and consolidation of the movements with financial stability (especially during the Depression), membership growth, ministering to building needs, development and coordination of congregational activities at the local and national levels being the primary foci for the expenditure of energy. When energy could be diverted away from purely practical matters, attempts to resolve ideological dilemmas brought to the fore by the great changes occurring in the situation of Jewry within American society and in the world in general took precedence over inquiry into purely theological problems. Nonetheless, certain theological developments or developments related exclusively to the realm of religious thought did command the interest of some of the Reform rabbinic leadership.

Though the "higher criticism" in regard to the textual analysis of the Bible was generally accepted in the ranks of Reform, questions were raised as to the scientific validity of Wellhausen's method and, thus, of some of his hypotheses. The role and value of archeology vis-à-vis the findings of the "higher criticism" became a bone of controversy. The challenge presented by science and Darwinism to traditional theism as well as to literalist fundamentalism as typified by the Scopes trial brought forth a theological response within Reform, that of "religious humanism." As documented in the records of the
C.C.A.R. and in other literature, Abraham Cronbach and Barnett R. Brickner were articulate advocates of humanism. In 1930 and 1931 their formulations were attacked by such theists as Bernard Heller and Felix A. Levy who supported the concept of "faith in a living God." This theological quarrel, in later-day garb, will be discussed more fully as the metamorphosis of Reform ideology is described on the following pages. The impact of Freudianism as it expressed itself in psychological and psychiatric theory and practice as well as in Freud's penetrating analysis of human personality and behavior was also felt by the Reform rabbinate. The best-known proponent of the importance of understanding the meaning of Freudianism for theology and religion was Joshua L. Liebman, of whom more will be said later.

One by-product of the accelerated rate of acculturation of the Jewish group into American society during the inter-war period was that Reform Judaism became progressively less and less the ideological movement of the "transplanted" German-Jewish upper-class in America. Julian Morgenstern, in an address delivered in 1947, criticized the Pittsburgh Platform with this development in mind. Conversely, the "Americanization" of United States Jewry made itself felt through the increased influence of eastern European Jews within the ranks of Reform in the makeup of congregations, especially of the newer ones, and in the "spiritual baggage" of a new generation of Reform rabbis, many of whom came from eastern European extraction and who were raised in Orthodox and Conservative homes which, in
many instances, were strongly Zionistic.

The eastern European middle-class Jews who chose to become members of existing Reform congregations or who founded new congregations themselves contributed to the creation of an atmosphere conducive to the introduction of more Hebrew and traditional ritual into the synagogue service, an atmosphere in which Jewish education (even the study of Hebrew) and religious ceremonies in the home took on greater relevance and in which Zionism and a positive attachment to a Jewish Palestine became acceptable.\textsuperscript{164} The threat and reality of international anti-Semitism also contributed to considerable activity on the part of Reform Jews in aiding in the establishment of a Jewish State for their persecuted brethren,\textsuperscript{165} though not all Reform Jews took part in and supported this endeavor with equal enthusiasm. Generally, however, the feeling of "peoplehood," of \textit{Klal Yisrael}, became more and more widespread among Reform congregants and rabbinic leadership. In addition, a significant transformation in ideological climate during the latter years of the interwar period—the questioning of the assumptions and achievements of liberalism, the "return to tradition" that was gaining strength throughout the western world as a reaction to the "failure" of liberalism, the mounting popularity of Reconstructionism, Conservatism and neo-mysticism within American Jewish life and religious thought—also made its presence profoundly felt in the Reform movement.\textsuperscript{166}

It was during this period of turmoil and change that the struggle over the role of rationalism\textsuperscript{167} and universalism
within Reform ideology took on serious proportions. Both concepts had been fundamental to "Classic Reform" as outlined in the Pittsburgh Platform, but the new direction which has characterized "modern Reform" was becoming increasingly evident as exemplified by the evolution of the Union Prayer Book and the growing enthusiasm for the concept of "peoplehood" and support for the Zionist movement.

The problems of Jewish identity and status, particularism vs. universalism and, finally, Zionism vs. Americanism, have been major concerns of the Reform leadership. The designation of the Jewish people as a *religious community* as opposed to a *nation* with a *homeland* (as asserted in the Pittsburgh Platform) was never formally accepted by the C.C.A.R. Nevertheless, the Zionist position was almost always on the defensive during the early years of C.C.A.R. Year after year, as the struggle over Zionism deepened, voices of moderation warned that the "Conference" must not split on the rock of Zionism. Isaac Mayer Wise, as noted heretofore, affirmed the idea of the peoplehood of Israel. However, though encouraging the colonization of Palestine, he would not accept plans for the formation of a Jewish state as proposed by Herzl and the political Zionists. The Conference majority officially retained the position of being against political Zionism until 1935.

After World War I, however, great changes were afoot. The Zionist spokesmen within Reform, Abba Hillel Silver and Stephen Samuel Wise, began to speak out in the latter half of the second decade of the twentieth century. The Conference,
nevertheless, still disassociated itself from the Zionist movement, especially from that element within it which the Reform rabbinate felt was anti-religious and secular in spirit.¹⁷¹

In the early 1920's the growing minority of Zionist-oriented rabbis became bolder in expressing their convictions. Unalterable changes in the world and in the American Jewish community were setting the scene for a climactic and revolutionary transformation within Reform. Not only were Wise and Silver active on behalf of "the cause," but others, such as Judah L. Magnes and Gustav Gottheil as well as lesser voices, joined the effort. In fact, already by 1926, it seems that a majority of Reform rabbis considered Judaism a civilization rather than a religious cult. They also agreed that there was a definite Zionist trend within the C.C.A.R.¹⁷² In 1935 Abba Hillel Silver's presentation of the Zionist position made a telling impact upon a large majority of the Conference. The so-called "neutrality resolution," which said in effect that the C.C.A.R. as a group was no longer opposed to Zionism and each member could accept or reject the Zionist program, was passed. The groundwork had thus been laid for a new statement of principle in reference to the nature of Jewish peoplehood.

The most significant statement of the position of modern Reform Judaism in regard to fundamental theological and ideological issues took the form of the Guiding Principles of Reform Judaism, known more popularly as the "Columbus Platform." The Columbus Platform was to be considered "not as a fixed creed but as a guide for the progressive elements of Jewry."¹⁷³ Judaism
was defined as "the historical religious experience of the Jewish people" possessing a universal message "aiming at the union and perfection of mankind under the sovereignty of God."

Judaism is, thus, neither a religious culture, civilization nor variety of humanism. The principle of the progressive development of religion is affirmed, and all truth is welcomed. New scientific discoveries, "while replacing the older scientific views underlying our sacred literature, do not conflict with the essential spirit of religion as manifested in the consecration of man's will, heart and mind to the service of God and Humanity."

A second principle posits "the doctrine of the One, living God who rules the world through law and love" and in whom "all existence has its creative source and mankind its ideal of conduct." God is both transcendent and imminent. Man, on the other hand, is "created in the image of God," is of immortal spirit and is an active co-worker with God. It is interesting to note that the "highest conception of the God-idea" talked of in the Pittsburgh Platform has been replaced by a "Living God of law and love."

"Authority, the crucial point in every religion, is defined in terms of Torah and Tradition, and charts the way between secularism and Orthodoxy. God's revelation is continuous and universal."

Yet the people of Israel, through its prophets and sages achieved unique insight in the realm of religious truth. The Torah, both written and oral, enshrines Israel’s ever-growing consciousness of God and of the moral law.
Being products of historical processes, certain of its laws have lost their binding force with the passing of the conditions that called them forth. But as a depository of permanent spiritual ideals, the Torah remains the dynamic source of the life of Israel. Each age has its obligation to adapt the teachings of the Torah to its basic needs in consonance with the genius of Judaism.

The section on Israel, by far the most controversial, repudiated the premise, asserted in the Pittsburgh Platform, that Jews are nothing more than a "religious community." It emphasized "peoplehood," obligations to international Jewry and the legitimate place of Palestine as homeland in the scheme of Jewish existence. Though not explicitly identifying Reform with the organized Zionist movement, it is definitely Zionist in orientation.

Judaism is the soul of which Israel is the body. Living in all parts of the world, Israel has been held together by the ties of a common history, and above all by the heritage of faith. Though we recognize in the group-loyalty of Jews who have become estranged from our religious tradition a bond which still unites them with us, we maintain that it is by its religion and for its religion that the Jewish people has lived... In all lands where our people live, they assume and seek to share loyally the full duties and responsibilities of citizenship and to create seats of Jewish knowledge and religion. In the rehabilitation of Palestine, the land hallowed by memories and hopes, we behold the promise of renewed life for many of our brethren. We affirm the obligation of all Jewry to aid in its upbuilding as a Jewish homeland by endeavoring to make it not only a haven of refuge for the oppressed, but also a center of Jewish culture and spiritual life.

This statement should be compared to paragraph five of the Pittsburgh Platform. The section on ethics re-emphasized the fact that social service and social justice were absolute imperatives of Judaism. It called for peace based on justice, for "spiritual and physical
disarmament" and for "organized international action for disarmament, collective security and world peace."

A significant departure from Classic Reform and the Pittsburgh Platform, which disparaged the role of ritual and ceremony, was the new stress placed upon "the preservation of the Sabbath, festivals and Holy Days, the retention and development of such customs, symbols and ceremonies as possess inspirational value, the cultivation of distinctive forms of religious art and music and the use of Hebrew, together with the vernacular, in our worship and instruction."

All in all, the Columbus Platform, which was accepted by the C.C.A.R. on May 27, 1937, is a remarkable document in many ways, an ideological "about-face" which reflected a realistic response to history and to the needs of the time and to American Jewry in transition.

With the acceptance of the Columbus Platform, those members of the C.C.A.R., who were adamantly against the pro-Zionist posture assumed by the Conference, banded together with a number of lay leaders and congregations to form the American Council for Judaism in 1943. Rabbi Elmer Berger and Mr. Lessing J. Rosenwald were at the forefront of the organization. The members of the American Council feared that Judaism was being transformed from a religion into a type of political nationalism which would endanger Jewish life in America and would hinder the integration of the Jew into American society. Against Zionism but not against the Israeli community per se (so it says), the Council has attempted to counteract the view that
Jews are part of a nation with its center in Israel and, conversely, has reiterated the idea that Jews are to be considered an integral part of the countries of their birth or adoption. In 1956, the following evaluation and conclusions concerning the activities of the Council were adopted by the C.C.A.R.:

Since this Conference took action in 1943 urging the dissolution of the Council . . . the Council has (1) impaired the vital work of the United Jewish Appeal . . .; (2) injected damaging divisiveness within some of our own Reform congregations; (3) sought to influence the United States Department of State in a policy contrary to the best interests of both the United States and the State of Israel; (4) reinforced the efforts of Arabs and others to incite prejudice against the State of Israel and Jewish people throughout the world; (5) impugned the patriotism of the vast majority of American Jews including the members of the CCAR; and (6) distorted and misrepresented the nature and meaning of Judaism. Therefore, the C.C.A.R. reaffirms its repudiation of the American Council for Judaism and declares that the latter does not represent liberal, Reform Judaism or any other valid interpretation of Judaism.

Spokesmen for "modern Reform", those who have made significant statements in book or essay form, have elaborated upon the themes, both theological and ideological, that have been the subject of the deliberations of the C.C.A.R. since the twenties and that have reflected the changing ideological and theological options present in the western world and in the American Jewish community. Theologically, four major positions can be identified among the contemporary Reform rabbinate: (1) positive theism; (2) liberal humanism; (3) existentialism, neo-mysticism and neo-traditionalism; (4) Reconstructionism. Positive theism, within the Reform movement, affirms...
"faith in a living God" and places, generally, increased importance upon traditional concepts, forms and practices without negating or repudiating the enduring principles of the Reform interpretation of Jewish life. Samuel S. Cohan was one who rejected the rationalistic-humanistic excesses of "Classic Reform." Julian Morgenstern, in his rejection of the rationalistic emphasis of "Classic Reform," shows a sympathy for the mystical element in religion though his theology is not necessarily "neo-mystical." Morgenstern, not surprisingly, is also critical of humanism as well as of Reconstructionist theology and ideology. Finally, David Polish exhibits a definite theistic orientation, though one somewhat more sophisticated than that of Cohan and Morgenstern. His discussions of revelation and salvation are instructive:

If we are to reaffirm the covenant, we must try to understand what the Event at Sinai means to us today. To many it has lost all historicity, and to them a covenant of contemporary Jewry could only mean a social contract rooted solely in the social and spiritual needs of our own generation. But to others, Sinai cannot be so easily dismissed. One need not accept the literalness or even partial literalness of scripture to be convinced that something revelatory occurred. The one ineluctable and inexorable fact of the revelation is that at Sinai there came to the entire household of Israel an overwhelming sense of God's presence and an overpowering awareness that He was making demands upon them. This is central. The rest is peripheral.

Such awareness occasionally occurs in the lives of individuals. When a man grasps a fleeting conviction that God addresses him, this is a profound religious experience. When it occurs to an entire group at the same time, whether it is a tribe or a people, this is revelation. It is even conceivable that the event occurred
at Sinai, but the full awareness of the event, with all the concimittant supernatural accretions, came later. ... 188

What lies beyond history has not been given equal or greater stress, not because Judaism is not concerned with it, but because this domain is exclusively God's. But within the historical process God summons man to struggle and act for the fulfillment of his own earthly destiny.

Perhaps this is why the idea of man's incapacity and helplessness before God is incomprehensible to Judaism. It does not see man's major preoccupation as bound to an other-worldly goal. This is a valid goal, but it is entirely God's domain. Salvation within this realm is only from God ... 189

The spirit of Polish's interpretations of traditional concepts might be said to be that of "neo-traditionalism" or "neo-supernaturalism," of which more will be said later. Cohon, Morgenstern and, especially, Polish seem far removed from the stark rationalism of "Classic Reform," from the emphasis on man and society of the liberal humanists and from the unabashed naturalism of the Reconstructionists. Nonetheless, they represent a significant theological segment within "modern Reform."

Religious humanism, in some instances positing the objective existence of God and in others not, places man in a much more central and lofty position than traditional theism or even modernistic positive theism does. In many instances, allied with religious humanism is liberal idealism, an interpretation of life which allots a great deal of significance to man's ideals and values as they reflect and are modified by the needs and aspirations of the changing civilization in which he sojourns. Usually a deep respect for science and naturalism is also present in this worldview, though liberalism
and theism are not necessarily antagonistic. However, as might be expected, theists of most varieties—fundamentalists, traditional supernaturalists, rationalists, mystics and existentialists—generally view religious humanism and religious naturalism with almost as much suspicion as they consider non-religious secularism.

Professor Abraham Cronbach, an ardent advocate of a modernist humanist, liberal version of Judaism espoused in the thirties by many, defined religion as "a person's assertion of his highest purpose." On Cronbach's philosophy, Joshua L. Liebman commented:

His dominant philosophic pattern is that of instrumentalism. So much so that those who are unsympathetic with Dewey's outlook will inevitably feel themselves remote from Professor Cronbach's point of view, while those who have found guidance in Human Nature and Conduct, Experience and Nature, The Quest for Certainty will be grateful to Professor Cronbach for illumination in spheres untouched by the American sage.

Abba Hillel Silver, better known for his leadership in the struggle for Zionist fulfillment and for his comparative study of Judaism and Christianity, Where Judaism Differed, also was a champion of religious humanism and liberal idealism. However, he was not as militant as others and was quick to recognize and appreciate the multi-colored nature of Jewish religious thought. Levi Olan was one of the most outspoken and staunch supporters of a truly liberal and modernist interpretation of Judaism within Reform. Reacting to the emergence of existentialism and neo-mysticism as a challenge to liberalism, he wrote:
Reform Judaism must beware of the dangers that beset all progressive movements. There is a tendency, at some point, to congeal into a new Absolute that resists all change. History is replete with the dead bones of movements that once throbbed with vitality. One of the sad illustrations is the birth, rise, and fall of Humanism. It did much to create the modern world with its emphasis on the individual, and its substitution of reason for ecclesiastical authority. It came to the aid of science by dusting off the classics and revealing their worth. But Humanism congealed into a reverence for classics and soon became a pretty exhibit in the museum of 'culture.' Another danger is that a movement may lose faith in time of radical change.

Modern liberalism must face ghosts not unlike the spectres of yesterday. There is sufficient evidence that in this disturbed hour of history man is again experiencing a 'failure of nerve.' The rise of irrational schools of thought in philosophy, as well as in social theory, is disconcerting to liberals. But the latter will contribute nothing to the future if they remain encrusted with the nineteenth century shell. There is a great need for a revival of the liberal faith, for emphasis upon reason, experience, freedom, individualism and progress. Whether mankind sinks into another era of mental and spiritual darkness or rises again into light depends in great measure upon the liberals. They must stop reshuffling the doctrines of their predecessors, and with confidence continue the search for truth not yet fully revealed. The essence of liberalism is the search.

In 1966, he restated his faith in the congeniality of liberalism and Reform Judaism in an essay, "An Unrepentant Liberal Jew." Joshua Loth Lieberman—modernist, Freudian, humanist, liberal—was an advocate of the marriage of reason with emotion. His thinking was definitely influenced by psychoanalysis and psychiatry as well as by anthropology, sociology and social psychology. The acknowledgment of the crucial role of feelings in human behavior called forth a return to a rich ceremonialism:

Before Freud, it was understandable that liberal thinkers should exalt reason and depurate emotion. By now, however, everyone should know that human beings require
creative outlets for their feelings, individuals and collective, if they are to be sane and happy... We who understand the need of emotion in religion do not base our richer ceremonialism upon supernatural revelation, but upon human and Jewish group-need... Liebman's writings affirm an unswerving faith in man's essential goodness and potential greatness. As might be expected Liebman is disturbed by the ascendancy of the pessimistic approach of existentialism and the despair of nihilism. He recognizes the challenges these "alien" philosophies present, and then identifies their inadequacies. He, also, comprehends well the challenge of science, technology, the machine age, etc., and the deleterious effect that this new "way of life" and set of values can have on the human spirit. However, he argues:

The truth of life is found in the principle of contextualism or relatedness. Now, many forms of relatedness are very poignantly defeating. That is why the writers of the world who celebrate and commemorate man's aloneness like to deny this law of life... But we are as much the product of relatedness as the cell is the product of molecules and the atom is a prisoner of its patterned electrons. We, all of us, live in a "field world" humanly as well as physically and chemically.

Man's relatedness to God is also a source of strength and freedom. Man is a creature of God endowed with both inalienable rights and inalienable qualities as well. Man is a morality-seeking as well as a truth-seeking creature. Since we affirm the Power greater than ourselves but are only able to catch "a few glimpses of His majesty in the order of nature and in the accents of human conscience," and since our language is limited and inexact, we "must always use metaphor and analogy...
in order to interpret Divine Reality." But what evidence exists that leads us to believe that God is real?

Though Liebman talks at times in theistic language, a humanistic and possibly naturalistic formulation of the concept of God seems implied in his writings. Joshua Liebman’s ideological and theological point of view seems to be definitely influenced by Reconstructionism. However, the most articulate Reform leader, who is an ardent Reconstructionist also, though one who exhibits a high degree of independent thinking as he attempts to cement the bonds between science and religion, is Roland B. Gittelsohn. Rabbi Gittelsohn’s theological conceptualizations and philosophy of Judaism and religion will be analyzed in the section on Reconstructionist ideology to follow.

According to Bamberger, in 1965 the majority of the members of the C.C.A.R. considered themselves liberal but positive theists. The most significant influence upon this group seems to have been the personality and thinking of Rabbi Leo Baeck. In addition, a substantial group identified themselves as naturalists, positing the objective existence of God as opposed to the God-idea of humanism and subscribing to many of the theological presuppositions attributed to Mordecai M. Kaplan. A third group, characterized as religious existentialists, have been influenced by the thinking of Buber, Rosensweig, Herberg and Heschel. Steven S. Schwarzchild, a member both of the Rabbinical Assembly (Conservative) and the C.C.A.R., states that "the
central operative truth of Judaism in any age is that truth which the age most needs and lacks. Judaism is never of, but always confronts the age or the world over against it." In our age the great need of man is morality, and the road to morality is Torah. He continues:

In the first place, morality must be super-human if it is to be moral at all . . . It must, therefore, come from "another world." "The world" can only be "repaired by means of the Kingdom of God." And that the Torah is that which "comes from another world"—quite apart from the evidence of Jewish history—I have learned through actual experience. I started out with the prejudices of most modern men—that the Bible is a human book, a product of history. I began to run across incredible marvels of goodness . . . And I learned from Franz Rosensweig that, as our sages put it, when studying the Bible one must make one's mind and heart like the desert in which it was revealed, open, empty, unprepossessed, accessible . . . I know it sounds dogmatic and fundamentalistic . . .

Another reason for turning to the Torah as the mainspring of the universal Jewish faith in our time is the proven futility of all other, worldly claims to truth . . . It should not be necessary to rehearse again the catalogue of the unexpungeable crimes of which this culture has made itself culpable: the names of Auschwitz, Hiroshima, Selma, Sharpeville, Siberia and Santo Domingo will serve as mere sign-posts. If Herberg made a mistake, it was not that he wanted to "leap" out of this morass, but that he made a theological leap rather than an ethical one . . . It was better for the Jew to leap to the Torah. Like the God who gave it, the Torah is beyond this world but profoundly concerned for it . . . It opens up faith and truth, to be sure, but more importantly, it bestows upon you the law. 203

Emil L. Fackenheim and Jakob J. Petuchowski attempt to set forth the liberal religious existential position in a relatively comprehensive manner. Petuchowski's reflections on the role of "mystery" and the nature of "revelation" give us insight into the neo-traditional and neo-mystical spirit
of the religious philosophy of the "new theologians," of whom Schwarzchild, Petuchowski, Fackenheim and Borowitz are the leading Reform spokesmen.

Yet when all the interpretations and explanations of the 'election' and the 'covenant' have been read and understood, the fact itself remains what it has always been: a mystery. The modern mind may wish to shun mysteries, but it would still have to utter in amazement: 'How odd of God to choose the Jews!'

The believing Jew knows that he can never fully penetrate the divine mystery. But he also knows that this particular mystery is a manifestation of the love of God . . .

Indeed, as Franz Rosensweig would have it, the Divine Love is the only content of Revelation. Man, becoming conscious of this Love of God, hears the divine command: 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God . . .'. Ordinarily, of course, love cannot be commanded . . . But this is precisely what the moment of Revelation does imply. God shows His Love, and longs for man's love in return. All the rest is commentary and interpretation. 204

Petuchowski concludes his work, Ever Since Sinai, with a discussion of a liberal approach to religious practice and observance, existentially perceived. The emphasis on individual commitment, a trademark of religious existentialism, is quite obvious. 205

Emil Fackenheim has been a formidable and vocal critic of religious rationalism, humanism, naturalism and Reconstructionism. 206 His theology, astute and sophisticated as it is, is definitely supernatural in tone and is similar in many respects to that of modern Orthodoxy. In his essay, "An Outline of Modern Jewish Theology," 207 he makes a serious attempt to present an interpretation of Reform-Liberal existentialist thought in a systematic, orderly fashion. Flowing from the affirmations he
makes and his re-interpretations of traditional Jewish theology is a novel concept of halakhah which allows for the freedom of choice so fundamental to Reform Judaism:

Halakhah is Jewish custom and ceremony mediated through the leap into Jewish faith; it thereby becomes the divine law to Israel. . . But through the leap of faith any one of them (and pre-eminently those of the Torah) have the real potency of becoming human reflections of a real God-Israel encounter. And thus each of them has the potency of becoming Halakhah, commanded and fulfilled: if fulfilled, not as self-expression but as response on the part of Israel to a divine challenge to Israel; as the gift of the Jewish self to God. Thus no particular set of ceremonies is, as such, divine law; this is an error flowing from the orthodox misunderstanding of the nature of revelation . . .

In another article, Fackenheim adds that the Jew must "hear" revelation with modern ears, addressed to him in the modern situation. He concludes: "For He, the God of Israel, still lives; and the liberal Jew, son of the covenant, still stands at Sinai, as did his father." The contribution of religious existentialism, as seen through the eyes of a Reform theologian, Eugene Borowitz, is summed up in his A Layman's Introduction to Religious Existentialism:

The existentialist approach and the existentialist interpretation may not serve each aspect of traditional religion equally well, and they are not quickly comprehensible in a technical and pragmatic age. Yet modern philosophy has not given the religious believer any more adequate instrument with which to understand and expound his faith. This one at least has the proven ability to bring men to God and, no lesser point, to bring the Biblical God back before man. A mode of understanding that would replace religious existentialism will have to admit to do that and more before it can establish its supremacy. In the great intellectual excitement that religious existentialism in its various guises has aroused
or furthered, some new style may be aborning. If so, it is not now visible, and when it arrives, one may confidently predict that it will show its descent from this lastingly significant pattern of religious thinking.212

In addition to theological considerations modern Reform ideological development, as pointed out earlier,213 has concerned itself with (1) the Jewish people and the land of Israel, (2) ethics and social justice and (3) the place of ceremonies, traditional ritual and liturgy and Hebrew in modern Reform practice.

As mentioned above, the struggle within Reform over Zionism reached its climax with the formation of the American Council for Judaism.214 Thereafter, the Zionist element within the C.C.A.R. enlarged itself and solidified its position. Abba Hillel Silver, a leader of this faction, played a significant role in molding public opinion and in influencing the United States government and the United Nations to support the establishment of the State of Israel. Joshua Liebman also made a point of affirming the relationship of Jewish peoplehood, Zionism and Reform Judaism.215 Leon Fram, presenting a Zionist interpretation of the relationship of Zionism to Reform and referring to the repudiation of the anti-Zionist element within the C.C.A.R.,216 concludes his essay:

That element in Reform Judaism which was never really an organic part of it, but which had entered into it factitiously, by dint of temporary and local situations, was finally recognized for the stranger it had always been. Reform Judaism no longer denotes a group of Jews who profess to be aloof from the interests and the needs of the Jewish people as a whole. Reform Judaism returns to its original function. It is the
faith of the Jews who are of the Jewish community and of the Jewish people wherever they are—Jews equally at home in Palestine and in America, in Europe and in Asia—who prefer the liberal rather than the conservative interpretation of the common Jewish heritage.

Reform Judaism faces a promising future... not only of service and leadership for all Jewish people in the Diaspora as well as in the homeland, but... 217

On the other hand, David H. Wice supports a non-Zionist interpretation of the relationship between Reform and Zionism: 218

The reason for our survival has been our religion. To make the central purpose of Jewish existence national survival through the creation of a political state would be a distortion of our whole history. Religious Zionists of all shades, indeed, insist that we must have both a Jewish state and Judaism; in practice, however, the nationalists have been much more tolerant of irreligious Zionists than of religious anti-Zionists...

At all events, it (religious Zionism) will have a significant contribution to make in such a situation. Reform is anything but hostile to Jewish Palestine; but it holds that Israel's destiny is not limited by territory... A state, by its very existence, tends to have a limiting influence. Reform will be able to prevent this self-limiting principle of statehood from reducing Judaism to a mere folk way, if it reaffirms that universalistic emphasis which has always been central to its message. 219

Though the question of Zionism had more or less been resolved with the establishment of the State of Israel in 1948 and the resolution repudiating the American Council for Judaism (1956) cited earlier, continued evaluation of the nature of world Jewry's relationship to the State of Israel, the character of the people of Israel and the place of Liberal Judaism in the State of Israel occupied the thoughts of the members of the C.C.A.R. In 1962, a special committee of the C.C.A.R., attempting to define the nature of Jewish peoplehood, arrived at the following
statement: The great challenge confronting world Jewry was stated in the following words by Leon Feuer:

To bind the Jewish communities of the world with the Jewry of Israel into a cohesive and purposeful unity requires an aim which is supernally challenging and which transcends any particular unit of time. It is only in the striving by both toward the eternal and ideal Israel that such an aim can be found.

An essay by Roland Gittelsohn describes the C.C.A.R.'s evolving stance on social justice and civil rights. A statement of general principle in this overall area is found in both the Pittsburgh and Columbus Platforms. In the main, the thinking of the Reform rabbinate, from the very beginning, has been liberal and progressive in this sector which has been one of great concern to Reform leadership. The first truly significant pronouncement in regard to social justice emanated from the 1918 Conference. The Reform rabbinate, in the main, presents a strong position in regard to peace, civil liberties and civil rights, those issues which seem to be the overwhelming areas of concern of those groups in our society struggling for social justice in our time.

Gittelsohn reflects: and a rationale for alteration of rituals from traditional practice consistent with the re...
The voice of the Conference on world peace has been the voice of prophecy. It has insisted on judging the conduct of all nations, our own included, by the criteria of justice and righteousness. Recognizing the excesses and crimes of both Russia and China, it has refused to permit these to be used as comfortable and convenient camouflage for our own deficiencies... That it has not always been a consistent voice indicates an increasingly mature grasp of reality. A half to three-quarters of a century ago it was still possible to re-iterate high ideals. The complicated realities of recent history have compelled us to go far beyond the dreams of immaturity. Without pretending to possess infallibility or omniscience, the Conference has learned to pursue the ideal of world peace through practical measures which offer some reasonable promise of success.

Did the forthright criticism of the Reform rabbinate play any role in the decline of the influence of the Senator from Wisconsin? There is no scientific standard by which to answer this question. This much, however, is certain: in speaking as it did, the Conference was true to its own highest nature and calling. And it unquestionably gave encouragement and support to many rabbis and laymen throughout the country who contributed at least a little bit to the defense of democracy.

The metamorphosis of the Reform attitude toward traditional practices, ritual, liturgy, etc. has been documented adequately throughout this section. The statements in regard to this aspect of Reform ideology included in the Columbus Platform are extremely significant. In the years since 1937 much has been written about this subject, and a variety of points of view have been stated. Unanimity is not present, but a tendency seems to exist. Rabbi Solomon Freehof has published a most comprehensive, scholarly work, Reform Jewish Practice and its Rabbinic Background, in which he attempts to present a guide to currently accepted practice, the rabbinic background of these practices and a rationale for affirmation of or deviation from traditional practice consistent with the tenets of
modern Reform Judaism. His philosophy of Reform practice is based upon the premise that the creative force behind change in the traditional code of observance is the will of the people. There seems to be some similarity between Freehof's emphasis on the developments of minhagim (customs and practices) as an expression of the creativity of the Jewish people and the role granted to Catholic Israel by Schechter. However, Schechter's bias was definitely in the direction of traditional practice and the authority of the law. Freehof, in the tradition of Reform, exhibits a prejudice in the direction of adjusting custom to the needs of the time and the people living in modern western civilization.

We cannot expect that adjustment will come from Jewish law. No law, particularly a purely interpretive law as Jewish law is, can ever be expected to adjust itself radically. But can the people again create its own minhagim, its new forms of observance and worship as it had done in the past? We do indeed see modern Jews groping their way towards modification and change in all branches of Jewish life.

Reform Judaism is the oldest of the modern attempts to adjust Jewish practice to modern circumstances. Whether the price that it paid for this adjustment is to be considered too great or not, it must be acknowledged that it has achieved a great deal. It has kept many generations loyal to Judaism.

It has been the consistent attitude of Reform that practices should be modified to meet the needs of the times, that the ethical and spiritual ideals of Judaism are eternal but they must find new modes of ceremonial expression from time to time. Therefore, Reform itself does not consider its practice as definite and fixed. It is consciously seeking new and better ways in which Jewish observance may inculcate Jewish ideals. Therefore many new practices develop constantly. Often they are a modification of some older Jewish practice which had been hitherto entirely neglected and which now is felt can be reconstructed and serve to instruct and inspire. It is,
therefore, of interest to Reform Jews to learn more of the vast treasury of Jewish practice in the past so that from it material for new observances may be derived. 229

Freehof devotes chapters to the following topics:

- public worship and the synagogue service;
- marriage, divorce and conversion;
- death, burial and mourning; the synagogue building. However, of the Sabbath and the dietary laws he frankly states:

It is noteworthy that there are certain important fields in traditional Jewish practice in which Reform has been especially creative, but there are certain other fields in which Reform Judaism has added nothing new ... The dietary laws and the laws of Sabbath observance, once so vital to Jewish life, have already dropped away from the lives of almost all Jews in the western world ... This neglect was not the outcome of any decision or mandate but the result of the intrusion of the environment into the hitherto secluded Jewish life. The neglect of these once treasured observances is not a characteristic of Reform Jews alone, but is characteristic of modern Jewry. Because these laws are so widely neglected, there was, alas, little left of them to reform. There were no changes which profitably could be made. 230

In another context, Freehof is critical of the quality of Reform worship and the meaning it has for the worshipper. 231

Jacob D. Schwarz, at the conclusion of his descriptive essay on the development of Reform Jewish practice in the United States, echoes Freehof’s call for self-imposed obligatory observance on the part of Reform Jews. 232

Joshua Liebman, who has at times shown Reconstructionist tendencies in his thinking, goes a step further and makes a case for a "code of conduct" for Reform Jews.
Reform Judaism has been psychologically unwise not only in regard to ritual, but also in reference to discipline. It has been too often like an open prairie exposed to all the winds of anarchy and license. No religion can survive with vitality unless it presents to its worshippers a minimum code of conduct which binds the group together into a disciplined fellowship. We do not want a creed of belief so much as a pattern of action. We desire not coercion, but persuasion—wise, self-chosen discipline which will make Reform Judaism understandable and meaningful in the realms of worship, study and action.

Should not commissions of laymen and rabbis begin to create a code of conduct, which shall not be imposed upon any worshipper in our synagogues, but shall be suggested as a tentative and revisable guide? We Reform Jews might well set up such standards as these: Our adherents should attend the synagogue once a week. They should read a certain number of Jewish books in the course of the year, and perhaps share in a congregational celebration at the end of that collective study. They should observe in the home and synagogue certain Sabbath and festival rituals. They should attempt to carry out in their daily living the teachings of the prophets and the rabbis regarding right relations between employer and employee, moral attitudes toward the oppressed and the exploited, and spiritual sensitivity in family relationships.

Let us make a beginning with a minimal code of conduct which shall serve to guide the Reform Jewish conscience in America.

The existentialists such as Fackenheim, Petuchowski and Borowitz as well as the Reconstructionists within Reform seem to be joining with the positive theists in their plea for the use of more Hebrew in the liturgy and the re-introduction of meaningful ceremonial practices and general ritual observance in both home and synagogue. However, Cohon points out that this effort "has not gone without resistance on the part of some laymen and rabbis trained to view Reform as a purely ethical faith unconcerned with externals." Leon I. Feuer on the other hand gave a positive evaluation of this overall
As has been noted earlier, the major institution of higher learning for the Reform movement is the Hebrew Union College located in Cincinnati. Principally a school to train Reform rabbis, it has established within the last quarter-century a School of Religious Education (1946), the American Jewish Archives (1947) and Museum (1948). It has also been responsible for the creation of a School for Sacred Music (1948) in New York. In 1950, the HUC combined with the Jewish Institute of Religion, a rabbinical training school founded in New York in 1922 by Dr. Stephen S. Wise. A new branch of HUC has recently been opened in Los Angeles. Originally situated in Cincinnati, the headquarters of the national organization of Reform congregations (the Union of American Hebrew Congregations) is now located in the "House of Living Judaism" in New York. In addition to being the parent organization of the National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods and the National Federation of Temple Brotherhoods, the UAHC sponsors the National Federation of Temple Educators and, in cooperation with the C.C.A.R., has activated a Joint Commission on Jewish Education.

Reform Jewish education, receiving a strong, initial stimulus from the pronouncements of Isaac Mayer Wise, was basically catechistic in nature in the nineteenth century. This minimal and superficial type of education was a reflection of the Protestant influence upon classic Reform as well as of the educational approach of nineteenth century American religious education. This form of education amounted to a weekly
session (Saturday or Sunday) of one or two hours. In 1883, a Sabbath School Union was founded, and, in 1903, it merged with the Department of Synagogue and School Extension of the UAHC. Thereafter, the UAHC and the C.C.A.R. worked cooperatively on the preparing of appropriate text materials for Reform religious schools.

In 1924, after considerable agitation and expressions of frustration, the Joint Commission on Jewish Education was established. This significant development came about because it had come to be recognized that (1) the text materials being produced until then were not meeting the needs of the students, (2) world events were increasing the need for a better informed Reform Jewry, and (3) Conservative Judaism was gaining strength and represented a real threat to Reform’s continued growth. It was furthermore decided to employ a qualified, full-time, professional educator to direct the development of Reform Jewish education at the national level. Dr. Emanuel Gamoran was appointed director. Under his leadership, the Commission, consisting both of rabbis and laymen, undertook the construction of a curriculum guide for Reform Jewish schools. This curriculum guide has been periodically revised and expanded and has proven of great help in standardizing learning experiences to a necessary degree and in giving direction to individual schools in planning their instructional programs. In addition, another significant pioneering project was the publication of colorful and interesting textbooks on many subjects, books that have been used in a great number of schools not affiliated with the
Reform movement. Also, a department of audio-visual education has been created, and films and film strips of great merit and on a variety of subjects have been produced. The Commission has encouraged the introduction of the systematic study of Hebrew and has continued Dr. Gamoran's battle for increased time for Jewish education. As of 1965, a three-day-a-week program was being recommended strongly by the Commission. The National Federation of Temple Youth (and its associated summer camps) and the Commission on Adult Education, both originally extensions of the "Joint Commission," are now independent departments of the UAHC. What the CCAR has achieved through the Commission on Jewish Education is not only a standardized curriculum, a steady stream of textbooks, materials, and equipment, and a clearing house for methods and organization, but aggressive leadership to persuade the Reform congregations of America to commit themselves to ever higher standards, richer content and more generous support for Jewish education.

Both Orthodoxy and Conservatism have devoted thought and energy to evaluate the present status of their movements and their ideological positions in relationship to the overall character of the American Jewish community as well as in regard to the direction of their own development as organized expressions of Jewishness. Reform Judaism, the oldest organized religious movement encompassing a segment of American Jewry, has not only undergone searching analysis from within, but it has also had its prophets. In the latter part of the nineteenth century and the early decades of the twentieth it was openly
stated that Reform might be destined to become "the my own American Judaism." In 1931, at the summation of his description and analysis of the growth of American Reform, Philipson concluded:

From such expressions it grows abundantly clear that the principle of adaptation to changing need and circumstances which has been the characteristic of the Reform movement in Judaism from the beginning is being recognized and advocated throughout American Jewry, barring the adherents of Shulchan Aruk Judaism. It is largely a question of more or less. As the years pass there will doubtless be an ever greater rapprochement of conservatism to the reform position.

Two later spokesmen are not so audacious. They are content to focus upon the present and future of Reform—its problems, tendencies and possible future directions.

While the current interest in theology are both understandable and helpful, one cannot help wonder whether the emphasis in the religious thinking of our movement and of the Conference is not again likely to shift. Confessedly, this represents the bias of the so-called classical liberal, the bias of the writer, if you will, but he has been wondering for some time whether we are not here dealing with an escape mechanism and an anxiety which are part of the general neo-orthodox revival of our time and characteristic of every time of trouble, and whether this is not a process which has pretty much run its course. It may once again be necessary for us to recall the prophetic warning that God is not interested in our offerings of rivers of oil and myriads of rams. Perhaps the reformers so glibly derided in certain of our circles were more nearly right about what constitutes the essence of Judaism than their latter day detractors are willing to acknowledge. . .

The interest of Reform Judaism in social issues, the long and honorable record of our rabbis in efforts toward the amelioration of the conditions of life and labor, and the building of world peace . . . are neither accidents nor the products of shallow liberal optimism. They are implicit in the nature of Judaism and came to their flowering in modern society in Reform Judaism. In recent years we
have on the one hand allowed ourselves to be detoured into a defeatist disillusionment with the God of Reason and History by the "tragid vision" of the Existentialists; and on the other by the "affluent society" atmosphere in which our middle class, suburban congregations function. The grim knowledge of world poverty in the midst of potential plenty, of dire want even in the prosperous United States, of the overhanging threat of nuclear destruction, is a challenge which will not be ignored by the members of the CCAR. One may well look in the future, not so much for theological speculation of the call for ritual re-appraisals, although they will not be absent, as for a renewed social radicalism and a reemphasis upon social preaching, teaching and action.241

The challenge facing Reform Judaism vis-à-vis the emerging needs of the contemporary Reform Jew is described by Cohan:

The tasks of Reform have not and can never be finished. Reform is a perennial process of self-renewal, of ever regenerating the creative spirit of Judaism and of carrying forward its goals for the individual and the community. It calls for the constant rethinking of the theological and ethical content of the historic faith and of restating it in terms that are relevant to the advancing generations of American Jews. Reform must stand by its liberal faith despite the obscuritanist trends and the waves of reaction in religion. The vast numerical growth of its membership carries the obligation of intensifying its educational efforts, to make its adherents conscious of their obligation as Jews and of the ties that unite them with world Jewry.

Reform has reshaped the externals of Jewish life. In the years ahead it must deepen the Jewish spirit of its followers. It has built beautiful Temples, but it has yet to make the modern Jew worshipful. The Jewish heart has still to be rekindled with the ardor of an abiding faith. The enrichment of the Jewish mind with Jewish knowledge and the strengthening of the Jewish will with loyalty and sacrificial zeal still remain a hope and a prayer. Reform, like all other phases of Judaism, is still looking to the day when the Jew will combine his love of modernity with a sense of eternity and his progressivism with constancy and sanctity.242

In the view of this writer, Reconstructionism (as a distinct ideology incorporating a unique theological position
as far as American Judaism is concerned) differs from the
three aforementioned religious ideological movements since it
attempts to cut across denominational lines and is not institution-
centered. It is a criticism and a constructive set of hypo-
thesis which appeals to men to utilize compassion and intelli-
genence and which proposes an approach to Jewish peoplehood that
views Judaism as the religious expression of those Jews who
thirst for creative survival in a secular world. Far from
abandoning Judaism as a religion (as it is accused of by its
detractors), it attempts to re-vitalize it and its institutions
through reasonable and self-critical means—addressing itself
to the Jewish people and their needs rather than to established
institutions, organizations, and movements.

To some it presents a dangerous and threatening per-
version of Jewish life, to others it is Judaism's response in a
variety of ways to the challenge of modern times. To this
latter group it represents a much more realistic program for
Jewish life than either Conservative or Reform Judaism does
as the American Jew confronts the problems of the "space-age"
and a rapidly changing world. In the introduction to the 1957
re-publication of his seminal and still most persuasive and
influential presentation of Reconstructionist thinking, Mordecai
M. Kaplan, the founder of Reconstructionism, states with utter
frankness:

It is, perhaps, not too much to expect that the re-
appearance of Judaism as a Civilization will help to vindici-
cate the Reconstructionist movement against those who
charge it with being more secular than religious, in that
it treats the problem of Judaism as a socio-psychological rather than as a theological problem. It is a fact, however, that the diagnosis of what is wrong with Jewish life, and the prescription of what is necessary to set it right, are as related to what we can learn from the human sciences as the diagnosis and cure of physical disease are related to chemistry and physics. The medicos who opposed Louis Pasteur's interpretation and treatment of physical disease were, no doubt, resentful that a chemist, who was no physician, should instruct them in their own specialty.

The republication of this book might also serve as a reminder that the idea of "Judaism as a civilization" was not intended as a slogan to abet laxity in ritual observances or indifference to religion. It was definitely intended to motivate Jews a maximum and not a minimum identification with Jewish life. "Judaism as a civilization" is a call to American Jews to attend to the following needs: 1) To re-affirm Jewish peoplehood; 2) to revitalize Jewish religion; 3) to form a network of organic communities; 4) to strengthen the State of Israel; 5) to further Jewish cultural creativity; and 6) to cooperate with the general community in all endeavors in behalf of freedom, justice and peace. May God grant that our People heed the call.243

In The Future of the American Jew, written in 1948, he states:

The reconstruction of Jewish life and thought will thus have to consist in the pursuit of the following objectives: 1. The rebuilding of Eretz Yisrael as the creative center of Judaism. 2. The creation of an adequate social structure for democratic Jewish communal life in the Diaspora. 3. The redirection of Jewish education to conform with the conception of Judaism as a religious civilization. 4. The revitalization of Jewish religion. 5. The stimulation of Jewish cultural creativity in literature and the arts. 6. The participation of Jewry in social movements that seek ampler freedom, stricter justice and better cooperation among men and nations.244
Only a Judaism calculated to bring out all that is best in human nature, and to guide us Jews in applying that best to all our human interests, can command sufficient loyalty to insure its survival and advancement. America is a cultural melting pot. Cultural differences that do not contribute to the realization of universal human values are bound to vanish. It is generally recognized that all men need to be rooted in a religious tradition, and that it is to the various historic religions, older than America itself, that the American nation looks for the strengthening of its own morale. It looks to Judaism, and rightly so, to accomplish this for its Jewish citizens. That expectation is an unequalled opportunity for us Jews not only to retain our group life in this country, but also to achieve a religious orientation that might prove of great value to the religiously starved mankind of our day. This is the unique chance which the God of history has given us; let us not fumble it.245

In this very same volume Kaplan offers what he thinks to be the "basic values in Jewish religion" (later published separately)—spiritual selection, faith, hope, humility, inner freedom, patience, thankfulness, justice, and love.246

Kaplan’s general conclusions in Judaism Without Supernaturalism247 amount to "(1) The need for adopting the status of peoplehood; (2) The indispensability of the Jewish Community in Israel as the hub of the Jewish People; (3) The recognition of theological diversity as legitimate and normal; (4) The broadening of the concept of religion to enable the Jewish People to designate itself as a religious community; (5) The need for Jewish education:

Though we do not agree on theology, we do agree on the centrality of Torah, in its broadest sense, as the search after the way of life that leads to salvation both individual and social. Torah was never intended to function as a "liberal" education for the few, but as character education for the multitude. It was not meant to be a leisure class privilege but a universal obligation. It has always been conceived as indispensable to the art of living.
We can want no greater common denominator amid all the diversities among affirmative Jews than the one inherent in a renewed emphasis on the need of making provisions for elementary and adult education of all Jews in the significance of their tradition, in the history of their People, in the situation confronting them at present, and in the truths bearing on the philosophy and theology of Judaism.

(6) In the United States and Canada Jewish peoplehood should be mediated through regional and local organic communities; (7) The need for a formal covenant to be openly entered into by all who are intent upon the perpetuation of Jewish life.

In the second chapter of this same work, in which he discusses "Jewish religion without supernaturalism," Kaplan argues that secularism is not enough:

The only alternative to the traditional and supernaturalist conception of God's self-manifestation that can make a difference in people's lives is not the metaphysical approach but the social-behavioral one. It may well be that the human mind is forever and intrinsically incapable of grappling existentially with ultimates, and is permanently and inherently limited to theorizing about them conceptually or by means of ideas—which are abstractions from reality. That God, as ultimate reality, is unknowable is a commonplace of all thinking other than that which is entirely naive. Theologians constantly remind us that all our affirmations concerning God have to be translated into negatives, if they are to approximate the truth. Consequently, religion which aims to improve human nature and the conditions of human living cannot be based on the ultimate nature of God. Its field of operations must be the nature of man. It has to focus its attention on that aspect of man's nature which is in need of being fully humanized, on what the human being ought to become, if he is to reflect the image of God. It is the business of religion not to give a metaphysical conception of God, but to make clear what we mean by the belief in God, from the standpoint of the difference that belief makes in human conduct and striving.

The point of contact between man and God, or as it is fashionable to state it nowadays, the encounter between man and God, is man's sense of freedom and responsibility. It
is at that point that religion has to function, so that man can utilize his freedom and responsibility intelligently, righteously and creatively. This is where the attributes of wisdom, justice and love, in the conception of God, have to be stressed.

There is nothing in this function of religion that requires resorting to supernaturalism. The freedom and responsibility of which human nature is capable are the natural manifestations, on a self-conscious level, of the cosmic principle of polarity. Freedom expresses the pole of selfhood, and responsibility the pole of otherhood, or cooperation. Is the human polarity of freedom and responsibility, with its promise of human metamorphosis into a higher type of being, futile dreaming and self-delusion, or is it as existentially real as the world of sense and sound we inhabit? If the latter is the case, then the self-conscious will to salvation is the immanent aspect of that cosmic reality for which no term can be more appropriate than "God." Whatever else human beings may have sought to express by the term "God," it has always had the connotation of man's responsibility for what he does and his freedom to choose between right and wrong, good and evil.251

Pointing out that naturalism is not synonymous with secularism, he states:

A naturalistic conception of religion does not commit us to the choice of either adopting the traditional belief in the choseness of Israel or dissociating altogether the manifestation of Divinity from the life of peoples or nations in general, least of all the Jewish People. On the contrary, complete dissociation of Divinity from peoplehood or nationhood is incompatible with any kind of religion, just as the assumption of exclusive chosenness is incompatible with naturalist religion. The truth is that every people in the world, insofar as it shows signs of seeking to achieve human perfection instead of the power to dominate, experiences the revelation of Divinity and has found its own true vocation.

Nor does naturalist religion commit us to the choice of either submitting to the authority of the past or treating the past as nothing more than a far-off milestone, left behind in our progress toward the future. In this respect, too, the synthesis of naturalism with religion points to a third alternative: We should accept the past as no more authoritative than the present. It should have the right to a vote, but not the right to veto, in the
determination of what we have to do to achieve salvation. As modern men and women, we cannot conceive of salvation unless we are permitted to exercise freedom of thought and are not restricted to uniformity of action. It is evident, however, that, unless we limit the scope of freedom to some extent, it is liable to degenerate into anarchy. That limit consists in the responsibility by which it must always be accompanied. Nor is absolute diversity in human behavior likely to help us achieve our goals as human beings. Evidently, there has to be some objective goal which is common to all who differ only as to the way it should be reached.252

On the subject of Jewish education Kaplan's statements in Judaism As A Civilization are also important.253 Finally, in 1966, Kaplan concludes his essay "Between Two Worlds" with the following passage:

We have been privileged to witness during the last century the first stage of the resurrection of the Jewish people. Modern Jewish scholarship and the Zionist movement have helped to bring about the first stage of the resurrection. Jewish scholarship has helped to give substance and body to the Jewish people of the past; Zionism has carried that process further by giving substance and body to the Jewish people in our day. Now the time has come for the second stage in the resurrection when the spirit must enter the risen body of our people. Now is the time for the spirit of a reconstituted people, of a morally responsible way of life, and of a religion based on the experience of Divinity in universal righteousness and brotherhood to enter the risen body of our people.254

Other spokesmen for the Reconstructionist position are Ira Eisenstein,255 Eugene Kohn,256 Jack J. Cohen,257 and Roland B. Gittelsohn.258 These writers amplify and, in their own manner, expand upon some or all of Kaplan's conceptions. Meir Ben-Horin, an "independent Reconstructionist," attempts to summarize what he conceives of as the uniqueness of Judaism:
Wherein may baffled Jews and non-Jews see the uniqueness, and the worthwhileness, of Judaism?

First, they may see the uniqueness of Judaism in the particular historical experience of the Jewish people. I have suggested that this experience revolves around the four fateful geographic-historic and geographic-religious localities known as Egypt, Zion, Auschwitz, and Sinai. In their combination and consequences they render the Jewish people possessors of a tragic yet heroic turn of mind, unlike any other. In the force of their thrust—"from slavery to freedom"—and in the profundity of their realistic idealism they render Israel capable of leadership among the nations of the earth. Without them and their agents-patients, the children of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, human civilization would be immeasurably poorer. For this combination of experience and aspiration is the mightiest ethical good ever assembled. It is unparalleled spiritual power making for human good on earth.

Second, they may come to see the uniqueness of Judaism in the in-tune-ness of its religion with science, mankind's supreme instrument for the discovery of truth in and about existents and existence. It is the genius of the Jewish people which broke and breaks through the various pagan and idolatrous interpositions of god-galaxies or god-individuals to intuit the divine in nothing less than the promise of existence itself, that invisible and inaudible and unfathomable character of the universe which permits visibility and audibility, and responds to man's efforts at intervention in behalf of ideal ends. The God of Israel is not a cosmic energy so organized as to function at least as a human mind and heart, but infinitely more so. He has eluded all attempts at concretization and spiritualization, including mysticism and hasidism. But He has been found in the work of casting ideals into realities and in the work of melting realities into ideals. Hence, He has not obstructed the human spirit in its quest for both practical and speculative certainty.

In Judaism, "the religious" is not separate from or opposed to the business of science (or art). Rather, science (or art) is one of the ways in which the faith in the existential promise is sustained. Hence, in Judaism, science is the power that reinforces faith in "the religious," and faith in "the religious" is the power that makes for scientific civilization. For Judaism, religion is the rebinding of man to the Unbound, commitment to the Uncommitted.

Jewish religion, therefore, when so reconstructed as to lay bare these truths embedded in the deeper layers
of its foundations, is likely to survive the scientific challenge to all traditional religions because it will reinforce that challenge and because, by doing so, it will achieve a new birth of creativity, a new vision of the divine.

Third, and returning once more to the revised " mishnah," the uniqueness of Judaism may be seen, negatively, in its radical opposition—literally, unto death—to absolutist totalitarianism. This is the doctrine which lends "intellectual" support to the most barbaric social regimes invented—Hitler’s Germany and Stalin’s Russia. Deriving their authority not from the consent of the governed but from the Absolute, they have enthroned private whims and follies and insanities on the seats of total power, i.e., power tolerating no restrictions, power responsible to no one except the Absolute which is the cosmic equivalent of total unconditionality, independence from conditions and, hence, total irresponsibility.

Positively, Judaism’s uniqueness lies in its status as mankind’s martyred yet lustily vigorous upholder of the anti-absolutist faith in God as the promise beyond realization. Judaism, often declared an outsider to mankind, is—in its ideal embodiment—uniquely equipped to restore to it, as an insider, the religious faith which is reverence for the promise of life, and which celebrates, as the means to its actualization, acts uniting intelligence and love.

For Judaism the world has no substitute. 259

Jack J. Cohen presents as well as anyone the Reconstructionist position and program as it pertains to American Jewish education. Included in some of the final pages of his comprehensive work, Jewish Education in Democratic Society, 260 are the following remarks:

We must have the courage to accept the fact that the Judaism of our children will not be the Judaism we know. It will be recognizable, but transformed. Like all the generations before us, we may be pained to see some of our cherished ideas and practices pass into the receptacle of outmoded tradition. But we should take heart from the knowledge that this is as it has always been and must always be as long as man seeks
out the divine. The question for us to decide is whether we have enough faith in ourselves, in our tradition and in our children to let them go freely about their in- evitable career of cultural search, criticism, revaluation, rebuilding and creating. If we encourage them in their venture they will be ever grateful to us and to the heritage which helped them to mature. They will grow but never rebel. They will criticize in order to enhance. Such a generation will be able to repeat with us, "Happy we are! How goodly is our portion, how pleasant our lot, how beautiful our heritage."

But it is appropriate to end on a note of dedication to all those nameless, unknown teachers of Israel, the melamdin, the maskilim, the saints, and the moral geniuses whose work, unknown to the masses and unrecorded in the annals of history, has nevertheless been the strength of our people. Those of us who despair about the future of Jewish education should reflect on the power of the few spiritual heroes who throughout the centuries have manned the classrooms of the Jewish school and have fanned the spark of Torah. We have no right to despair, no right to self-pity, and no right to shallowness. Jewish education deserves all the devotion and intensity of which we are capable. Like all the mitzvot, such effort will bring its own reward. 261

It is obvious that a systematic presentation of Reconstructionist ideology, including its theology and its educational thought and proposals, has not been offered at this time. However, it must also be apparent that Reconstructionist ideology, theology, and educational philosophy lend themselves to the "progressive reconstruction of Jewish education," especially as it pertains to Jewish education in American society. Additional evidence of this tentative finding will be presented in the chapters to follow.
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As indicated by the introductory material, the potential evidence of a progressive surge in American Jewish education must be examined with a multitude of factors in mind. The nature and extent of the evidence relied upon and the degree of scientific discipline exercised in interpreting the accumulated data is one of the more important considerations in this regard.

The confrontation and interaction between American Jewish education—as an expression of an attempt at religio-cultural minority group survival, as process and as institution—and progressive education—as criticism, as philosophy, as educational approach and as movement—is difficult to study and to describe properly and adequately. As one makes the effort to comprehend this manifestation of ethnic adaptation it becomes necessary to view American Jewish education in the light of the following: (1) Jewish education in all its ramifications as it is presented by the various interpretations of Jewish life and movements which have made up the matrix of American Judaism; (2) non-religious as well as religiously-oriented Jewish educational institutions and movements; (3) communal, in contrast to congregational, education and varying combinations of these two forms of sponsorship; (4) intensive as compared to 'extensive' programs of supplementary education; (5) supplementary versus day school education; (6) informal education as an extension of formal Jewish education—
Jewish school as it is related to the Jewish center (community and synagogue), the Jewish camp, the Jewish youth group, the educational trip to Israel, etc; (7) levels of Jewish education and their diverse challenges and problems--pre-school, elementary, secondary, higher and adult education. One must then identify evidence of the progressive impact as it shows itself in the various contexts just enumerated. In addition, the differential status of progressivism must be determined within the major facets of the overall Jewish educational process--philosophy of education, curriculum implementation and curriculum development, psychology of learning and methodology, administration and supervision. This many-sided analysis is a challenging task. In the realm of the collection of data, does one use unpublished materials, published materials and documents, curricula, minutes and proceedings, interviews, observations and observational checklists, questionnaires, or some combination of these? Can a sampling or can a given type of selective inquiry have universal or at least general validity?

As these methodological issues are considered and in addition an examination of the "confrontation" is attempted vertically or historically, the investigation becomes even more complex. The most that can be hoped for is a fairly accurate descriptive-analytical statement based upon the utilization of necessarily limited and circumscribed evidence. Obviously when additional evidence is presented as part of further research, the interpretations arrived at in this study and the ensuing conclusions assuredly may be open to revision and reformulation. It is axiomatic that any findings based upon limited evidence must of necessity be
tentative and conditional in nature. It is with these considerations in mind that the following evidence, analysis and conclusions are offered.

A. Early Beginnings—Dr. Samson Benderly and "The Bureau"

Existing evidence, historical records and historical research lead one to the conclusion that, generally speaking, American Jewish education was far from "progressive" during the last decade of the nineteenth century. Samson Benderly's experimental program (of which more will be said later) in Baltimore notwithstanding. During the same period that Parker's "Quincy System" and Dewey's "Laboratory School" at the University of Chicago were becoming well-known and influential in the field of general education, Jewish education was characterized by the shallowness of the Sunday school under both Reform and Conservative auspices and of the major "traditional" educational institutions, the heder and the Talmud Torah for indigent Jewish children. The teaching of Ivri (mechanical reading), translation of prayers and Pentateuch, instruction through "catechism" and moralizing, and the reign (sometimes of terror) of the maamed typified the Jewish education of the times. Needless to say, the educational environment created by poor facilities, antiquated materials and methods and untrained, and, in many cases, poorly educated personnel was not a healthy one. The influx of east-European Jewry, commencing in the latter decades of the nineteenth century, stimulated the further development of the Yeshivah and Talmud Torah movements and, in some respects, eventually led to the improvement of educational standards and conditions in the early decades of the twentieth
However, in the main, even the most "modern" of these institutions as well as Conservative and Reform religious schools as late as the end of the first decade of the twentieth century were not as yet ready to respond constructively to the need for the changes demanded by those who had begun to assimilate the spirit, philosophy and approach of the "new education."

As the impact of the "new education" proposed by the Dewey-Kilpatrick school of American educational thought began to be felt to an increasing degree, both in the form of criticism of the inadequacies of traditional American education and in the form of innovation and radical experimentation, there arose among Jewish educators those who echoed, in whole or in part, the same criticisms and the call for innovation and experimentation in regard to Jewish education. Attempts were made to energize the progressive critique by actually implementing in practice progressive principles—in methodology and the psychology of learning, in curriculum development and in administration. It is not surprising that the more radical efforts to "change" and "reconstruct" Jewish education were looked upon with dismay and suspicion by many religionists, by some Hebraists and by most Jewish educational perennialists. During the early period of attempting to adjust and adapt Jewish education to some of the needs of American Jewish life (prior to 1915), note should be made of the implementation of the philosophy of the Heder Metuqan and the introduction of the Ivrit be-Ivrit method of Hebrew language instruction in the "modern Talmud Torah" which to some degree represented a transplanted, if not wholly indigenous, effort to improve the quality of
intensive Jewish education through the application of modern educational
principles. Of this initial attempt to revitalize American Jewish
education, Honor says:

All of [these] institutions . . . came into
existence as a reaction to the deplorable conditions
under which the children of recent immigrants were
receiving a Jewish education. They were brought into
existence by individuals whose outlook had been formed
under the impact of modern Western thought on the one
hand, and Zionism and the Hebraic renaissance on the
other, and who were seeking a means of transmitting
the Jewish heritage not as something which had developed
in an ancient dead past, but as something which had been
created by a living people whose creative powers had
never ceased and was, therefore, to be regarded as part
of an ongoing process with roots in the remote past,
with relevance to the present, and with potentialities
for the future. These individuals were seeking at the
same time an instrument which would be modern,
adapted to the needs and interests of American Jewish
children, which would conform to accepted educational
theory and practice, and would be effective in winning
the loyalty and appreciation of the children taught, and
help them integrate themselves into the stream of
American life without losing their Jewish identity and
their awareness of the responsibilities which this
identity implies. 9

The influence of the "new education," as progressivism in
American education was called, began to exert itself in Jewish
educational circles with the entrance upon the stage of Dr. Samson
Benderly at the turn of the century and during the early decades of
the twentieth century. Though Spencer and Pestalozzi were "closer"
to Benderly than were Dewey and his precursors--Mann and Parker,
the practitioners, and James, the philosopher--Benderly evinced an
affinity for the insights and innovations of progressivism by introducing
into the program of the Jewish school experimentation, extra-curricular
activities, play activity, safety and health education, independent use of the library, projects, visual aids and student-government among a host of other changes.\textsuperscript{10} The Baltimore Hebrew Free School, Benderly's "laboratory school," in which innovations and experiments were the order of the day and which was fortunate enough to have on its staff people such as Ben Rosen and Rebecca Aronson (later Mrs. Barnett Brickner) "became known to the 'inside circle' of those who were concerned with the future of American Jewish education as one of the very few schools which were charting the course for the future. The school became a showplace, and the spirit of devotion and enthusiasm which it engendered in students and teachers became the subject for discussion and writing.\textsuperscript{11} The influence of Ahad ha-Am's philosophy,\textsuperscript{12} of the dedication to the upbuilding of Erets Yisrael\textsuperscript{13} and of the need for adapting Judaism to the character of the developing American Jewish community\textsuperscript{14} permeated Benderly's educational approach. The "new educational process" which Benderly advocated had as its goal the creation of a new form of Diaspora Judaism, a Judaism of tomorrow.

The Jews of today, however, particularly those of Western Europe and America, even though they look upon Palestine as an indispensable Jewish spiritual center, no longer consider themselves as exiles. They look upon the land in which they live as a permanent habitation for themselves and their descendants. And, not only do they not avoid the forces of their surroundings, but rather seek to come under their influence in order to become an integral part of their environment and to share both in its responsibilities and its opportunities. What form of Diaspora Judaism can survive under such circumstances we do not know. The Jewish people as a whole has never had the incentive and therefore has not attempted the task of the creation of such a Judaism. The time, however, for attempting this task is at hand, and primarily so in
America, where the environment is completely modern and where the Jews are sufficient in number to sustain the losses which such an experiment will involve. The great goal, therefore, which we can set before our teachers and our youth in America is to become the pioneers in the upbuilding of such a Diaspora Judaism. 15.

Benderly's ideal of improving Jewish education through the assumption of responsibility by a democratically structured Jewish community entered the stage of realization when, in 1910, he became director of the educational extension of the New York City Kehillah, the Bureau of Jewish Education, the prototype of similar bureaus that were established throughout the United States in later years. Since the philosophy and activities of the New York Bureau and Benderly's contribution to its effectiveness are amply recorded and documented in a variety of sources, a description of its development, its achievements and failings and its overall contribution to Jewish education in America would be superfluous. However, an analysis of what it represented and attempted to do so as to determine the possible import of the thinking and practice associated with progressive education upon the educational orientation of the leaders of "modern American Jewish education" is in order. Not only must the thought and activities of Samson Benderly be evaluated, but the educational philosophy and philosophy of Jewish life as well as the educational background of those identified with the Bureau must be considered. Dr. Benderly and his associates (such as Mordecai M. Kaplan) and those who worked initially under Dr. Benderly at the Bureau and later held important educational posts throughout the country as well as the generations of students whom he influenced
have made a major contribution to the evolution of American Jewish education and to the growth of the profession of Jewish education. The links between progressive educational thinking and practice and these modern American Jewish educators must be ascertained since their influence upon most sectors of the Jewish educational establishment has been quite telling.

As early as 1907, Rabbi Louis Grossman, in the report of the Committee on Religious Schools to the annual meeting of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, expressed criticism of the Reform movement’s Sabbath schools similar in tone to the criticism of traditional general education by the early leaders of progressive education. Though still talking of "apperceptive mass" and adhering to certain assumptions of faculty psychology, Rabbi Grossman emphasized the importance of educating the whole child, of knowing and respecting student-interests, of educating not for transmission of information but for the formation of character, of using internal motivation rather than external discipline, of promoting self-discipline and self-activity and of correlating subjects and establishing a 'pedagogic center' or "core" as an organizing influence in the overall instructional program. He stated bluntly that public education was far ahead of Sabbath school education and asked if the information "given" in the Sabbath school was relevant to the needs of the Jewish child. He called for discarding the worn-out notion that "stuffing pupils with information," that mere "knowing" contributes to "becoming." In contradiction, the taking into account of student-interests will lead to student-activity and to the exercise of student-freedom as real educational
growth occurs. 17

Many of these criticisms and corrective principles seem similar to those incorporated into Benderly's program at the Baltimore Hebrew Free School 18 (even though no direct relationship between Grossman and Benderly can be determined) and into other educational experiments, the most noteworthy of the earliest ones being the projects of the Bureau of Education in New York City. Benderly's dynamism and dedication attracted a group of disciples who were educated at Teachers College under the tutelage of Dewey and of Thorndike and later, beginning in 1913, of Kilpatrick. This group, whose thinking and accomplishments are so pertinent to this study, did basic research and experimentation, of both an "action" and a theoretical nature and which was permeated by the spirit of progressivism in education as part of their responsibilities at the Bureau.

Although, as has been stated earlier, Benderly was originally influenced by the thinking of Spencer and Pestalozzi more than that of Dewey, Parker, James, etc., evidence does exist that Benderly's philosophy of life and education as well as many of his projects were to one degree or another based upon the thought, experiments and practical innovations of the "new school" in American education. In turn, those who worked under him, in addition to being affected by the cogency of the new philosophical and educational trends being developed at Columbia University and especially at Teachers College, were also enamored by the educational approach of the progressivists as it touched them through their contact with Benderly. Rebecca Aronson (Mrs.
Barnett A. Brickner reminisced of her experience at the Baltimore Hebrew Free School: "Just about this time, the scientific work in general education done by the Columbia University Teachers College group was coming to the fore. No sooner were the works of Thorndike and Dewey published, then Benderly had them on his desk. He was filling himself with the newly acquired 'Chochmah' of these educators. In the mornings he would read, and in the afternoons he would test out these newly acquired theories. Then the fun began..."^19

In addition, it is significant to note that Benderly exhibited a pragmatic tendency in his thinking. Isaac B. Berkson, one of the first generation of his disciples, recalled that "once... he defined an educated person as one who could change his views in the light of new facts and situations... Although he was prepared to compromise with practical realities in execution, he was never a compromiser of fundamentals... There was as little in him of the opportunist as there was of the conformist. He was opposed to doctrinal formulations and to rigid ritualisms."^20 Interestingly, Benderly, who seems to have valued the instrumental use of intelligence, was generally regarded as "essentially a mystic permeated with a strong feeling for nature, as a source of vital creative force and of communion with the Infinite."^21 There are many indications that Benderly's strong desire for "change" went to extremes. Mordecai Soltes, who worked diligently with Benderly in the area of extension education, commented that "one could not escape the conclusion that at times he attached great importance to change for the sake of change, an attitude which made for instability."^22 Whether this penchant
for change was a characteristic of Benderly's personality as was the tendency toward the mystical, or whether it was a resultant of his espousing the pragmatic, experimental philosophy of the progressivists is difficult to determine. Most probably, the philosophy reenforced the existing tendency which may have developed as a product of Benderly's devotion to the method of science. No matter what analysis is accepted, Benderly's zeal for educational experimentation and research was real and infectious.

Almost all that Benderly did in his efforts to modernize and Americanize Jewish education was a reflection of his devotion to the idea of integrating Jewish life into the new American environment through the instrumentality of Jewish education modified by many of the insights of progressive education. Though he was a staunch advocate of intensive Hebraic education, witness his experiments with and implementation of the Ivrit be-Ivrit method\(^{22a}\) and his support of the "modern Talmud Torah," and though he was an avid defender of all efforts at creative Jewish survival in the United States, Benderly would not allow traditional Jewish educational ideas, methods and patterns to stand as obstacles to revitalizing Jewish life. As a corollary to his devotion to an American Judaism and to a modern program for American Jewish education, Benderly was a strong advocate of community responsibility for Jewish education—a Jewish education democratically controlled, organized and publicly supported by community funds, a Jewish education of the same quality as general American education and one complementary to the system of general education.\(^{23}\) In addition, he conceived, as an
extension of the concept of democracy in Jewish education the idea of
equality of Jewish educational opportunity just as this idea is the corner-
stone of the American system of public education.

The influence of progressivism upon Benderly's thinking and the
Bureau's activities can best be understood by examining the projects,
innovations and experiments sponsored by the Bureau. More important
than its actual successes were the Bureau's attempts at acting as a
"lever,"²⁴ and a "laboratory," at initiating experiments and stimulating
the New York Jewish community and, in fact, the American Jewish
community to search for better ways to meet the religio-cultural educational
needs of American Jews. A summary analysis, comprising new departures
in the areas of methodology, curriculum development and administration
will be presented²⁵ so that the tremendous scope of the Bureau's concerns
and the pervasiveness of progressive thinking reflected in its activities
can be fully appreciated.

1. The Area of Methodology

In the sector of methodological improvement, the Bureau, in its
"model schools,"²⁵α and through its supervisory function in regard to other
educational institutions and projects, either introduced or, in some cases,
reenforced the use of (1) functional Hebrew²⁶; (2) the Ivrit be-Ivrit (natural)
method of Hebrew language instruction even in a Reform Sunday school
(Dr. Enelow's)²⁷; (3) English for the teaching of history, current events
and other subjects even in the more intensive Hebraic programs²⁸; (4) audio-
visual aids such as, in the early days, stereopticon slides for the teaching
of Bible and lantern slides for the teaching of Jewish history²⁹; (5) new,
well-illustrated, attractive textbooks for the teaching of Bible and for instruction in Hebrew (Sefer ha-Talmid as an early example); (6) a children's magazine, The Jewish Child.

From articles, reports on experiments, materials produced, etc., it seems obvious that the Bureau--Benderly and those who worked with him in the early years and were his students and disciples, i.e. "the Benderly boys (and girls)"--attempted to implement the findings of progressive education in the realms of methodology and the psychology of learning to a great extent. For example, in discussing the objectives of a standard curriculum for Jewish weekday schools Benderly pointed to the need for understanding and utilizing the student's "apperceptive mass" (fund of experience and past learnings) so as to coordinate the teaching of subjects with the "developmental grasping of values" as well as to the need for correlating Jewish education with Jewish life (principle of assuring the relevance of learning experiences to the life-needs of pupils). Articles in The Jewish Teacher and, later in Jewish Education, among the various periodicals in which the Bureau-oriented personnel expressed themselves, attest to progressivism's impact upon methodological research, experimentation and innovation. Many additional allusions to methodological questions posed and answers given by the progressivists as they found their way into Jewish educational thinking and practice will be presented later in this study. Indeed, Benderly and the Bureau were in the forefront of the movement to make Jewish education "more attractive" through methodological and, as will be pointed out below, curricular revision and also through administrative reform.
2. The Area of Curriculum

The activities of the Bureau in the area of curriculum development took many forms. The ensuing analysis will not necessarily focus upon exact chronological sequence (though the overall study takes account of historical development and is written in historical perspective) since studies of the Bureau prior to 1918 by Dushkin and after 1918 by Rudavsky are more concerned with exactness in this area. However, a summary of the projects, experiments and new directions in curriculum development instituted by the Bureau until its dissolution in 1941 will be attempted so as to present an overview that will give a sense of developmental perspective and wholeness to the enterprise initiated by Benderly, his associates and disciples. From time to time, at other points in this study, most of these experimental ventures and new approaches will be discussed more fully and critically as additional evidence and materials are examined. However, since the Bureau seems to represent the pioneering force in the "progressivization" of American Jewish education, it is wise to view its areas of activity as an integrated and relatively consistent, if not always successful, attempt to modernize American Jewish education and to bring it "up to date" for the purpose of assuring creative Jewish survival and of meeting the needs of the majority of American Jews.

Solely for the purposes of deepening our understanding of the breadth and depth of the Bureau's efforts at improving the content, structure and meaningfulness of the Jewish educational process, efforts at "curricular change" will be classified in four categories. It should be noted (a) that these "categories" impinge upon each other and (b) that they include
innovations from 1910 until the demise of the Bureau in 1941.

(1) Introduction of "new subjects" and the "correlation of subjects" within the confines of the "formal curriculum"—inclusion of the study of current events, modern Palestine and the American Jewish community in the course of study, a greater emphasis on the study of Jewish history; introduction of the various arts in order to concretize and make learning experiences more attractive and meaningful (music, arts and crafts, dramatics, and dance); correlation of subjects as for example Jewish history and Bible as represented in the three volumes of The Outline of Jewish Knowledge produced by Israel Goldberg and Benderly; the utilization of the unit approach in the study of Jewish civics and customs and ceremonies.

(2) Modernization and standardization of curricular models and curricular statements—the creation of a standard curriculum for the Talmud Torahs cooperating with the Bureau as part of the work with the Association of Hebrew Principals:

(a) Methodological changes such as the "natural method" of teaching Hebrew with the use of an aural-oral approach as well as of objects, pictures, stories, etc.; (b) changes in curricular forms and patterns; (c) correlation of Jewish education with Jewish life so as to reconstruct the Jewish home and the Jewish community; (d) correlation of subjects, concretization of learning experiences and coordination of subjects taught with the developmental grasping of values.

(3) Extension of the limits of curricular experiences—the introduction of extra- or co-curricular activities such as clubs, interest groups, junior congregations, assemblies, student self-government, also, the regarding of inter-school activities such as holiday celebrations at the elementary and secondary levels, the inter-high school choir (Zimrat Aleph), etc., as legitimate extensions of the curriculum.

(4) Broadening and deepening the concept of "curriculum"

(a) Different types of schools with differing objectives to meet differing needs were aided in refining and extending the scope of their curricular experiences. Separate Hebrew high school and junior Hebrew high school units, geared to levels of adolescent development, were created.

(b) Differential types of curricular plans for students with differing backgrounds, motivations, needs and capacities (mainly at Hebrew high schools supervised by the Bureau) were formulated:
1. grouping of students within a given instructional program based on individual differences in capacity, motivation and achievement;

2. establishing Hebrew (intensive) and English (extensive) departments at the secondary level with the extensive department emphasizing "content" rather than "language"—units in customs and ceremonies and in history, the study of the Bible in English, emphasis on "functional Hebrew," etc.;

3. forming of "acceleration classes" for "late beginners" (10-11 year olds) with more than average ability for a "crash Hebraic program;"

4. experimenting with "individualized self-instruction" based upon the Dalton and Winnetka plans.

(d) Secondary educational institutions for girls were established (The Florence Marshall Preparatory Schools for Girls, etc.)

(e) Informal or extension education for children and youth not attending formal classes was initiated:

1. Extension schools in Jewish social institutions (YMHA's, Talmud Torahs, Settlements, orphan asylums, etc.);

2. Children and youth groups (throughout New York)—the circle of Jewish Children (for elementary school-age children) and the League of Jewish Youth (for secondary school-age youth) with emphasis upon holiday celebrations; later, Hanotim (replacing the Circle of Jewish Children) and Habonim (replacing the League of Jewish Youth) with emphasis upon Erets Yisrael—its upbuilding and emerging culture.

(f) Provision for affording information and educational materials dealing with Jewish family and home life (Jewish values, festivals, history, etc.) to parents of pre-school children (The Jewish Home Institute).

(g) Schools for adult Jewish studies (The Israel Friedlander Classes sponsored by the Jewish Theological Seminary, as an example).

(h) The establishment of a "community school" which served also as a "community center" for all age groups similar to the Gary plan in general education (The Central Jewish Institute).

(i) The stimulation of the development of the Jewish educational summer camp.
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2. The Kvutzah (1926-1933) -- a training program consisting of winter instruction and meetings and a summer camp experience accentuating supervised study and an Hebraic atmosphere (the speaking of Hebrew) among other activities. The students selected were from among the best graduates of the Hebrew high school.

3. Camp Achvah (founded in 1932) -- a camp sponsored by the Bureau and directed in its early years by Dr. Benderly. The camp was similar in its program to Cejwin (not Hebrew-speaking and no supervised study).

In his essay on the impact of the American environment upon Jewish elementary education, Honor comments on this broadened concept of curriculum which gave rise to these new approaches to American Jewish education:

The most important influence on curriculum development in the Jewish school emanates from the distinction made by American educators between "course of study" and "curriculum," and their defining the latter as "the total series of experiences in the school, or made possible through the school, or for which the school is responsible." This conception of curriculum has not only affected content taught and method used in the Jewish school, but has led to the attempt to extend the influence of the Jewish school and to the placing of emphasis upon parent education as part of the curriculum of the school. Similarly, the conception of education as being derived from total experience, or in the formulation of John Dewey, as "the continuous reformation of experience," has led Jewish educators to perceive that their responsibility goes beyond the utilization of the Jewish school as an educational instrument, that they must also take advantage of the educational possibilities in the Jewish community center and other recreational agencies, and above all in the summer camp which affords opportunity for experiences in Jewish living from the moment the child rises in the morning until he retires in the evening.

3. The Area of Administration

Though, in some respects, the impact of progressivism upon
educational administration and related areas was less dramatic and came upon the scene later than modifications in methodology, principles of learning and curriculum development, certain indications of the inroads of the progressive spirit in the thinking of Dr. Benderly and the Bureau can be observed in this area also. As has been noted earlier, the Bureau pioneered in planning a more realistic and psychologically sound approach to school organization by providing different educational experiences for differing maturational and motivational levels—pre-school, elementary (formal and informal, degrees of intensity, etc.), junior Hebrew high school for graduates of the Talmud Torahs, adolescent and youth education (informal or extension, formal intensive and extensive programs, leadership training, etc.), adult education, and secondary education for girls. In addition, it encouraged the formation of coed Hebrew high schools as well as the scheduling of classes two or three days during the week with increased use of weekends for "intensive educational programs." Also, the Bureau established procedures for uniform record-keeping and standardized record forms.

In another vein the Bureau persevered in research and experimentation, in the improvement of the preparation of teachers and educational personnel, in the development of personnel standards and personnel practices, and in the supervision of schools under its jurisdiction.

One of Dr. Benderly's prime objectives was to embark upon a continuous program of research, experimentation and evaluation. In many instances, the experiment was considered more important than its success or the implementation of its outcomes. In conjunction with this
inclination, the Bureau set out to develop "model" or "experimental" schools. Additionally, Benderly encouraged "action" and "theoretical" research on the part of his associates and disciples and stimulated the writing of three extremely significant doctoral dissertations at Teachers College by members of the Bureau staff. Dr. Benderly also worked closely with Dr. Mordecai Kaplan, the Dean of the Teachers Institute of the Jewish Theological Seminary, in order to create for students aspiring to be teachers in Jewish schools a coordinated program for professional education with the Teachers Institute and Teachers College (Columbia University). Benderly was instrumental in the creation of the short-lived Training School for Jewish Communal Service under the leadership of Dr. Julius Drachsler and in having the Jewish community accept women teachers in Jewish schools. The Bureau was a staunch advocate of certification and licensing of teachers and principals, of the establishment of and adherence to standards for teachers regarding educational and personal qualifications, of the setting up of a scale of remuneration befitting the needs and dignity of the teacher, and of the creation of a satisfactory code of personnel practices to be followed by Jewish educational institutions in New York and its environs. Finally, as early as 1910, the Bureau moved into the field of supervision by convening seminars for principals of the Talmud Torahs with which it was working.

A careful comparison of the lasting contributions of progressivism to American education as determined by Cremin with the "new departures" initiated by Benderly will lead to an appreciation of the Bureau's role in the "progressivization" of Jewish educational thinking in the United States.
The entire ten points mentioned by Cremin are reflected in the innovations put forth by Benderly and the Bureau in their efforts in New York City. One evaluation of Benderly's contributions states: "Like all prophets, Dr. Benderly was ahead of his times. . . There is hardly an aspect of Jewish education into which he did not introduce system, order, beauty, in consonance with the latest in the field of education. . . It would be impossible to categorize all the 'firsts' that we owe to Dr. Benderly and the Bureau of Jewish Education. Dr. Benderly was pioneering in a new world of education and almost everything he touched and did therefore represented a first attempt from the point of view of modernization, on American soil, of textbooks, methods, materials, buildings, schoolrooms, teaching aids, and the like. . ." Of Benderly's pioneering spirit, Dushkin says: "... He was fascinated by every new approach of American educators to the education of children and cherished every idea and advice that would help him modernize Jewish education. . . Throughout his life, Benderly's name became the symbol of the struggle between those who were doing things in the traditional manner and those who were seeking new ways." Berkson describes Benderly's devotion to the modernization of American Jewish education thusly: "As the articles in this Memorial Issue amply testify, there is hardly any progressive idea in the field of Jewish education at the present time which Dr. Benderly did not envisage." 

B. The Period of Gestation--Pioneers and Prophets Prior to 1920

During the period in which bold, new approaches to American Jewish education were being attempted by the Bureau of Jewish Education
of New York City in the name of a "community approach to Jewish education," criticisms and recommendations, similar to those of Rabbi Louis Grossman noted earlier, were to be heard among Reform Jewish educators and those concerned with "liberal Jewish religious education." Steps had been taken to improve the quality of Reform Jewish education, such as the creation of more appropriate text-materials and the establishment of a Teachers Institute in Cincinnati which, to some degree, was progressive in orientation (Rabbi Louis Grossman was its director).

It would seem, however, the most significant event in the development of Reform Jewish education in the United States was the formation of the Joint Commission on Jewish Education (co-sponsored and supported by the C. C. A. R. and the UAHC) in 1924 and the appointment of a qualified, full-time, professional director. Interestingly, the director, Dr. Emanuel Gamoran, was one of the original group of "Benderly boys." Prior to this occurrence, the opening of the Teachers Institute was probably one of the more important developments of national proportions that took place in Reform Jewish education, though its success and impact was not what had been anticipated since it existed only until 1919. In the first bona fide article on Jewish education (1911) found in the periodical Religious Education, Rabbi Grossman commented on the nature of religious education in the United States and the role that the Teachers Institute, then only two years old, should play in its development. Emphasizing the need for all "sects" to work together on the scientific aspects of education as well as the need for public and religious educators to cooperate with each other, he stated: "The Teachers Institute will work out, it is hoped, a
valid and working form of instruction in religion and morals, made possible for us today by the progress of science. It will give to the graduate a wholesome sense of respect for and confidence in the laws of child growth, in the function that religion has in the economy of the soul-life. . . All teaching is experimentation."85

Related to these ideas were ones which proposed articulating the goals of religious education as character-building and the creation of the moral person,86 as adjustment and self-realization,87 as socialization of the child and socialization of the school88 (the school as model community).89 Rabbi George Zepin defined knowledge not as "information" or "power" but as "service to mankind" and referred to Nicholas Murray Butler of Teachers College in offering this definition: "Religious education has become the process of adjusting man to his environment so that he can become of the greatest service to society."90

Numerous references to the "whole child" ("Education . . . must develop the whole man, the head, the hand, the heart")91 emphasizing the need to take into consideration aspects of developmental psychology and the "new" psychology of learning proposed by progressive educators can be found. Making the child the center and the starting point of the learning process,92 providing satisfying and enjoyable learning experiences in the Sabbath school,93 the relating of learning activities to the spontaneous needs and interests of students,94 the concretization of learning experiences and materials,95 the advantages of "group-learning," proper social climate and esprit de corps in the classroom,96 the need for attractive and hygienic facilities97 all are alluded to in pronouncements
in the literature—in the C.C.A.R. Yearbook and in Religious Education magazine. Simon says caustically: "Self-activity is a key word in modern pedagogy. No room is found in our religious schools for child-activity. Our work is that of 'pouring in'." Zepin is just as outspoken in his contention that knowledge is not a body of information and the child's mind is not a tabula rasa. Throughout these and similar statements reflections of "progressive methodological suggestions" such as the use of audio-visual aids and of more attractive and graded textbooks, the use of dramatization and debate, the need to vary activities and to provide for physical activity as part of the instructional program, the place of assemblies, etc., are to be found. The recommendation to add current events to the curriculum, the importance of relating the curriculum to real life-needs, the desirability of grouping students as to their capacity and level of achievement, the encouragement of a "new freedom for research and experimentation," are mentioned in these early writings. Almost all essays include references in one form or another to the "new education." The cited evidence permits the conclusion that there was an increasing sentiment to modernize Reform religious education. Additional evidence of this tendency prior to 1920 is found in a number of articles published in The Jewish Teacher. Careful scrutiny of The Jewish Teacher and investigation of the aims and activities of the Jewish Teachers Association (JTA) give more than an adequate index of the importance of progressivism in general education in the second decade of the twentieth century to the development of that approach to Jewish education which could be
considered "indigenous," "American," and "modern." As has already
been implied in the discussion of the Bureau of Jewish Education of New
York City and in the statements of liberally-oriented Jewish educators
in the C. C. A. R. Yearbook and in Religious Education, attempts at
adapting Jewish education to the educational climate being created in the
United States were taking place on all fronts. However, a high degree
of caution must be exercised in extrapolating from these "adventures
in theory" and recorded instances of practical reform to the day-to-
day practice in Jewish educational institutions throughout the United
States. Even in the "cradle of American Jewish progressive education,"
New York City, traditional educational ideas and traditional Jewish
educators were in the majority, and these forces, even to this day,
have resisted many of the changes proposed by the "progressivists."

The function and character of The Jewish Teacher is best
described by citing an excerpt from its initial editorial statement:

It is in this spirit that a group of Jewish teachers, college men and women, who have been born or trained in
this country, have united with other teachers, who have come to these shores later in life and have brought with them the idealism, the knowledge and the experience of other lands, into an Association of Jewish Teachers. Their purpose is to help create the profession of Jewish educa-
tion by spreading an esprit de corps among Jewish teachers, by adopting a professional attitude towards their work, and by stimulating discussion, research and experimentation which shall base the work of the Jewish school upon sound psychologic and pedagogic principles. They have committed
themselves to three principles: first, that Jewish education is an unsolved problem...; second, that it is a community problem...; third, that Jewish education is worthy of the service of the best minds and hearts in Jewry and must, therefore, be raised to the dignity of a profession. These are the only three principles to which
the Association as such subscribes. All other questions,
questions of principle or of method, the Association leaves to the individual opinions and conviction of its members and considers them proper subjects for deliberation and discussion.

This magazine... is to be more than the official voice of an Association of Teachers; it is hoped that it will serve as a forum wherein all opinions and endeavors in the field of Jewish education will find frank and free expression. Its aim is to become the organ of the profession, in the English language.

Notwithstanding its stated impartiality as to principles and methods appropriate for American Jewish education, study of its expositive and analytical essays and editorial statements prior to 1920 reveal certain tendencies:

(1) articles critical of the "sterility" of some of the purposes, most of the methods and the overall curricular plan of traditional Jewish education abound;

(2) champions of the "new education" are either community-oriented (Bureau of Jewish Education of New York City personnel) of religiously liberal (leaders and spokesmen for Reform Jewish education and for the embryonic Reconstructionist viewpoint);

(3) The institution of changes, many of which were a direct product of the assimilation of the goals, principles, curricular designs and methods of progressive education, is called for by critics of the "old school";

(4) a great sense of purpose and a feeling of urgency characterize the writings.

Of the significant early statements dealing with the goals and
objectives of modern American Jewish education found in The Jewish 
Teacher is one by Mordecai M. Kaplan. 110 In addition to his call for 
open discussion by the Jewish community of religious problems and 
principles, thus necessitating a reevaluation of the content of Jewish 
education, Kaplan agrees with Dr. Butler that the aim of the religious 
school is to integrate the child into the life of the religious community. 
Kaplan denounces as miseducative moralizing, story-telling and the 
attempt to indoctrinate the young with abstract religious principles. 
On the other hand, he posits as legitimate goals the healthy development 
of personality and character development, adjustment to the environment 
and binding the child to the Jewish group. The purpose of religious 
education is "to make the child feel himself a part of a social environ­ 
ment that expects him to live up to its ideal." 111 The premium on 
critical and creative thought rather than on the transmission of knowledge 
only 112 and criticism of the overemphasis on method and technique 
without proper evaluation of aims and objectives and their relationship 
to method 113 are brought out by Dushkin. He goes on to say:

We believe that unless the Jewish teachers of this 
country are interested in the philosophy of Jewish education, 
and unless each of us strives to formulate for himself and 
herself, the broad aims and principles underlying our work, 
the development of the Jewish school will be unhealthy and 
haphazard, and a real profession of Jewish education will 
not be possible. 114

In the introductory section of a four-part discussion dealing with 
the teaching of Jewish history, Honor compares the "old" versus the "new" 
conception of knowledge.

Formerly, we were interested in the past for its own 
sake. To-day, inasmuch as we feel that we cannot have 
an intelligent understanding of contemporary ideals,
institutions or problems, unless we are aware of the processes whereby these have come into being, we are still interested in the past, but only in so far as the knowledge of the past will function in our lives. Yet, in spite of this fundamental change in our point of view, all our text-books in Jewish history, and in large measure our curricula and courses of study, seem still to be based on the idea that the purpose of teaching history is to convert our pupils into store-houses of information, and that the purpose of history is to enumerate facts, events, names and dates. 

As a consequence of this new, functional approach, the ultimate aim of teaching Jewish history must first be identified. Then, a method consistent with this aim must be arrived at. Finally, the purposeful selection of material to be taught, consistent with aim and method, must be made.

Honor stated the aim of teaching Jewish history as follows: "We have formulated our aim in this manner because we believe that the teaching of history must prepare the American-Jewish child for the struggle of adjustment confronting him in this country. . . adjustment, which, to us, means: the change in the mode of living, whereby the continuity of the group may be best assured." His differentiation between habit and thought is reminiscent of Dewey's distinction between these two modes of "adjustment." At the end of his initial essay, Honor, in referring to the study of history by students eighteen years of age and above, makes an interesting statement about the role of inquiry in education.

Rabbi Louis Grossman, 119 agreeing in principle with Mordecai
Kaplan that "preparation for life" and "re-enforcement of character" should be the goals of a religious education that not only supplements but also interprets general education, is drawn to the "new education" because it is dynamic. Affirming with Honor the functional nature of knowledge, his conceptualizations and his mode of expression show a marked kinship with Dewey and Kilpatrick though the religious coloration of Grossman's formulations is obvious:

Facts have meaning only so far as they contain and give forth life. When we 'learn,' we receive moral influence. We act by the urge of what we know. In a word, knowledge and interest go together. We accept what we want, and we are interested in what we need. . .

He goes on to state that the child rather than the subject or the curriculum should be the center of the educational process, that the child should not be viewed as an "imagined future man" ("The child is in the school that it may live its child-life; not a preparatory life, but its life as it is.")

that teaching Hebrew (a classical language) for Hebrew's sake and indoctrination through catechism are miseducative, and that the experience, maturity, and psychological development of the child must be taken into consideration in all educational endeavors. His closing statement would do justice to the leading progressive educators of his time as they scathingly identified the "sins" of traditional education and glorified the insights of the "new education."

This is the age of the child. This fact seems to have application everywhere, in modern civilization, except amongst us. With us there is not even the dawn of it. The Jewish child has not yet come to his rights. . . Education means, so runs the ancient pedagogic wisdom, filling the child with information; it means discipline, control. But it does not occur to us that the only effective
information is that which stirs interest, widens sympathies, and urges the will. We have all along thought for the child, and we have frowned when the child began to decide for himself. This scandalous distrust of child-nature is revenging itself upon us by producing aloofness and indifference. Approach the child with reverence, with the reverence due to the profound facts of life it is revealing, to the wonderful promise it holds, and to the destiny it has in its keeping, and teaching may be lifted to the sanctity of a noble profession. Let us give to our subject, the Jewish Child, the significance which child-study has acquired in all departments of educational study.

It could be argued that aims and objectives of Jewish education when buttressed by principles of learning or psychological principles comprise the substructure for varieties of philosophies of American Jewish education. Included in the various formulations proposed would be (in the majority of instances) specific goals translated into educational terms which stem from the religio-ethnic nature of the Jewish people, as well as unique goals which might enable the Jewish educational process for American Jews to be a meaningful one and one appropriate to the needs and interests of individual Jews and to the needs of Jewish group-survival. Important as an understanding of these so-called "philosophical positions" is for appreciating the development of American Jewish education, it must be noted that the ideological stances incorporated into these educational approaches are significant for the purpose of this study only in those cases in which they tend to agree or conflict with generic progressive philosophical and educational goals and principles.

With this focus in mind, some goals and objectives as formulated prior to 1920 have been presented. As part of that presentation it was impossible to separate out completely principles of learning or psycho-
logical principles. In addition to those assertions already noted (in statements cited from *Religious Education*, the C.C.A.R. Yearbook and *The Jewish Teacher*), the following significant principles and ideas were enunciated in *The Jewish Teacher* (prior to 1920): The proper type of motivation, according to Dushkin, "should vitalize the lesson by relating it to actual needs and interests of child both in its school and its out-of-school life." Interest in the lesson should be active, "i.e., the stimulus should be some compelling vital motive," and "attention should be spontaneous and not forced, involuntary rather than involuntary." Pupil self-expression, initiative and cooperation just as the teacher-student relationship, a healthy group-feeling, esprit de corps and social atmosphere within the class, and proper hygienic conditions within the classroom are also considered to be important. Dushkin refers the reader to such works by Dewey as *Interest and Effort*, *School and Society* and *Moral Principles of Education* and to Thorndike's *Principles of Teaching*. Another classic by Dewey, *Schools of Tomorrow*, is reviewed by Samuel Margoshes.

Of this description of early progressive experiments, Margoshes says:

> For the Jewish teacher, Dr. Dewey's book is of special significance. Only when we contemplate the schools of to-morrow do we realize that our own schools, speaking broadly, are schools of a day before yesterday. The introduction of play into our lower grades, the reorganization of our curriculum to suit the changing needs of our pupils, and especially the educational attempts to follow the natural development of the child, are of particular significance to Jewish schoolmen. Our schools have much to learn from the American schools of to-morrow.

Honor proposes the cycle approach to the teaching of history for a variety of reasons, one of which is the "psychological limitation!"
of the pupils. He goes on to state: "While our aim will constantly be
to develop in our pupils an historically conscious attitude towards Jewish
life and its problems, the manner in which we shall accomplish our aim
will vary according to the needs and apperception of our pupils." Dushkin, in a discussion of the League of Jewish Youth, points out the greater meaningfulness of active participation in an experience in which the whole self is involved as compared to a routine lecture or class, a principle which can be applied in many instances to educational experiences in the more formal classroom settings. In an article on "object work" in the Jewish school, Hajnalka Langer presents the view that Jewish education should provide for experiences in Jewish living, not about Jewish living, experiences involving the total self of the learner.

We must avoid the error of educating but one aspect of the life of our children--the mental. We should not forget that a child does not consist entirely of brains. At best, our giving the child Jewish ideas to think about, instead of Jewish things to do, is but a fractional part of the work. Students of pedagogy can readily see how much our schools lose because they do not attempt anything which leads to free self-activity on the part of the child. The little hands must feel, the eyes must see, and wherever possible, the ears must hear, that which the child's mind can grasp. The physical agencies of education must be pressed into service as well as the mental and the emotional.

Agreeing with Grossman, she pleads that children should be educated as children and that concrete experiences should be substituted for words. Construction by the child of ceremonial objects and actual participation in ceremonial observances give the child an opportunity to do something to help the family and the community relate better to the Jewish heritage. Also, the experience invests greater meaning into
present-day Jewish life and provides satisfaction based upon a sense of
achievement and the ability to relate itself to the child's native interests. 133

Problems of "control" and "discipline" were mentioned by Rev.
Rudolph Grossman in his report on the help that "The Jewish Religious
School Union of New York," 134 an organization of Reform religious
schools, was giving to its participating schools. Dushkin's editorial
statement in 1917 reflects some insights of the "new education" as they
pertain to this perennial problem. Not attempting to give teachers the
"formulas" they ask for, he analyses the causes of discipline problems. 135
He mentions, for instance, a poor child-teacher relationship, physical
or psychological problems on the part of the student, a poor attitude on
the part of the student toward his studies, an unhealthy learning environment
in regard to facilities, equipment and materials and various methodological
and curricular problems. His emphasis on diagnosis and a professional
attitude toward discipline problems is definitely in the spirit of the
"scientific approach" to education proposed by the early progressivists.
Finally, the need to know the student and have personal contact with him,
to create a receptive mood in the student and minimize or completely
eliminate reprimand, to have a clean and attractive classroom with
attractive bulletin boards, to encourage students to participate in
"classroom management" and in the care of their room are noted in
another early article by Suchoff. 136

Suggestions for methodological and curricular innovation during
this period include Rev. Rudolph Grossman's call for a children's service,
student government, "social service" activities in the school, the intro-
duction of athletics and a school newspaper and the increased use of audio-visual aids.  Dushkin's appreciation of the need for drill to be well-motivated as well as his critique of tests—a test should enable students to view the material learned from a different perspective and to perceive new relationships rather than calling merely for recall of the material—both fortify the view that "drill" and "testing" must be considered as potentially purposeful and meaningful learning experiences.  

Berkson, in his discussion of a system of Jewish education for girls, mentions methodological and curricular departures already itemized as part of the summary of the Bureau of Jewish Education of New York City's contributions to the progressivization of American Jewish education. 

Honor, as alluded to earlier, urged the utilization of a curricular plan for the teaching of Jewish history known as "the cycle method." This new approach demanded methodological variations as the maturing students were to be exposed to generally the same historical periods but in a different manner, with different emphases and with the addition of more complex material as they advanced in their Jewish education. 

The use of play activities, stories, games, etc. was suggested by Deitchman in proposals made for making the teaching of Hebrew reading more enjoyable. The League of Jewish Youth, in an editorial statement, is talked of as an extension of the curriculum, an effort to create a "community of adolescents." The introduction of "object work" and participation in actual religio-ethnic activities are suggestions which definitely have methodological and curricular implications. 

The concept of the "community school center," namely the Central Jewish
Institute of New York, is dealt with in an early article by I. B. Berkson. Though professing recreational and social purposes and being primarily conceived of as a "community house for the neighborhood" with the stated objective of developing a "neighborhood spirit in a big city," the Institute was also considered an educational institution having a well-organized Jewish school as the nucleus of its educational program. In retrospect, the Central Jewish Institute might be considered the earliest significant attempt in Jewish education at the ultimate extension of the curriculum and the utmost amplification of the school's responsibility to the Jewish community in that it actively concerned itself with community organization, informal as well as formal education, all levels of educational need and the social and recreational needs of all age groups and of the family-as-a-whole. More will be said of this experimental venture as Berkson's doctoral dissertation is analyzed.

Barnett Brickner, in discussing changes in teaching in the Reform Sunday school states: "History too is undergoing radical changes both as to content and method. Though the newer standards of Dewey and the influence of the educational sociologists have not as yet penetrated into the almost medieval educational fortress called the Sunday school, there is gradually evolving the need of presenting the work in history problematically. . ." He lauds Eugene Kohn's and Julian Morgenstern's attempts at making the teaching of Bible more relevant and meaningful and commends efforts to include the teaching of customs and ceremonies and current events in the curriculum. He also suggests the correlating of the teaching of customs and ceremonies with the Jewish calendar and with the study of
Hebrew and history. Admitting the problems present in "reaching the
adolescent," he notes the potential of "club-class sessions" and of "social
service experiences" as attempts to expand the curriculum and to adapt
it to the particular needs and interests of the teenager. In reference to
other areas of the curriculum, other writers suggest that the study of
the geography of Palestine replace less relevant subjects 149 and that
both liturgic and secular music be introduced into the educational program
of the Jewish school--in the classroom, in the assembly and through the
school choir. 150

From the evidence cited thus far it is possible to gain some
understanding of the manner in which progressivism began to insinuate
itself into the thinking and practice of American Jewish education and,
also, to acquire a degree of comprehension of some factors contributing to
progressive education's attraction to a rather influential group of American
Jewish educators. Traditional objectives, principles, curricular designs,
content, methods and, even, administrative procedures started to be
modified or, in some cases, transformed. Though the breadth of
progressivism's influence was initially limited, even moreso in practice
than in theory, and though it was actively condemned by some religious
traditionalists and educational perennialists and essentialists, its impact
was a significant one upon the field of Jewish education, especially at
the speculative, philosophical and experimental levels. Not only did
the "new education" offer new roads to follow, but part of the strategy
of those who supported it was to discredit traditional Jewish education--
in some instances, its content; in some, its general and specific objectives;
and in others, its methods. In addition, as the record from 1920 to 1965 will show, varying degrees of acceptance of progressive goals, principles and methods took place in the Jewish educational community. Because criticism of traditional Jewish education (oftentimes partial but in some pronouncements almost total) was put forth in many instances by American-educated or American-born Jewish educators, it symbolized to some an attack upon the fundamentals of traditional Jewish religious life or upon Jewish life as envisaged by those associated with the east-European Haskalah. Also, because it became entangled in the sociological, religious and ideological dilemmas of the period, 1920 to 1965, a period of upheaval and transition in the world and especially for world and American Jewry, it became the focal point of great controversy and was cause for passionate expressions of feeling and belief. Within this context an attempt will be made to assess progressivism's contribution to American Jewish education and to point out how and in which areas it was more readily assimilated, as well as the various permutations of its original position which came into being as it was to become identified by certain Jewish educators and a sector of the American Jewish community as an instrument for adjustment, adaptation and creative survival for American Jewry. It is safe to say, after examination of the evidence, that the concepts and ideas assimilated and the practical innovations attempted prior to 1920 (and in later years by the Bureau of Jewish Education of New York City) laid the groundwork for all that followed.
C. The Initial Phases in the Development of American-Jewish Versions of the Progressive Credo

The years 1918, 1920 and 1924 are noteworthy in that they mark the dates of publication of three major works (refinements of doctoral dissertations) devoted to a detailed study of American Jewish education during the early decades of the twentieth century. Though historical and sociological analysis is presented as necessary background material for that which follows (and is worthy of commendation as a contribution per se), the major significance of these extended presentations is their attempt to place upon firm footing—theoretical as well as practical—the necessity for educational reform and change. The influence of progressive educational thought, innovations and experiments is quite obvious. In a certain sense these three works, each different in emphasis and scope, may be viewed as the most respectable and scholarly treatises that served to present the views developing among a specific segment of American Jewish educators, especially among those associated with the Bureau of Jewish Education of New York City. However, the more important point, from the perspective of this study, is that these works are testimony to the profound influence exerted by the theoreticians of progressive education, especially John Dewey and William H. Kilpatrick, upon the thinking of the American-educated leadership core among Jewish educators in the United States during the early decades of the twentieth century. In the preface or acknowledgements of all three books, the leading proponents of the "embryonic" progressive thrust in general education and Jewish education are mentioned—Kilpatrick and Benderly in
three instances and Dewey and Mordecai M. Kaplan in two. A summary of the ideas expressed—concepts, principles, criticisms and recommendations—by Dushkin, Berkson and Gamoran is all that will be included at present, though the temptation remains for extended analysis and comment since so very few studies of the scope and depth of these exist and since they appeared as progressivism was beginning to shake the very foundations of the traditional approaches to Jewish education in America, indigenous and transplanted, both in theory and in practice.

Alexander Dushkin's philosophical rationale (found in the opening chapter of *Jewish Education in New York City*) used to evaluate existing Jewish educational institutions—the overall educational process, the curriculum, facilities, etc.—consists of the centrality of individual growth and development and the principles of democratic society. Adjustment, both individual and group, to new environmental conditions is to be facilitated by instituting reforms in the Jewish educational process which should reflect changing historical and sociological forces.

Education is defined by Dushkin, within the context of his study, as "meaning transmission, habit formation, enrichment of experience, adjustment, direction of personality." The Jews, having the right to exist as a unique group within American society, should not only have Jewish education enrich the personality of the Jewish child, for without a meaningful Jewish education the Jewish child is "culturally deprived," but should strive to have it contribute to the development of a sense of obligation and responsibility on the part of Jews to Jewish life and to democratic society. In addition, Jewish education, within the context
of American society, can be an instrument for positive Americanization, can be psychologically beneficial to the Jewish child and can aid in having the Jewish ethnic group and other groups make significant contributions to strengthening American life by perpetuating their ethnic culture and by adding the international dimension to American cultural life. ¹⁵⁴

Dushkin's approach to describing the objectives of Jewish education should be noted:

(1) Psychologically, Jewish education is the process of enriching the personality of American Jewish children, by transmitting to them the cultural heritage of the Jews, and by training them to share in the experiences of the Jewish people, both past and present.

(2) Sociologically, Jewish education has two meanings:
   (a) It is the transmission of group consciousness by Jewish fathers to their children, so as to preserve Jewish life;
   (b) It is mental and social adjustment of the American Jewish children, so that by preserving the values of their people, they may be able to live the completest, and, at the same time, the most cooperative lives.

(3) Religiously, Jewish education may be defined as the training of Jewish children to understand and obey the will of God as it has been expressed in the history, literature and laws of their people. ¹⁵⁵

The temper of the remainder of Dushkin's evaluation is one of "reform" and "adaptation" rather than that of "reconstruction" and "radical experimentation." His dedication to the democratic ideal precludes the validity and viability of the Jewish parochial school, especially as it existed at the time of his survey of Jewish schools in New York City. ¹⁵⁶

The "common school" fortified by effective "Jewish supplementary education" seemed to promise the best opportunity for successful integration of the Jew into American society. ¹⁵⁷
As would be expected, Dushkin underscores the need for modern, up-to-date facilities, voicing all the recommendations of the Bureau of Jewish Education and the progressivists in American education. The need for assigning great import to motivation, interest, love and individual differences in solving educational problems—discipline, elimination of students, individual learning problems—is also underlined. In the field of administration and supervision Dushkin establishes the need for parents' associations and parent education, for in-service education of teachers and for modern, cooperative supervisory practices, and for raising standards and improving personnel practices in regard to teachers. Generally speaking, curricular revision must take into consideration the fact that the teaching of the remote past must be supplemented by teaching the immediate past, the living present and the approaching future. Teaching the Jewish present should be implemented by courses in American Jewish history, American Jewish civics (anti-Semitism, "blue laws," immigration policy, etc.) and American Jewish organizations and cultural activities. Other subjects to be included in the revised curriculum should include Palestine, Israel among the nations, Yiddish and Jewish current events. Dushkin echoes most of Benderly's suggestions and refers to many of the changes initiated by the Bureau in the areas of method, differentiated curricula, textbooks, etc. In a concluding chapter Dushkin supports the idea that the Jewish school center (such as the Central Jewish Institute) was potentially the best Jewish educational institution then in existence. "If the Jews of New York were to construct a chain of twenty-five to fifty such school centers throughout the city,
they would be laying the securest foundation for the upbuilding of a healthy, constructive Jewish community life. In this direction lie the most sanguine hopes for American Jewish education. It is important to note that he also supports the validity of the institutional synagogue such as the "The Jewish Center" whose rabbi was at that time Mordecai M. Kaplan.

Isaac B. Berkson's doctoral study, *Theories of Americanization: A Critical Study with Special Reference to the Jewish Group*, is mainly a sociological analysis of the place of the Jewish ethnic group in a democracy and the role and form that "ethnic" or "religious" education should play in preserving the unique identity of a minority group, in this case, the Jews. Philosophically, Berkson exhibits pragmatic tendencies and adheres more closely than does Dushkin to the overall spirit of early, orthodox progressivism. The conception of democracy that he presents has as its basis the fundamentality of science and evolution. He acknowledges the relativity of values and the pluralistic nature of truth. He speaks out strongly against absolutes, even the "absolute God," and shows a predilection for naturalistic religion. Not only does Berkson affirm the uniqueness of the individual, but, being a foe of indoctrination and supporting "self-determination," he also calls for diversity and interdependence. His description of the relatedness of democracy to the fulfillment of human personality indicates the degree of his commitment to progressive ontology, epistemology and axiology.

In the endeavor to develop Personality three conditions must be held in mind:

1. That each unique individual be regarded as
the point of reference for value;
2. That the environment present a diversity of possibilities accessible to all;
3. That there be a consciousness on the part of the individual of his dependence upon the intricate series of natural and social relationships upon which his individuality rests.

Since these three conditions may exist in an infinite variety of degrees, we must realize that democracy is no one definite state but a tendency of development. We can, therefore, speak of democracy only in comparative terms. It is the direction of the movement which will define any condition as democratic or not. Where there is a progressive consideration of uniqueness, a multiplication of diverse possibilities, a growing consciousness of man's interdependence—there does democracy exist.

Based upon this conception, a "community" theory pertaining to the Americanization of ethnic groups is proposed:

Like the "Federation of Nationalities" theory, our position insists on the value of the ethnic group as a permanent asset in American life. The "Community" theory differs from the "Americanization" and "Melting Pot" theories in that it refuses to set up as an ideal such a fusion as will lead to the obliteration of all ethnic differences. Furthermore, it regards a rich social life as necessary for the development and expression of the type of culture represented by the foreign ethnic group. . . The "Community" theory. . . would make the history of the ethnic group, its aesthetic, cultural and religious inheritance, its national self-consciousness the basic factor. . . Culture. . . must be acquired through some educational process, and is not inherited. . . Community of culture possible of demonstration becomes the ground for perpetuation of the group, rather than identity of race. 169

He then goes on to relate the "community" theory to the progressive-pragmatic principles espoused in the introductory chapter.

Its essential merit is that it rejects the doctrine of predestination; it conceives the life of the individual to be formed not in accordance with some preconceived theory but as a result of the interaction of his own nature with the richest environment. In this it satisfies the
basic notion of democracy that the individual must be left free to develop through forces selected by the laws of his own nature, not moulded by factors determined upon by others either in the interest of themselves or in accordance with an assumed good.

So, too, a comparison with our three criteria, the unique individual, enrichment of environment, and dependence upon social institutions, finds the "Community" theory the most adequate solution. It provides in greatest measure for conceiving the individual as creator of and participant in the culture to be evolved, and allows at the same time for a great degree of individual diversification. . . It offers the greatest opportunity for the creation of a free, rich and lofty Personality.

In asserting the right of ethnic groups to perpetuate themselves in a democracy and of the importance of multiple cultural allegiances to keep democratic society healthy, he states that the Jewish school, the communal Jewish school, 171 and the family are the most important institutions for fostering Jewish group life. The synagogue is relegated to the position of "only one agency with a limited sphere of influence." 172 Generally, the parochial school, such as the Catholic school which is under direct clerical control, is not an acceptable vehicle for ethnic education because it segregates children from the mainstream of American society. The Jewish school, whatever its form, should "be in accord with democratic notions." 173 Even though the Jewish day schools of the day were relatively communal in nature and were under lay control, and they met the need for "real educational experience" as opposed to indoctrination in abstract principles, "the parochial school neither in its Catholic, Jewish nor national form would seem to fulfill the demands of the democratic idea that the school system must be representative of the community at large; that to organize it along the lines of one sect
or ethnos would tend to segregation and indoctrination." \(^{174}\)

Berkson's plan for effective ethnic-religious education calls for the establishment of "complementary ethnic and religious schools." The most appropriate institution, in his opinion, is a "community center with a broad educational and recreational program." He continues, "The Central Jewish Institute represents at this writing the furthest development in the attempt to work out a plan in which two elements, preservation of the ethnic culture and adjustment to America, will be duly considered." \(^{175}\) Berkson then concludes his book with a detailed description and analysis of this institution, of which he was formerly executive director. Of the curriculum of the Talmud Torah, the most important part of the Central Jewish Institute, he says, "The curriculum... is partly a response to the wishes of the parents and partly the conception of those in charge of the school. It represents a modification of the traditional course to the needs of the child living in America..." \(^{176}\) Methodological and curricular innovations as suggested by Benderly and others associated with the Bureau are incorporated into the instructional program of the Talmud Torah. In addition, extension education for children and youth, a parents' association, Jewish and American holiday celebrations, club work, provision of a meeting place for Jewish organizations and civic education all have their legitimate place at the Institute. \(^{177}\)

The third dissertation to be considered consists of two volumes. Emanuel Gamoran examines in depth the nature of the traditional curriculum of the Jewish school in its east-European milieu in his initial volume. In the introduction of the second volume of his doctoral study, he focused upon...
the crisis in which American Jewry found itself in the twenties and boldly stated:

The only solution to this distressing state of affairs is provision for an adequate Jewish education in which the important values of the Jewish group will be transmitted to the young. Such a selection of values must be based on an analysis of the needs of Jewry, from the point of view of group survival as well as from the point of view of group adjustment.

The author hopes that the discussion in this volume will stimulate thought and activity on the problem of adjusting the curriculum of the Jewish school to the conditions in America.

"Principles of the Jewish Curriculum in America" was the designation of the second volume of his dissertation entitled Changing Conceptions in Jewish Education. It should be taken note of that Dr. Gamoran dedicated this latter section "to my teacher, Mordecai M. Kaplan, a pioneer in the revaluation of Jewish values."

At the outset, Gamoran discusses the nature of democracy, the relationship of the individual to democratic society, the socialization process and the role of education in this process. All of these interrelated subjects are explored within the context of the premises of John Dewey who is amply quoted and referred to throughout the presentation.

Gamoran concludes that education, socialization and life, if not one and the same, at least overlap and are very much interconnected. Referring to the aim of Jewish education in America, he states,

It may be said that if the aim of general education is gradually to socialize the child up to and including the world community, the aim of Jewish education is to socialize the child into the largest Jewish community. Thus, from the point of view of America, Jewish education may be conceived as an integral part of the socialization process which it intends all its children
to go through, while from the Jewish point of view this step is in itself a socialization the quality of which is well known and has been tested by centuries.

Gamoran specifies that the child must be socialized into the family and then into the religio-ethnic group prior to his socialization into the world Jewish community, and the author underlines the importance of the quality of this socialization.

Gamoran then proceeds to lay the groundwork for the reconstruction of the traditional curriculum of the Jewish school with the following remarks:

These two thoughts, that the school curriculum should be a reflection of life and that the school should improve life and idealize it, are being accepted more and more widely in our educational theory. But while theoretically accepted in many quarters, this view is far from being carried out in practice. In fact, so tremendous is the gap between educational theory and practice that very often undeserved reflections are cast upon a well deserving educational theory which has really never been applied.

Quoting John Dewey freely, he criticizes the static, literary nature of the traditional curriculum. He then discusses the place of permanence and change, pointing to the need for relatively permanent values within a dynamic society. However, for the Jewish group to survive in a dynamic society, Judaism must also be dynamic; it must reflect the acceptance of change. The adjustment of the Jew to the situation in which he finds himself must allow for the continuation of his individuality and must prohibit self-effacement. Gamoran then proposes group preservation, adjustment to modernism and adjustment to democracy (American society) as the criteria to be utilized in order to select the subjects (and how they
should be presented) for the reconstructed curriculum. He discusses different types of Jewish values—survival and humanistic—in the light of the above criteria and finally evaluates the subjects in the traditional curriculum based upon this subjective analysis of values.

Gamoran calls for most of the reforms and curricular changes suggested by Dushkin, Berkson, Benderly and others, but his systematic development of a rationale for these departures is his major contribution. He suggests the inclusion of such subjects as "present-day Jewish problems," "reading Judaica," "Jewish contributions to civilization," "Jewish cultural ideals as reflected in literature and life," in addition to the new subjects proposed by others and noted previously. He ends his exposition of possible adjustments of the curriculum by alluding to some practical applications for extension education and the Sunday School. He advocates "a curriculum of values organized into activities in which children can engage" but as a compromise accepts the validity of extra-curricular activities "as an excellent means of making subjects of study real and vital in the lives of the children." He quotes Dewey—"The school must itself be a community life in all which that implies... In place of a school set apart from life as a place for learning lessons, we have a miniature social group in which study and growth are incidents of present shared experience," and then portrays how this can become a reality in the Jewish school. He finally brings the discussion to a close with the following words: "In preparing for these celebrations the children will not receive education which prepares them for Jewish life. They will be living Jewish life in the school, and that is the best preparation for further living."
Though philosophically not as radical as Berkson, Gamoran's position is definitely ideologically radical in that he seems to identify with the developing approach of Reconstructionism, and his position is educationally forward-looking as evidenced by his desire to totally redesign the curriculum of the Jewish school. It seems that Dewey's and Kaplan's influence is more pronounced in the case of Gamoran than with either Berkson or Dushkin. However, all the treatises have much in common. They express a need to take into account the challenges to Jewish group survival that the new dynamic, democratic environment in the United States presented. They approach the problem sociologically, not theologically, though the importance of the religious element in Jewish ethnic group-life is affirmed. A conception of the aim of general education and the need to adjust or reconstruct the Jewish educational program so that it is more consistent with that aim is shared by them, notwithstanding differences of degree and emphasis in reference to their recommendations, many of which are variations of the "progressive credo" or flow from some of its premises and from its basic worldview.

The transformation in the educational thinking of a significant group of Jewish educators brought on by responses to the challenge of progressivism, as indicated by the statements and events already cited, gained momentum in the 1920's. Many of the criticisms of traditional Jewish education by the so-called "modernists" and recommendations for change and reform were repeated. No area of the educational process remained untouched and sacrosanct. It is not surprising that in the twenties various forms of resistance to the inroads of progressivism into
the arena of Jewish education began to become manifest. Change and reform were suspect and unwanted by many professional educators, religious leaders and laymen. It might be argued that this nascent hostility is the most valid evidence that progressively-oriented Jewish educators were beginning to exert at least a modicum of influence upon the profession and the process, even if this influence had not made itself felt in each and every community, school and classroom.

Since the Jewish Teachers' Association \(^1\) and those who sympathized with it at the Bureau of Jewish Education of New York City and otherwise came under attack during this period by the more extreme wing of the Hebraic-Nationalist ideological faction \(^2\) as well as by religious traditionalists, it is imperative that some pertinent ideas and principles incorporated into the JTA platform (1923) be examined. Noting that the platform is not a catechism and that within the association "there are wide divergences of opinion particularly in religious and in Hebraistic leanings," the authors of the platform, in order to implement the goals of the Association, say of the study and the use of Hebrew:

The Jewish Teachers' Association believes in thorough instruction in the Hebrew language for its historic and religious associations and also as a language of intercommunication among international Jewry.

The Hebrew language is the most valuable medium for conveying all the Jewish ideals that will make for the best Jewish life. Whenever those to be taught have attained such a fluency in Hebrew that it is for them a language of free communication, all subjects of study should be taught only in Hebrew.

But until such a time as Hebrew has become to the learner a medium which he can fully employ, thought values must be conveyed to him in his vernacular due to the limited period allowed for a Jewish education. Training in Jewish ideas and ideals to the extent that they are adapted to the
understanding of the learner, cannot be deferred or postponed till he shall have acquired skill in the use of the Hebrew language.

Though affirming the centrality of the "institutional synagogue" and the validity of traditional Judaism "as the only Jewish religious expression in keeping historically with the past," it allows for "academic freedom" in the area of teaching the carrying out of religious observances.

It believes in teaching descriptively and sympathetically Jewish ceremonial observances; but it reserves to the individual teacher, the freedom to teach or to refrain from teaching the conduct which is to follow. However, a positive attitude must be taken toward ceremonies that are of national historical significance.

In the same spirit of accommodation, extension education is looked upon as a necessary compromise with the environment.

The progressive bias of the organization comes through clearly in the statement of its final two principles.

The J. T. A. believes that the school does not function which does not aspire to Jewish play as well as to Jewish study. It therefore recognizes extra-curricular activities as an integral part of the school's work.

The Jewish school must be a democratic, cooperative organization both in the relations of the teaching and the supervising staff and in the relations of teacher and pupil.

In short, and at the expense of possible "over-interpretation,”

(1) a pragmatic and functional approach to the teaching of the Hebrew language with a relatively greater emphasis given to the need to present relevant information, ideas and principles, (2) a suspicion of teaching which might lead to uncritical indoctrination of religious practice, (3) the necessity for pleasurable and meaningful learning experience, (4) the
creation of a democratic environment in the Jewish school—seem to have been put forth as fundamental principles which the organization championed. The overall character of the Association as it saw itself within the context of Jewish educational endeavor in the United States is stated forthrightly in an editorial in the same issue of The Jewish Teacher:

The Jewish Teachers' Association wishes to unite those Jewish teachers who have been trained in American public schools and universities. It wishes to experiment in the field of Jewish education, especially in curriculum making and in methods of teaching. We must adjust our curricula and our methods to a changed environment. This can only be done by constant experimentation and discussion. To do this we must have Hebrew schools taught by teachers trained and brought up in America. The Jewish Teachers' Association differs from other groups of teachers not only in its personnel, but in its point of view. The destiny of Jewish education rests in our hands, and we are determined not to shirk our responsibility, or to ignore the issues involved.

Thus, battle lines seemed to have been drawn for a struggle with (a) the radical Hebraists, (b) the religious traditionalists (Orthodox and Conservative), (c) those who stood against change and reform of Jewish education in America.

As might be expected and as was the case among progressivists in general American education, expressions of agreement with progressive principles and innovations were of varying magnitude and took many forms during the twenties. Those Jewish educators who felt impelled to express themselves concerning issues in the realm of the philosophy of education dealt with a variety of issues. One major principle that was indorsed by many was the need to view Jewish education as an instrumentality for
creation of a democratic environment in the Jewish school——seem to have been put forth as fundamental principles which the organization championed. The overall character of the Association as it saw itself within the context of Jewish educational endeavor in the United States is stated forthrightly in an editorial in the same issue of The Jewish Teacher:

The Jewish Teachers' Association wishes to unite those Jewish teachers who have been trained in American public schools and universities. It wishes to experiment in the field of Jewish education, especially in curriculum making and in methods of teaching. We must adjust our curricula and our methods to a changed environment. This can only be done by constant experimentation and discussion. To do this we must have Hebrew schools taught by teachers trained and brought up in America. The Jewish Teachers' Association differs from other groups of teachers not only in its personnel, but in its point of view. The destiny of Jewish education rests in our hands, and we are determined not to shirk our responsibility, or to ignore the issues involved.

Thus, battlelines seemed to have been drawn for a struggle with (a) the radical Hebraists, (b) the religious traditionalists (Orthodox and Conservative), (c) those who stood against change and reform of Jewish education in America.

As might be expected and as was the case among progressivists in general American education, expressions of agreement with progressive principles and innovations were of varying magnitude and took many forms during the twenties. Those Jewish educators who felt impelled to express themselves concerning issues in the realm of the philosophy of education dealt with a variety of issues. One major principle that was indorsed by many was the need to view Jewish education as an instrumentality for
Though this concept had roots in traditional Jewish education, it was a cardinal principle of the Dewey-Kilpatrick school as it attempted to reorient thinking concerning goals and objectives of general education. Education as a process of adjustment and as a process leading to personality enrichment and self-fulfillment also received wide attention. Another theme that writers dwelled upon was that education is not just a matter of transmission, the stating of abstract principles or the learning of subject-matter. It is life itself, experience, a process in which the learner's needs modified by the environment must be met. The importance of a healthy social atmosphere and group process for assuring positive learning experiences in a democratic environment was also stressed. On the other hand, there were only passing references at this time to the need for inquiry and to the need to help students arrive at decisions based upon the critical presentation of evidence. In the main, the deeper, philosophical implications of the progressive position were not discussed (as was the case to a degree in the treatises previously analyzed), though allusions to the centrality of the child, to the whole child, and to the fundamentality of democracy and its relationship to individual growth can be found. What is most impressive is the recurring reference by the various spokesmen to the criticisms, ideas and written works of Dewey and his followers. Of interest is the fact that Berkson, the most radical of the Jewish progressivists thus far in the philosophical sense, contributed in 1927 to Sheviley Hahinuch, a Hebrew educational periodical of growing stature, two articles entitled, "John Dewey's Conceptions and an Evaluation of Jewish Education in
America in Light of These Conceptions. 200

Keeping in mind the criticism of the traditional curriculum that had already found its way into the nascent American Jewish educational literature, we should not be surprised that this theme should be continued by many a progressively-oriented Jewish educator. Gamoran, as one of his first tasks as director of the Department of Synagogue and School Extension (later the Joint Commission on Jewish Education) sponsored by the Reform movement, criticized existing curricular designs utilized in Reform religious schools. Commenting on the failure to teach current events in the early grades, he states: "In fact, because current events deals usually with living issues and with living people, they offer an opportunity for concrete instruction in contrast to most of the subjects in the Jewish school which are on the whole very abstract." 201 He was also highly critical of the lack of an organized program of social service and extra-curricular activities. 202 In another essay, Gamoran establishes the place of the "project method" in the teaching of customs and ceremonies. 203 One of Gamoran's important early contributions to Reform Jewish education was the creation of a revised curriculum (or better, course of study) which was adopted in March, 1924.

Affirming the place of "experiences" in the curriculum of the Jewish school, Dushkin raises the following issues: "We undoubtedly could and should accept the idea of experience and teach through situations. But "how broad should be the unit of the Jewish curriculum, and how wide the range of our experience? Shall we take all of life as the range of the curriculum?" He sees the curriculum of necessity being of a limited
nature. "Israel forms the unit, the range of our teaching, and Israel is not to be interpreted to mean only the Torah, but all of the phases of Jewish life... the people of Israel, the life of Israel, the land of Israel, and the language of Israel..." The recorded reactions to Dushkin's paper are interesting:

In the discussion that followed the most serious objection to Dr. Dushkin's plan was that it did not unify the child's life. It distinguished the Jew from the American by presenting only the "Jew-side" of life and made no provision for adjustment to environment. Other speakers observed that if the arts will be subordinate in the school, they will not exist in Jewish life; that Hebrew, if it is to be taught at all, should be taught "as a power in life"; that truths should be taught without any coloring at all--Jewish or otherwise, and that economic problems of the day should be stressed. One even maintained that we had no justification for perpetuating Jewish traditions.

Dr. Dushkin, in summarizing the discussion, maintained that his plan, while emphasizing the Jewish phase of life, did not preclude the teaching of adjustment. (It would appear that adjustment will be easier when the Jewish outlook will be appreciated by the child. He will know what to adjust.) Music, drama, art, and science would not be neglected because Israel is concerned with them, and to understand Israel they would be necessary.

Discussing a viable curriculum for "JTA schools" Jacob Golub makes the following assumptions:

We should, therefore, translate for the child the life of his community. Charity, sobriety, these are the living facts that can be taught. Not that charity is in the Bible, but that the child sees it in his life, is important for him. He must be led to live with the community of to-day... We should not set up the present Jewish home as the ultimate ideal, for we want Jewish life to be dynamic. But the child must first assimilate the static; then he can be taught to recognize the dynamic forces.

Golub envisages devoting fifty percent of the time the child spends in the Jewish school to teaching "Ivre" and "Chumash" in order to satisfy parents
(the static). The remainder of time should be dedicated to "dynamic study, for teaching change and growth." He specifies a critical study of Bible, history, and of Palestine as elements in this facet of the curriculum.

"The great problem is to decrease the number of subjects, and through those left, to embody what we want to teach. We can turn to the old Curriculum, and make it serve our own aims." 207

It is not surprising that the progressively-stimulated curricular conceptions of "projects," "broad fields," "units," and "experiences" were becoming more and more part of the vocabulary of many Jewish educators during the twenties. Gordon, in two articles in Sheviley Hahinuch 208 traces the development of the project method--its characteristics and advantages--and results of experiments with it in general education. He then explores its use in the Jewish school in the area of teaching holiday and festival observances. Its major objective is "to give to Jewish children, wherever they are, the necessary understandings and to implant in their hearts the desired attitudes towards the holidays of Israel and its festivals." 209 He compares the fear of the introduction of this new approach to the opposition to the "natural method" of teaching Hebrew existing in certain circles. Articles by Honor 210 and Markowitz 211 also support the introduction of the project method as a potential remedy for the sterility of the subject-centered, literary curriculum. Honor states:

On the other hand, genuine projects are gradually being introduced into the curriculum of the Jewish school, with the hope that in time a project curriculum will evolve which will make provision for the child's learning through experience and at the same time make possible the
accomplishment of the aims of the Jewish school. 212

As has been suggested already, the effort to expand the curriculum by means of adding new subjects such as current events 213 and creative writing 214 and by emphasizing the importance of extra-curricular activities 215 was sanctioned as an expression of the need to "modernize" Jewish education. The establishment of a Jewish kindergarten, especially of a type similar to Pratt's Play School 216 and the kindergarten at Columbia University, was justified as a broadening of the curriculum. 217 Suggestions for differing types of curricular plans to meet differential student needs and for general curricular revision were a continuation of the impetus in this direction initiated in previous years.

From the strictly methodological standpoint, the popularization of the project method in teaching current events, customs and ceremonies and Jewish history was the foremost contribution to "the theory of Jewish educational method" during this period. Those methods and techniques which brought into play group spirit and social interaction such as discussions, group decision-making and division of labor also gained support. 218 The utilization of the arts--drama, 219 art and arts and crafts, 220 music, --and of games (as a form of constructive activity), 222 of visual aids and trips, 223 of diaries and class and school newspapers, 224 and of assemblies, 221 were recommended by many based upon the successful experiences with them and the proven usefulness of these methods in general education.

The methodological and curricular innovations called for and just noted were based upon certain philosophical and psychological premises.

Since the major philosophical principles related to progressivism in
education which were adopted by Jewish educators cited have been stated already, it remains to give indication of the more important psychological principles discussed by various writers. Student needs, individual differences, interest and effort, creativity, purposive learning, active (individual and group) learning, self-discipline and inner controls all were alluded to many times as educational problems, were analyzed, and solutions were offered. It is not a source of wonder that a scientific knowledge and analysis of the inner workings of the American Jewish child was called for, either directly or by implication, as a necessary step in formulating a sound approach to fostering a realistic and meaningful program of Jewish education. Epstein stated: "Our American Jewish school will not achieve its goal and will never serve as an educational and social center for our children as long as we do not know how to create an environment appropriate to their yearnings, as long as we do not understand what animates them and we do not focus upon their unique needs, as long as we do not investigate their inner world and we do not discover their basic characteristics in order to find support for our educational objectives." Related to all these affirmations is the increasing sensitivity in the literature to the problem of motivation—the need to utilize it and, in many cases, to create it. Generally speaking, the discussions of the project method may be pointed to as witness to the sincere attempt to incorporate into the Jewish educational process many of the psychological principles related to or emanating from the progressive point of view. Especially sophisticated were Gamoran's exposition and analysis found in the 1926 edition of the CCAR Yearbook and Gordon's series of articles in Sheviley Hahinuch.
Comparatively little seems to have been written during this period concerning administration and supervision which might be construed as exhibiting progressive influence. However, a few contributions are noteworthy. The importance of parent education as a vital part of the educational process is brought out by Kaplan. \(^{229}\) Achievement testing as well as the training of educational personnel is discussed in an annual report on the work of The Commission on Jewish Education in 1929. \(^{230}\) In another instance, individual and class self-evaluation is suggested as a valid alternative to competitive grading. \(^{231}\) An interesting monograph entitled *Teacher-Training for Jewish Schools*, \(^{232}\) written by Gamoran, was published by the Department of Synagogue and School Extension of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations in 1924. The rationale and program for teacher education proposed by Gamoran is replete with references to progressive premises and principles in the areas of child-learning and teacher-development. The suggested bibliography in the area of education and pedagogy is to a large extent progressively-oriented, works by Dewey, Kilpatrick, Thorndike, Berkson, Dushkin, and Honor being highly visible. Jewish education as a process of adjustment and the use of the project method in the Jewish school are major subjects in a course in education for beginners. \(^{233}\) The concepts of practice teaching and observation of a critical-constructive nature, of the utilization of experimental schools (both in Jewish and general education), teacher growth and in-service training are amplified upon. \(^{234}\) On the subject of supervision, Gamoran states:
The first most important fact to remember is that supervision is not inspection. . . The function of the supervisor is to help, to offer as far as possible constructive suggestions, to guide the teacher and to provide for his growth. The general attitude that the principal will have toward his teachers will soon be reflected in the attitude which the teachers will have toward him. . . To succeed in obtaining the friendship of the teachers to the extent of making them feel that they are co-workers with the principal, that together they are attempting to solve some of the very difficult problems connected with Jewish education, is the task of the rabbi or principal who would be successful. This can be attained best through the development of a scientific attitude to the whole problem of Jewish education, through the maintenance of an open mind--the willingness to suspend judgment until all the facts of a situation have been ascertained. 235

During this period most instances of identification with aspects of the progressive credo did not explicitly mention at which points they differed from it. Nonetheless, a few examples of progressively-committed educators who took exception to some of the popular conceptions (and misconceptions) do exist. In an article concerning the views of John Dewey and Jewish education, 236 Isaac Berkson points out that the needs and demands of society to perpetuate itself must be considered in constructing the curriculum. From this assumption, which might be challenged for its arbitrary nature by many a progressivist, Berkson reached the conclusion that there is definite justification for a book-centered education as far as the Jewish religio-ethnic group is concerned. Though acknowledging that Dewey's approach to education was valid for American society in general, Berkson reasoned that, if the Jewish community goes to extremes in giving priority to principles such as "the growing student" and "the developing society," then "we may cause our own extinction." Nevertheless, Berkson rejects the literary-nationalist educational formula as being too
narrow and rigid. Jewish education, in modern American society, must help compensate for the lack of an authentic Jewish environment by transforming itself into a process of participation in Jewish societal life.

However, a literary education for a gifted minority is an absolute essential for Jewish survival. Berkson concludes that "any discussion of Jewish education that does not include as a fundamental principle a need to perpetuate the knowledge of classical Hebrew literature in the original is neither healthy nor complete. . ." 237

Another leading figure who, while generally agreeing with the principles of progressive education, took exception to the JTA (Jewish Teachers' Association) version of progressivism as enunciated in its platform 238 was Mordecai M. Kaplan. He asked the question: "Is the Jewish school a religious school or not?" He then went on to criticize the JTA platform for minimizing the importance of the spiritual and ethical element in its approach to Jewish education. 239 Other critics of the platform stressed the need to teach as much of the curriculum in Hebrew as possible with special emphasis on the study of the Bible in the original and the need to teach actual religious observances, not only "an appreciation of them." 240

As has been indicated earlier, negative reaction to the intrusion of progressivism into the realm of traditional Jewish education came mainly from two directions. The Hebraists—of the nationalist-Zionist variety, of the religionist faction, and of various combinations of each—had serious misgivings about a total "progressive reconstruction" of Jewish education similar to Berkson, although the group-as-a-whole was
in the main committed to many progressive principles and innovations. Moses Feinstein cannot suppress his fear that the study of Hebrew literature might suffer at the expense of celebrations, songs, prayers, projects, etc. 241 Frishberg, in the Hebrew periodical Hadoar, points out that the "needs" of the students are of secondary importance as compared to the survival need to teach Torah and the Hebrew language. 242 Touroff goes further as he castigates the New York Bureau of Jewish Education. He condemns the "practical educators" that do not feel that a serious study of the Hebrew language and of the sources in the original is absolutely necessary for a quality Jewish education. He makes a plea for the formation of an intensive Hebrew high school to produce readers of Hebrew and asks the "practical educators" if they are with "us" or against "us." 243

Pinchus Churgin took the perennialist position in his opposition to the "new education." He stated adamantly that Jewish educators cannot accept the goals and objectives of general education which talk in terms of the "natural development and growth of the child." Jewish education is unique and different. It must induct the Jewish child into the fullness and totality of Jewish life. Therefore, since Jewish survival means Jewish survival wherever Jews shall live, there can be no such thing as "American Jewish education." Though local conditions must be taken into consideration, these conditions cannot be allowed to affect negatively the teaching of the national content of Jewish education. Facts, the knowledge of Torah, Judaism and the Jewish past are far more important than a "model Seder" or a "class Shabbat observance." Habituation to the practices which are so basic to the Jewish way of life can only occur
It remained for Simon Ginzburg, a spokesman for the militant Hebraist-nationalists, to take the most extreme position. He criticized the "new education" and "new psychological and sociological out-looks" in no uncertain terms, administering a verbal beating to the teachers in the Jewish Teachers' Association and to the young principals and administrators associated with the Bureau of Jewish Education for being influenced by these new approaches. His tirade against "minimalism" did not spare Touroff and his "kindergartens" nor Scharfstein and Whiteman who dared to state that Jewish education, unsullied by the "new education," was not eminently successful.

There seems to exist evidence also, that elements in the Conservative movement, generally predisposed toward tradition and traditional Jewish education, made an early attempt to assimilate some of the insights and new approaches of progressive education but found it quite difficult to accept certain other premises and departures of the "new American Jewish education" as it was evolving in the twenties.

A Curriculum for Jewish Religious Schools, prepared by Rabbi Alter F. Landesman, was published in 1922 by the Education Committee of the United Synagogue of America. Ideologically traditional and educationally essentialist, Landesman incorporated at various points some suggestions which coincided with reforms proposed by the progressivists in general education and with some innovations put forth by the so-called "modernists" in Jewish education. The reader is referred to works by Dewey, Thorndike, Dushkin, Berkson, Eugene Kohn, Honor, Barnett Brickner, Hajnalka
Langer, Louis Grossman, etc., and the influence of Mordecai M. Kaplan and the Bureau of Jewish Education of New York City is quite evident and acknowledged by the author of the book. Many psychological principles and methodological techniques associated with progressivism are incorporated in the abundance of suggestions given to teachers. The project method for teaching history; concretization of learning through the use of drama and the arts, audio-visual aids and, in certain instances, real experiences; self-activity and student activities; developmental levels; motivation and interest; the "natural method" of Hebrew instruction; meeting individual needs; correlation of subjects; education as adjustment to the environment and not to abstract principles; modern hygienic facilities and equipment—all are important aspects of the Jewish educational process according to Landesman. The real strength of the curricular design is not in its originality (as Landesman readily admits) but rather in its statement of general and specific aims for each subject in each grade and for the four different types of educational programs to which it addresses itself—intensive (five day-a-week), three day-a-week, two year and Sunday school. It provides suggested time allotments for each subject per grade per program, offers an abundance of advice in the area of methodology and provides a general and specific bibliography for teachers and lists of possible texts for student-use. The curriculum, presenting specific as well as general objectives and principles of Jewish religious education from the Conservative viewpoint, is a good example of the "enlightened essentialism" proposed by some leaders for Conservative congregational schools during the twenties.
It should be remembered that at this time the Conservative movement was in the stage of infancy and had as yet no strong coordinating group for developing relevant and meaningful programs for Jewish education on a national level. Nonetheless, it is interesting to note that during this period Mordecai M. Kaplan, with the assistance of Leo H. Honor, was directing the Teachers Institute of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America and was working closely with the Bureau of Jewish Education of New York City and the Jewish Teachers' Association. Kaplan, to a significant degree, was inclined to accept the need to "progressivize" Jewish education. However, Charles I. Hoffman's reaction to Berkson's dissertation, when placed within the perspective of the ideological flux characterizing the Conservative movement during the years following the founding of the United Synagogue by Schechter, tends to substantiate the existence of an eclectic philosophy of Jewish life called attention to in a prior chapter, a stance that is extremely significant in understanding the role and the limits of progressivism in the development of Conservative Jewish education.

Hoffman stated in 1921:

If we could get rid of the elaborate and sophomoric substratum of philosophy, and concentrate upon the specific recommendations for the development of Jewish education in America, there would be more likelihood of agreement and a greater usefulness to the work that is presented for our consideration. It is this elaborate foundation that is repellent, with its worship of man; its essential exaltation of self-indulgence; its apparent repudiation and depreciation of religion, although one suspects that this appearance is largely artificial and unreal. . . The work might be accepted as a guide were it not for its studied depreciation of religion in general and Judaism in particular. . .

In another article in The United Synagogue Recorder (1928),
Rabbi A. M. Hershman discussed the purposes of Jewish education which, in general, seemed to be to achieve the purposes of the synagogue, the Jewish school being subservient to the synagogue, and to prepare the child for participation in synagogue life. Consistent with this narrow objective is the assertion that the transmission of the religious heritage is of paramount importance. This heritage is obvious and uncomplicated——Torah, Avodah and Gemilut Hasidim. 248

Although the material so far presented is far from exhaustive of every utterance or every shade or nuance of opinion, it serves to portray the positions of the various groupings of the "Jewish progressive educators" as well as the positions of some members of the opposition who either directly or indirectly chose to address themselves to the "danger on the left." As will now become apparent through selected documentation, progressive influences became stronger in the thirties, and attitudes within the progressively-oriented camp as well as within the camp of the articulate opposition began to become crystallized and, in some cases, increasingly rigid and unyielding. On the other hand, almost all segments of the Jewish educational community, even while it was becoming increasingly fragmented into diverse, and in some cases, hostile ideological factions, began to exhibit at one level or another of its educational apparatus (or at least in some statements made by spokesmen) some degree of influence attributable to the insights spawned by the "new education."
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Chapter VI

Maturation and Popularization As Well As Questioning of and Resistance to Progressivism in Jewish Education (1929-1940)

A. Philosophy of Education

Progressivism in education was no longer "new" in the thirties, neither in the field of general education nor, on the battlefields of theory at least, in Jewish education. Though Cremin points out that progressivism in general education reached the peak of its popularity in the mid- and late thirties, he also presents evidence that, as a philosophy of education and as a movement, it was losing at this very same time its dynamism and was commencing to decline in respect to its relevancy and its following. The situation was somewhat different in the domain of Jewish education. Although forces were at work which during the thirties began to exact their toll upon the progressive approach to Jewish education, especially in the realms of speculation, theory and criticism, there are indications, from the evidence available, that progressive innovations, experiments and influences were becoming more widespread in the classrooms of a number of Jewish schools.

Jewish Education magazine, first published in 1929, was to become the official digest of the English-speaking members of the profession of American Jewish education in its totality, replacing and expanding upon The Jewish Teacher. However, in its initial years, it seems to have attracted in the main writers who exhibited a definite progressive or social reconstructionist orientation. In fact, at a first, superficial glance, one might
be led to the conclusion, based upon an examination of the articles published during the thirties, that progressivism and the many variations of the progressive credo existing among Jewish educators ruled the day for almost the entire period. This portrayal, reflecting a process of natural selection prejudicial to progressivism which resulted from the basic character of the periodical and its editorial board in its initial years and representing the view of leaders of American Jewish education who had been "reborn" as they had come into contact with the life-giving spirit of early progressivism, might not be quite accurate. In examining the various ideas related to the sphere of the philosophy of Jewish education, it must be noted that the problems of the times are mirrored in many statements and that indications of then-existing, as well as future, controversy are voiced openly or implied indirectly. As has already been documented, variations of degree of identification as well as a selection of principles to be emphasized took place in the twenties on the part of those who affirmed the positive value of the "new education" as a "corrective" to traditional Jewish education. It remained for the thirties, however, to be the period during which (a) positions were better articulated, (b) nuances and shadings related to ideological considerations became more widespread and (c) a critical approach to principles and priorities (and their important implications) took on more significance.

Before proceeding, a word of caution must be added. Categorization of an individual's thinking based upon analysis of statements vis à vis progressivism in Jewish education will indubitably do an injustice and will not be completely accurate. Nonetheless,
in the quest for an understanding of the maturation of progressive thinking in Jewish educational circles and the defectors from the ranks, of greater or lesser consequence, no alternative remains other than to make just such an attempt. Indeed, the historians of American progressive education are forced to make varying distinctions among American progressive educators because the movement was marked from the very beginning by a pluralistic, frequently contradictory, character. The reader will search these pages in vain for any capsule definition of progressive education. None exists, and none ever will; for throughout its history progressive education meant different things to different people, and these differences were only compounded by the remarkable diversity of American education.

The counterpart of this phenomenon in Jewish education is further complicated by the increased ideological and sociological ferment which has been prevalent during the last thirty-five years in the American Jewish community.

1. General Progressivism

It would seem that it is not required at this juncture to examine in detail the expressions of agreement, echoed during the thirties, with many of the major pillars of the progressive philosophy of education which had been affirmed previously by a number of Jewish educators. In passing, however, note should be made that some of the more important objectives re-emphasized during this period were those of (1) Jewish education as a vehicle for character education, (2) Jewish education as the provision of experiences in Jewish and democratic living, not only as a process for the transmission of Jewish knowledge and the Jewish heritage, (3) Jewish education as inquiry and the search for truth in contradistinction to Jewish education as
propaganda,⁶ (4) the need to foster democratic ideals and to encourage "experimentalism,"⁷ (5) the need to allow for making, doing and experiencing creatively as a unique individual,⁸ (6) Jewish education as a continual process of experimentation in the area of method and curriculum.⁹

Of interest also is evidence of the increasing assimilation of progressive thinking into the philosophy of education of American liberal religious movements (other than Judaism),¹⁰ as well as the growing recognition by some leading figures in American education of the importance of religious-moral values as a counterforce against the relativity and skepticism bred by an uncritical worship of science.¹¹ Kilpatrick, thus, asserts:

"What we must do is to release again for our attention the fact that education should teach us to pursue our highest ideals in the belief that we have a right to these ideals, and that there is nothing in the nature of the universe to interfere with them except our own failure to study and pursue them."¹² The debt that the so-called "modern" Jewish educators owed to the leaders of general progressive education, especially to the faculty of Teachers College, was explicitly expressed in a variety of contexts during the decade. Shiffman made a special point to indicate his recognition of the value of experience in an analysis of trends in Jewish education in America.¹³ In honoring Kilpatrick in 1937, Chipkin said: "You have always treated with high and sincere respect the peculiarly Jewish cultural efforts of Jewish groups in this country... You have helped us to discover sources of self-respect and social idealism in our historic background and cultural heritage...and helped us..."
transform them into modern, scientific, American forms.*14 In his essay, "Twenty-Five Years of Jewish Education in the United States," Chipkin commented: "The place of Teachers College, Columbia University, in the profession of American Jewish education is unique. For the man in the profession it is difficult to think of American Jewish education without reference to that institution and its leading personalities—Dewey, Kilpatrick ..."15 After an evaluation of the relevance of Dewey’s thinking to Jewish education in America found in an essay entitled "John Dewey and Jewish Education," Samuel Blumenfield concluded:

In his more recent writings, Dewey refers to ethics as a basic principle in education and to faith as a factor in social expression. In these writings he comes closer to traditional values in Jewish culture which are still cherished in Jewish education. But whatever the fate of some of Dewey’s views and beliefs, his will remain an abiding contribution to the progress of education.

By his recognition of the value of experience, his emphasis upon the centrality of the child in school, and his vision of education for freedom of the individual and the group, Dewey has also made an indelible imprint upon the fortunes of Jewish education in America.16

2. Hebraic-Nationalism

As has been indicated earlier, many interpretations or variants of general progressivism adapted to the needs of Jewish education became more readily identifiable and distinguishable in the thirties. One such approach came forth from among those associated with the ideological position known as "Hebraic-nationalism." Frishberg pointed out that the program of Jewish schools should meet the needs of the time and should have a connection with Jewish life as it really exists in America.
He suggested that the instructional program be unified around "national institutions." It should consist of the study of the Hebrew language and of the Hebraic sources in the original, as well as of extra-curricular activities emphasizing religion and community. Samuel Dinin, admitting that Jewish life had become secularized and humanized, stated that the basic integrating factor in the school should be nationalism and that the most important goal of Jewish education should be integrating the child into the Jewish community.

The need to give a position of primacy to the teaching of the Hebrew language and consequent study of the original sources within the overall "progressive-nationalist" approach is forcefully stated by William Chomsky:

"The New School, in order to justify and secure its existence, must meet the challenge of modern educational principles and must face the impact of the newer educational tendencies. It must recommend itself primarily to the child... It must base itself on children's needs and natural interests, as well as on the needs and interests of the environment... Education must grow out of the desires, interests, needs and purposes of the child—a basic tenet in modern pedagogy... To be sure, we feel that Hebrew is an essential need for our group survival... But we cannot with impunity impose our adult-made standards and needs upon the child and force him into a rigid mold of prescribed and inhibited self-expression.

Emphasizing the centrality of "Palestine," the Hebrew language, and the created socio-cultural needs of the Jewish child, Chomsky adds:

"In brief, Jewish education should teem with experiencing genuine Jewish living. In order to become socialized into the new environment the child can be made to experience a real urge and purpose to learn the new language, to acquire the new habits of life and to cultivate desired attitudes..."
"Specific practice" in reading Hebrew for comprehension, and thought-centered experiences in the Hebrew language are absolute necessities. A critical attitude toward an imposed, doctrinaire approach to teaching religious ideas and practices was also prevalent among many Jewish progressivists. As an example, Chomsky pointed out: "We learn to be religious or good not by cold-blooded understanding or memorizing of doctrines or precepts, nor even by doing perfunctorily the good or religious deed, but by practicing the emotional response accompanying these deeds, since ethical and religious conduct draw their sustenance from the emotional concommitant, the way one feels about them.

A. Crinson, after affirming progressive principles of education and the Hebraic-nationalist direction that the process should take, stated: "Subject-matter would be determined not by the religious necessity of studying divine texts but by the needs and wants of those to be educated. We teach customs and ceremonies and folkways dogmatically—as sacred and immutable. We teach our literature as texts of revelation. We teach the prayer book and through it religion in the same way. The method of religion is often diametrically opposed to the scientific method of openmindedness and experimentalism with which we should like to approach the teaching of subject-matter in the Jewish school. The process of life and education cannot be subordinated to ends and goals set up in another age and another clime... It must expose its truths and its values to criticism and evaluation in the light of modern knowledge; it must test them in the crucibles of science.

Judah Plich, alluding to the controversies raging within the ranks of the progressively-oriented Jewish educators—between "minimalists" and "maximalists" in regard to the importance of teaching Hebrew and between "religionists" and "nationalists"—of organized Jewish life, it might be regarded as a enumerated a number of major problems facing Jewish education in...
the lack of a Jewish environment to vitalize the studies in the Jewish school, the lack of a well-formulated philosophy of Jewish education in the United States, the economic and socio-cultural status of Jews in United States, the relationship of Jews to Erets Yisrael and Zionism, the place of religion in the Jewish school. He stated his position in regard to the teaching of religion in the Jewish school in unequivocal terms: "In reference to the question of religion and its place in the school, I am ready to do away with the teaching of religion in the school completely. However, I am not against a Jewish education permeated by the spirit of the Hebraic tradition." Berkson also supported the position that Jewish values have legitimacy outside of a formal religious framework.

A more accommodating but still critical approach as to the place of religion in Jewish life and education by the "nationalists" is found in Golub and Honor's important essay.

It is fatuous to imagine that a given ritual or ceremonial leads to spiritual exaltation because it has done so in the past. We must rather empirically devise ritual that will truly inspire . . . We must extract from the past as much as is still serviceable, but the ultimate synthesis must always be original . . .

These creative patterns must, however, be consistent with historic continuity . . . Intelligent adjustment demands that we know the career of the problem and not merely its more recent manifestation . . .

An active religious life must, of necessity, be lived in terms of an organized group, and until religious affiliation is possible with a body consonant with our own thinking, we shall be obliged to compromise with existing agencies. As we have already indicated, however, the school must be one of forces working toward the reconstruction of the present . . .

The synagogue is today the most widespread unit of organized Jewish life. It might be regarded as a legitimate function of school to lead the child to assume . . . that he will . . . enter synagogue membership. The
school cannot, however, accept the present synagogue, with its serious limitations, as the satisfactory agency for developing a creative Jewish life. While urging affiliation with the synagogue, the school must, at the same time, submit the institution to a thorough-going critique and re-evaluation. The young Jew must understand what the synagogue should be at its best and how far his own synagogue falls short of the ideal.32

Rather than taking a partisan position in reference to the controversies of the period, Alexander Dushkin, seemingly a voice of moderation, raised the fundamental question as to how modern the Jewish school can in reality be. After pointing out the difficulty inherent in the existing educational situation in regard to the faithful implementation of the principles of (1) "child-centeredness," (2) the need for activities and projects, socially planned and in the spirit of purposeful doing, and (3) the need to offer knowledge and to teach skills so that they might have practical applications, Dushkin concluded that the Jewish school will have to be either radically re-organized or progressive techniques will have to be introduced into the subject-matter curriculum whenever possible with the goal of gradual curricular change.33 Most Jewish educators accepted the latter approach. However, a few, during the thirties, presented plans for a radical re-organization of the Jewish school and of the Jewish educational process.

3. Radical-Progressivism

Israel B. Rappaport, alone at first as early as 1933 and later with E. A. Nudelman, brought into question the total validity of the Hebraic, subject-centered curriculum. His proposals for the supplementary congregational or communal school33a amounted to a radical re-evaluation of its objectives as well as the total reconstruction of its curriculum and re-structuring of its in-
structional program. In his 1933 critique, Rappaport dwelled upon the apparent inconsistencies between progressive principles of education and the emphasis on teaching the Hebrew language and Hebrew sources in the Jewish school in the United States.

But it must be kept in mind that organized knowledge and, therefore, subject-matter is the superstructure and not the foundation of life. The first task then is to create experiential appreciation among our children. There is no room for formally organized language or content matter until that task has been accomplished. 34

A comprehensive plan for creating a new "American Jewish school" was offered in 1939 by Rappaport and Nudelman. 35 Their opening statement set the tone for their relatively radical proposals for the creation of this "new school":

A new formulation of aims, program and organization of Jewish education in America must reckon with the realities of American Jewish life. The present-day Hebrew school, congregational or Talmud Torah—the least unsatisfactory of the Jewish school types—does not meet the demands of the American situation. Proposals that have been made for the improvement of the present school are in the nature of piecemeal reforms that will prolong its existence but will not invest it with a new vitality.

One of the drawbacks of the present school is that it is heritage-centered, striving "to transmit to the child the glorious heritage of 4,000 years." In the process of transmitting the heritage, violence is done to pedagogic principles of primary importance, and the public is either indifferent or actively opposed to the proposition that the Jewish school must perforce be a Hebraic school, namely, that most of the studies must be presented through the vehicle of the Hebrew language. 35

In spite, however, of progressive tendencies exhibited in the formulation of aims, the programs advocated by previous writers on the subject retain the major part of both the traditionalism and linguistics of the present school as well as its present form of organization. The newer features contained in these programs are merely calculated to mend the fences around the present school. Departures from the traditional curriculum, such as the teaching of current events, history, customs and ceremonies, and Keren Ami in the vernacular, are unrelated and uncoordinated with the rest of the program.
They do not constitute a constructive change in the curriculum, but are merely tolerated as second-class citizens. We, on the other hand, are convinced that efforts to bolster up the present school are in a large measure futile, and that a new type of American Jewish school is desperately needed. We advocate a school which, in its orientation, program and organization, is calculated to meet the needs of American Jewish children as well as of the American Jewish community.36

To Nudelman and Rappaport the Jewish school must be a "common school" ("will not foist any particular point of view upon its pupils"), a "communal school," a "leisure-time" school," a character-building institution, and it must be "American-oriented."37 The specific recommendations for curricular change, which included the establishment of an informal activity program and the creation of an "experience" and "child-centered" school, the inclusion of Hebrew studies on a voluntary basis only for those who were sufficiently motivated as a result of the activity program and other factors, as well as a host of other changes, will be analysed further during the discussion of trends in curriculum development during the thirties.

Communal-Social Reconstructionism

Before proceeding to discuss progressive philosophical influences among various religionist groupings during the thirties as well as progressive philosophical influences among leaders and practitioners in various sectors of the formal Jewish educational enterprise--adolescent and adult education, Jewish education in the Jewish center, the progressive Jewish day school--it is incumbent upon the student of the period to refer to a position taken by a number of Jewish educators which was quite in tune with the spirit of the times and which had become quite popular in progressive circles during the thirties. Social reconstructionism,
representing a response to the trauma in the American society as well as a not unexpected departure from the "open-ended" and individualistically-oriented progressivism of the twenties, found willing adherents among some Jewish educators. The sociological and historical factors contributing to the development of this permutation or extension of progressivist thinking and the role that this ideological departure has played in the course of progressive education's evolution in the United States have already been noted. That Jewish educators should respond to this societal re-direction of the progressive elan during a period of social, economic and political turmoil is certainly understandable and could even be considered in keeping with an aspect of Jewish tradition (the battle for social justice especially identified with Hebrew prophecy) and with a significant trend in the metamorphosis of the Jewish people during modern times (the passionate attachment of a segment of Jewry to liberal social movements).

Samuel Dinin, who reflected in his dissertation a sincere devotion to the building of a true democratic society as well as to the reconstruction of Jewish life and Jewish education so that they might contribute to the rejuvenation of the fabric of American life, is strongly critical of the Jewish school of his times (1933). Though seemingly concerned with the growth of the Jewish child, the Jewish school "has been entirely unconcerned about the role of the child in the creation of the new Jewish civilization or of the new social and economic order." Dinin refers to the insights of Counts and Childs, and he suggests that the reconstructed curriculum of the Jewish school must, among other things, be permeated by a vision of the new, emerging social order in the
United States. William Chomsky echoes this view when he states: "Progressive educational thinkers regard it as one of the most important functions of education to equip individuals to see the defects of existing social arrangements and to take an active part in bettering conditions." 40

Before citing additional affirmations of the social reconstructionist point of view by some important Jewish progressivists, another mode of expression concerning the societal dilemma facing Jewish education, the Jewish community and American society in the thirties should be cited. Kalman Whiteman 41 reflects the anguish of the Jewish educator who, observing the crisis around him, calls for a re-direction of Jewish education away from the Hebraic-Nationalist point of view and toward the religious-traditional point of view. The rationale behind this reaction is instructive. Whiteman lays at the feet of the Hebraic-Nationalists the responsibility for the phenomenon of the graduates of the Talmud Torahs turning to Communism and forsaking their heritage. He implies that a greater appreciation of our religious heritage—its values, its contributions to the cause of freedom and democracy, its symbols and ceremonies, the knowledge and the desire to follow the Torah—would act as inhibiting factors in this flight from Judaism and democracy on the part of Jewish youth.

The panacea that Whiteman (and many others then and in the following decades) looked for in a return to Jewish tradition was sought for by Dinin, Chomsky and others in a more society-oriented, socially-responsible form of progressivism. Berkson
and Edidin, as examples, take a strong stand as to the need to relate and adapt American Jewish education to the problems of American society. Berkson, in lauding Kilpatrick's contribution to social reconstructionism in general education, states:

When we think of Jewish education adapted to American life . . . we must have in mind a program that goes along with liberal Americanism. To think of American education in socially progressive terms, and to use Jewish education as a bulwark of conservatism is to create a disharmony. An education based on such a dual tendency will fail to integrate the Jewish and American character . . . The two educations, Jewish and general, supplementing each other, must be invested by the same spirit of democratic attitude of progressive outlook.42

Edidin points to the relationship between this position and to the need to reconstruct the Jewish community in America and, in so doing, places a heavy burden upon Jewish educators and the Jewish educational process:

The fundamental purpose of teaching Jewish community life to the young ought to be to help effect a reconstruction of the Jewish community. The emphasis here is social and dynamic rather than individual and static. The present Jewish community is a highly unsatisfactory social organism. A new community has to be constructed out of the old, and education is to help bring it about. The young must be shown the shortcomings of the present order and be imbued with a passion for changing it, as well as for change in general. The attention of the youth must be focused not so much on individual desires and ambitions but rather on the social good, in this instance, on the future of the Jewish group. The necessity of a shift of emphasis in education from the individual to the social has come to the surface most strikingly during the past few years, for it is now realized that idealization of rugged individualism and laissez faire is largely responsible for the present chaos in Jewish group life, as well as in the general society.43

Indeed, it is far from coincidental that an editorial concerning the NEA published in The Reconstructionist in 1937 is critical of "timid, idealistic, liberal educators." Expectedly, the
editorial takes a militant stand in favor of the social reconstruc-
constructionist wing of the progressive educational movement,
looking to men such as Kilpatrick, Counts and Childs for leader-
ship and direction.44

5. Religionist-Progressivism

In addition to those leaders in Jewish education whose views already have been cited, it has been noted that spokesmen for religionist positions as well as for some significant institutional forms gave evidence of accepting aspects of the generic progressive philosophy of education (if not the overall progressive credo) as they articulated the goals and objectives of programs of Jewish education. That a group of leaders of Reform Jewish educators affirmed progressive principles is not surprising.45 More interesting is the fact that a representative of the Orthodox interpretation of Judaism, writing in a work dedicated to modern American Orthodoxy,46 would seriously question the objectives, curricular construction and methods of the Orthodox educational institutions of his period. David de Sola Pool,47 admittedly a modernist, pointed to the need to re-define the goal of Jewish education so that it would become far more than the mere trans-
mission of factual knowledge. His emphasis upon an expanded curriculum (including extra-curricular activities), on decent facilities, and on improved method is an indication of the in-
fluence of the "progressive critique." Concerning the problem of method, he says: "In almost all Jewish schools the instruction is too literary and academic and too far removed from the living requirements of the child and his interests. There is too much
mechanical memorization, too little lived activity." Notwithstanding a statement such as this which shows a degree of affinity for progressive thinking, it would be foolhardy to assume that a majority or even a segment of Orthodox Jewish educators were willing to re-evaluate their philosophy of Jewish education in the light of progressive principles. The evidence in no way allows for such a conclusion.

The eclectic character of the Conservative movement would seem to indicate, as has been alluded to from time to time, that divergence of opinion, of educational objectives and of ideological position should be expected at various levels and within different groupings comprising the Conservative educational establishment. Such seemed to be the case in the twenties, and the situation became even more complex in the thirties. It must be kept in mind that many leaders in Jewish education who espoused the Reconstructionist, social reconstructionist or community-progressive ideological stance worked, in some cases by force of circumstance, closely with Conservative educational institutions and exerted a considerable influence upon the development of Conservative Jewish education. Lerman makes note of the fact that the formative years of the Conservative school system (supplementary congregational schools as well as "progressive" day schools), years of groping and of great challenge to the Conservative movement and to the United Synagogue of America, coincided with the "hey day" of progressive education in the United States. Thus, a temptation exists to equate Reconstructionist, social reconstructionist or progressive Jewish educational
thought with Conservative educational thought during the thirties. However, based upon the evidence, this simplistic interpretation presents an inaccurate picture, one that misrepresents reality and, therefore, fails to establish a point of departure for the later directions in which Conservative Jewish education proceeded. What might prove to be more meaningful is a careful examination of the views of those who unequivocally identified themselves with the movement or who spoke more or less officially in the name of the movement so that a position, if any definitive one existed, toward the progressive philosophy of education can be determined.

In 1927 Rabbi Samuel M. Cohen became director of the United Synagogue Committee of Education. He stated, in 1929:

"We recognize that the congregational school has a different aim from the community school. In addition to everything that the community Hebrew school might strive for, the congregational school also has the important objective to fit the child for synagogue and Jewish community life."50 A few years later Rabbi Cohan authored a version of an integrated activity curriculum for Conservative congregational schools which was entitled The Progressive Jewish School.51 The work, published in 1932 by The United Synagogue of America, has a promising preface. In it Cohen states:

Studies undertaken in connection with this assignment indicated that the addition of activities to the existing curriculum will not prove effective. It was found necessary not only to change the curriculum but also to bring it into reciprocal relationship with the life about the school—in the synagogue, the home, the Jewish and non-Jewish communities. In other words, a new curriculum developed, more in conformity with the present-day position of the progressive educational school.52
In the first chapter, which is devoted to analyzing the nature of "character" and the need for "character education" and which relies heavily upon Hartshorne and May, Cohen comments that the aims of modern education have broadened to include and emphasize not only that which is traditionally new and vital that has not the socializing of the individual and the development and strengthening of desirable habits and loyalties, and that character needs are to be socially conceived as a quality of group functioning rather than as an entity possessed by isolated individuals. The details of the curricular plan and of suggested methodological innovations related to the proposed "new" approach will be discussed later. However, it is of interest to note here that he discusses his program in the following terms:

The school activities provide experiences that make for the Judaizing of the self and the growth of the personality. To live in the school environment, to carry out various projects possessing the qualities of self-initiation, the children will require considerable instruction and drill in small units of knowledge and skill. These units for the most part will be organized in the children's enterprises rather than in patterns logical or chronological, comprising formal subjects. The teacher provides the information and guidance and helps in the acquisition of the skill. What these units will be will vary from school to school.

There is a definite predilection for taking into account (in theory at least) the interests and feelings of the students and the need to create situations in which the students will learn to live together and will participate in a democratic manner in the affairs of the school. Cohen looks at the school as an organic community, a democratic community and places a premium upon "school spirit."

Rabbi Cohen's "attempt" has had its critics. Samuel
the leaders of Conservative Judaism. The conflict between the "denominational religionists" and the "community-oriented progressivists," which became prominent in the twenties and thirties and still exists at present, is a marked characteristic of the critique offered in Jewish Education in 1933. This significant ideological controversy, in which progressivism found itself enmeshed as it made its impact felt in the field of Jewish education, deserves serious consideration especially as it has affected the "traditionalist-Reconstructionist" and "secular-religionist" controversies that have been part of the development not only of Conservative Jewish education and American Judaism during the last fifty years.

6. Religionist-Reconstructionism

Mention should be made at this point about the convictions of some Conservative Jewish educators and educators, sympathetic to the Conservative movement, regarding the validity of the progressive philosophy of education as implemented in certain day schools supported by Conservative Jews. The "progressive day school," as a unique institutional form, will be discussed more fully in another context. Suffice it to say, that although the day school did not begin to become an institution of real significance for Conservative Judaism prior to the later fifties, experiments during the thirties are definitely worthy of note. As Lerman points out, a number of educators who identified themselves with the Conservative movement in the thirties felt that only the progressive day schools could institute fully the approach of the progressivists. That progressivism and experimentalism found their way into the Conservative establishment at the national
level, though the philosophy became generally associated with the reconstructionist wing of the movement, is another fact that should not be overlooked. Mordecai M. Kaplan, definitely influenced by progressive thinkers, was the Dean of the Teachers Institute of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America for many years. Samuel Dinin, who worked with Kaplan at the Teachers Institute during the thirties, acknowledges in his evaluation of the achievements of the institution (from its inception until 1935) the profound influence of Dewey and Kilpatrick. "Activity" and activities, the scientific-experimental approach to solving problems of education, the need to train teachers in progressive methods of education, the need to have Jewish education permeated by the spirit of the "new" education with increasing emphasis upon the crafts, the arts, music, drama, etc., are all discussed as part of the summary. Dinin is critical of the curriculum of the Teachers Institute in that there is not sufficient emphasis on the integration of subjects or on "active learning." The curriculum in 1935 remained "subject" and "text-centered." In conclusion, Dinin recommended that "a differentiated curriculum organized about basic concepts and ideas and using the conference method of procedure would make it possible to free the best students." Another evaluation of progressive influences at the Teachers Institute is offered by Lerman who states: "It was perhaps the liberal-permissive and experimentalist spirit of a movement that embraced thinkers from extreme theism to naturalism that encouraged a free flow of ideas. Neither the Orthodox nor the Reform groups produced as many educational theorists as did the Conservatives.
During the many years that M. M. Kaplan headed the Teachers Institute of the Jewish Theological Seminary it was the center of attraction for all free spirits. However, Lerman also adds that, even though in retrospect Scharfstein, and many others who were associated in one way or another with the Conservative educational establishment were progressively-oriented in the twenties and thirties, "the realities of Jewish life and the Jewish school gradually had a sobering effect. The formula finally arrived at called for the old content to be taught by new methods. They thus became essentialists."

As has been implied, the Reconstructionist (Jewish) ideological position has been closely related generically to a branch of Conservative Jewish thought and has also found adherents among a number of Reform rabbis and educators. The affinity between Reconstructionist educational thinking and the progressive philosophy of education is also important to ascertain, especially during the thirties when both were very influential. It became obvious during this era that Mordecai M. Kaplan and his philosophy of modern Jewish life was exerting a considerable influence upon the ideological-theological thinking and upon the educational thinking and practice of Conservative and Reform Judaism (and upon educators "affiliated" with these movements) and similarly, upon the "community-oriented progressivists." As with social reconstructionism in general education, a high degree of overlapping occurred between Reconstructionist educational thought and that of the "Conservative progressivists" on the one hand and the "Reform progressivists" on the other. The nature of the
Reconstructionist movement— it being non-institutionalized and of an inter-movement character— contributed in great measure to this phenomenon. Kaplan, the founder and guiding spirit of the movement from its very inception, identified himself, officially at least, for many years with the Conservative movement. Nevertheless, from the historical point of view, the thirties was that epoch in which Reconstructionist principles of education, especially as they were embodied in variations of Jewish progressivism or social reconstructionism or in Conservative or Reform philosophical or ideological positions, could be most plainly identified as having themselves felt and seriously considered.

Kaplan's views on Jewish education, in all justice, should be noted before those of his followers or disciples are entered upon the record. A chapter in his first major work (1934), Judaism as a Civilization, is devoted to the "meaning of Jewish education in America." The overall goals of Jewish education in America are to develop the desire and the capacity to (1) participate in Jewish life; (2) understand and appreciate Hebrew literature and language; (3) behave ethically and conduct oneself in accord with Jewish religious principles; (4) adapt Jewish sanctions and aspirations to the times by the reinterpretation of values based upon a rational and experiential approach to all problems of morality and religion; (5) stimulate artistic expression and creation of values. His is an emphasis on the well-being of the child and the importance of the present as a point of embarkation. He states that "to achieve this end the child must be given increasing control over his own experience so that he will himself be able to shape and direct it toward aims freely and intelligently chosen..."
Kaplan also notes the need to foster insight into the spiritual values of Jewish civilization, to create respect for the dignity of the individual personality, to encourage intergroup acceptance and tolerance, intellectual honesty, open-mindedness, responsibility, social- and international-mindedness, creativity in values, etc. Other progressive biases of Kaplan come through as he continues with his analysis: "In all modern theories of education it is reiterated again and again that we respond much more readily to activity than to ideas. . . Education is the process of continuous growth, the result of present experience which modifies and reconstructs all previous experience. . . ." Kaplan's naturalistic-functional-developmental approach to the nature of the God-idea and to the teaching of the God-idea is also included in his presentation. In one of his concluding remarks he points out that "it should be remembered that religion is as much a progressive unlearning of false ideas concerning God as it is the learning of the true ideas concerning God." The implementation of some of these principles would be expected in the supplementary school affiliated with the "Society for the Advancement of Judaism," the organization of those who ardently identified themselves with Reconstructionist principles in the thirties and who were activists on their behalf. David W. Pearlman, the principal of such a school, in discussing the objectives of the curriculum emphasized the following general aims: (1) to transmit the essentials of the Hebrew language and literature, (2) to help the child become socialized into the Jewish group so as to help the child actively participate in affairs of Jewry,
(3) to develop the creative aspect of the child's personality through creative group activities. What was actually included in the curriculum and what methods were used will be discussed at the appropriate moment. However, the goals of the "creative group activities," as stated by Pearlman, are of interest: 1. To give the child an opportunity for free Jewish expression through the arts . . . . 2. To cultivate the aesthetic phase of Jewish life; 3. To encourage and develop cooperation as well as to inculcate an attitude of being of service to the Jewish group and the school. 70

In 1933, Samuel Dinin's dissertation, Judaism in a Changing Civilization, 71 gave additional respectability to the Reconstructionist bias in Jewish educational thinking. Not as ideologically radical as Kaplan or as others who spoke out during this period, Dinin devoted himself primarily to the place of experimentation, democracy and progressive principles in the Jewish educational process. As has been pointed out already, he defended the right of the Jewish school to play a positive social reconstructionist function and called for the reconstruction of the curriculum of the Jewish school through a serious attempt to make the "extra-curricular" curricular and through the introduction of the project method to replace more traditional but less effective methods. Kaplan's influence is acknowledged openly in the preface and can be noticed at various other junctures in the treatise.

The attempt of the Reconstructionists to give to the Jewish school a broad outlook vis à vis Judaism and the Jewish people and a degree of independence from synagogue authority was exemplified by Barnett R. Brickner's statements during the heart
of the depression. That he placed himself strongly on the side of progressivism and experimentalism as far as Reform Jewish education was concerned was noted earlier. More significant is the fact that a practicing rabbi defended the Talmud Torah against the charge of "secularism" and raised serious question about the wisdom of the "congregationalization" of Jewish education. As a parody on Judaism and Jewish history, he stated, "it would be if Jewish life would become completely ecclesiasticized, which danger is real in the face of the growing tendency toward the congregational school."

In addition, Brickner was greatly dismayed by the effect of the depression on Jewish education, an historical aside which has had long-range significance for the development of Jewish education in America. The rabbi supported the Reconstructionist view that the synagogue is only one, though a major, institution of Jewish community life in America and called upon the rabbinate to cooperate with Jewish educators to create a viable and realistic philosophy of American Jewish education.

The Reconstructionist orientation of Golub and Honor's essay is obvious from the type of criticism of existing institutions which they offer—criticism of the Jewish school, the synagogue, traditional rituals as well as beliefs. As an example, they state: "Neither the Talmud Torah, nor the congregational daily school, nor the Sunday school are institutions for creative adaptation. . . . Problems are not faced squarely; questions are not answered frankly." They add at another point: "We wish, accord-ingly, to set forth as a principle of the Jewish curriculum that
an evaluation of the adequacy of institutions and beliefs through which our society hopes to advance toward the ideal must be one of the basic courses of the Jewish school." Finally, Honor, in an essay on the teaching of Jewish history, gives evidence of Reconstructionist leanings as he presents his observations and ideas concerning the teaching of the God-idea, legend and Biblical history. The scientific-naturalistic bias of Reconstructionism is quite apparent in the following quotations:

Teachers of Jewish history should be mindful to treat the Jewish group in no way different from that in which all other groups are treated. The children must learn to perceive the same laws and social forces at work in the history of their people as in the history of all other peoples. The very uniqueness of their history must be explained in terms of the operation of these laws and forces. There is no room for the thaumaturgic in history.

This implies a careful differentiation between Biblical story and Biblical history. The procedure has been advocated for many years by Professor M. M. Kaplan. Legend has its place in literature, where it may be presented as legend; but it has no place in history, as a part of the story what happened in the past . . . One of the phenomena which should be made intelligible to the child as a result of his study of history is the confusion which has been wrought as a result of our ancestors' original lack of appreciation of a dynamic world and the consequent inability to perceive the evolution of institutions. Because of the false assumption that the basic institutions of their day had always been what they were at that time, they saw their part in a false retrospect . . . The teacher who perpetuates these misconceptions by submitting the false reconstructions of the past as history is guilty of deliberate misrepresentation and is responsible for the inevitable reaction which is bound to come from wrong concepts and misunderstandings . . .

It follows from this discussion that there is no place at any time in the history instruction for God to be presented as the active agent in human activities . . . Significant, indeed, is the study of history which will lead to the realization that the God-concept has never been fixed, that the constant factor in Jewish history has been the search for God, the Ultimate Reality,
rather than any specific answer. A child so trained will not be estranged from his people, if upon reaching maturity he will find himself in disagreement with his ancestors in regard to many fundamental conceptions. He will know that his search for a view of the cosmos, which is compatible with the social aspirations of our own day, which will lead to the enhancement of life through giving it new meaning and purpose, is not opposed to the spirit of Jewish history, but on the contrary, is in complete harmony with it. That child will be equipped to do battle with the disintegrating forces which are threatening among Judaism. 78

7. Adolescent and Adult Education

Worthy of mention, but not the least bit surprising, was the fact that the progressive philosophy of education became increasingly applied to adolescent and adult Jewish education, two "levels" of education which were taking on greater significance as the decades were passing. Some representative, though by no means the only, allusions to progressive approaches to adolescent Jewish education in the thirties included statements by Roland B. Gittelsohn and Alexander Dushkin. Gittelsohn,79 a Reform rabbi with Reconstructionist leanings, felt that the ultimate goal of adolescent Jewish religious education was the integration of the adolescent into active adult Jewish life, encompassing both the larger Jewish community as well as the life of the congregation—adult religious life and the adult Jewish service of worship. He viewed as one of the major goals of adolescent Jewish education the "provision for an outlet for the expression of wholesome social and creative energies through Jewish channels." 80 On the other hand, Dushkin, at the third annual conference of the National Council for Jewish Education criticized the Council for devoting too much of its energies to extension education for adolescents rather than to the problems related to intensive Hebraic studies.
for adolescents. In general, Benderly’s commitment to developing programs of meaningful adolescent Jewish education by taking into account a variety of principles of progressive education (as has already been noted) was affirmed in many communities, but limited effort was given to clarifying objectives and to creating better instructional programs for various groupings among Jewish adolescents until the fifties. Jewish youth and center programs (informal education) and education in the Reform movement possibly being the exceptions.

Although there were some educational spokesmen who sought to focus attention upon the sins or abuses of which progressive education was allegedly guilty as part of the discussion of adult Jewish education ("The other approach . . . stresses the cultivation of the adult student's faculties and tastes rather than vocational benefits. This view has been frequently expressed in terms of the liberal school of American education which speaks of education as identical with life, and the function of education to be not 'the preparation for life,' but living. Progressive as this approach is in theory, its practice under American realities has frequently led individuals and organizations to reverse the order of values and instead of viewing education as life they are ready to endorse life on whatever plane by using the label 'education.'"), other educators sought to adapt progressive principles to the adult Jewish educational process. In enumerating objectives of adult Jewish education, Dr. I. M. Goldman pointed out that "it must be conceived more in terms of human experience, in terms of Jewish experience and the enrichment of it, in terms of the needs
of Jews and of Judaism." He went on to comment that "the program of studies should in the main be a reflection of human wants and needs . . . ." The teacher of adults should start with the people where they are and should deal with life's situations confronting the students. Honor, among other subjects, dealt with the possible long-range effects of real education upon adult attitudes and mores:

As an educator I recognize that mores cannot be artificially created, but I also know that through the slow and gradual process of education attitudes can be developed which can bring about a changed relationship to existing mores . . . In other words, without deluding ourselves as to the difficulty involved, if we have faith in the educational process we can have faith in the vitalizing of Jewish mores.

Earlier, Rabbis S. H. Markowitz and Isaac Landman also supported the introduction of progressive ideas into the thinking concerning adult Jewish education. Markowitz asserted that the core of adult Jewish education should not be only "subject-matter" and the purpose "the transfer of knowledge" but rather that it should hold "human experience as the subject-matter of education."

Adjustment to the dynamic present should be fostered rather than adjustment to the spiritual possessions of the past. Rabbi Landman qualified his endorsement of the introduction of the progressive approach in the following manner:

The test of religious education, then, is in its values more than in its content and method. In method it should be flexible, sensitive and responsive to change; in content it should be pertinent to current human experiences and applicable to that life of which religion is presumed to be the way . . . And Jewish educators are agreed in principle that the Jewish religion, in order that it may function in the present day for the present generation towards the spiritual conditioning of its adherents to build a Jewish way of life compatible with the American scene, must combine our progressive
educational tradition in the general sense with the methods of progressive education in the scientific, technical sense. However, it appears to me that liberalism must recognize traditionalism in educational procedures. Progressive principles cannot, and should not, cut away entirely from the past which holds such source material of great value. On the other hand, progressive method cannot fail to adjust the heritage of the past to the new knowledge, especially in an age when secular culture dominates the lives and thoughts of men, and needs no longer to go to Church or Synagogue to find its wells of living waters.

8. The Jewish Center and the Progressive Day School

Two types of institutions which gained a relatively high level of popularity during the thirties afforded evidence of being significantly influenced by progressive thinking, namely, Jewish community center and progressive Jewish day school. The educational philosophy of these institutions, the one, an informal, leisure-time, character-forming agency and, the other, a type of school established explicitly upon principles of progressivism as promulgated in the thirties, seems to have been militantly progressive during the fourth decade of the century. As early as 1931, Phillip L. Seman, then general director of the Jewish People's Institute of Chicago, related the progressive emphasis on character development with the overall objectives and programs of Jewish social service agencies, especially those concerned with character education or personality development. Of education and the Jewish institutions of the period he says acidly:

School may mean a more adequate adjustment to life; the means of realization of some ambition, or a monotonous routine curbing desire, in other words, a situation from which he must be truant.

Those of us who are more or less acquainted and have followed the newer trends in education, who have recognized wisdom in the far-seeing possibilities of the programs of . . . John Dewey, Kilpatrick, etc., have no
doubt that in practically every case it is the fault of the school or of the definitions brought to the school by the youth when there is maladjustment; ... Knowledge must become a part of the devotional life of the individual and be built into his behavior patterns ... If the family, the school, the synagogue are changing, then character education must be in terms of these changes and not in terms of these institutions as they existed. The development of young personalities and characters must be given precedence over any tradition or practice which as been surrounded by sentiment.  

In respect specifically to the Jewish center, more and more spokesmen became unabashed in their affirmation of their potentiality of utilizing progressive principles in the educational programs, informal as they might be, of this institution, which was indigenous to modern America and to the American Jewish community. Slavson stated the case in these terms: "It can be said that the aim of Jewish education should be essentially character training ... It should encourage creativity, originality, resourcefulness, imagination and power. ... While Jewish history, traditions, religious precepts, its wealth of thought, art and literature are the materials of Jewish education, they should not be used for teaching purposes, but rather for personality enrichment and development ... Jewish centers, too, can play an important part in building a Jewish spirit and Jewish character. This can best be done by the use of the methods suggested by progressive education." Discussing the many possible roles of the Jewish Center in the Jewish educational process, Soltes, a devotee of informal group activity as a legitimate expansion of the educational process, stated: 

There has also been welcome evidence of the growing dissatisfaction with the customary methods and practices in the promotion of educational
activities, a searching for progressive techniques that are in consonance with the best in contemporary educational thought and which make adequate provision for purposeful participation in self-initiated undertakings which approximate life situations and afford avenues of release of creative energies.

It would serve no further purpose in the present context to offer additional documentation of the influence of the Dewey-Kilpatrick school of thought upon the Jewish center movement during the thirties. The affinity between the social group work process and the goals and process of progressive education is more than coincidental. As educational thinking among certain segments of Jewish educators became more progressively-oriented and social group work in the Jewish center began to recognize its Jewish educational function, the confluence of methods and objectives became more and more apparent. However, in the case of the Jewish center and, also, in the case of certain progressive Jewish day schools, the Jewish objectives were either considered secondary or were poorly articulated at best; or, where they were on a sound basis, they could not be implemented as hoped for because of a lack of personnel with proper Jewish knowledge, background and attitudes.

Witnesses to the significance attributed to the "private, progressive Jewish day schools" are quite numerous. To many these schools represented a landmark, to others an experiment, and to some a possible panacea for many of the problems besetting Jewish education during the turbulent thirties. Dinning felt that the experimental private day school was the best of the existing Jewish educational institutions of his day, but he rightfully felt that it would reach only a small number of students.
Golub, in 1931, pointed out that the private, progressive day school was, in his opinion, the best institution available for offering an intensive "Hebraic-civilizational education." He proceeded to comment that "American Jewry needs more day schools on the level of America's fine experimental schools, where a serious effort will be made to evolve an American Jewish child life." Dushkin stated, in a similar spirit: "If these schools are experimental, progressive, intended to show a way to overcome some of the difficulties in our weekday and Sunday schools, conducted under good auspices and under controlled conditions as, for example, the school of the Brooklyn Jewish Center—we should bless these efforts." In another perceptive essay, Golub contrasts the "school of individuality" and "the system." Of the former, which seems in great part to approximate the progressive, experimental day school, he says:

The school of individuality, on the other hand, is the escape from the system, the effort to rise above it. It challenges the system because it disagrees with its basic values. It attempts to keep abreast of new scientific thought and to draw the consequent inferences. There one finds the true child-centered school, the flexible curriculum, true pupil planning and an education that does actually spell growth...

The system, too, is often progressive. It attempts to follow the lead of the school of individuality...

The system, if well-constructed, will produce highly credible results. It may be able to approximate projects, freedoms, pupil self-government, or the new outlook in history and geography... Here and there a teacher or even a school may be possessed of initiative equal to the "individual school." An occasional community may boast that its school system is as modern as any private progressive school. The sensitive observer, will detect the essential machine-like quality...
Of interest is the philosophy and articulated objectives of the schools (or ones similar to them) that have been talked of. Two articles descriptive of the programs, curricula, problems and spirit of a representative school will serve to give some conception of how the people doing the education work at these institutions actually conceived of their endeavors while being involved in them. Fannie R. Newnan stated that the two major objectives of the Center Academy (Brooklyn) were developing an integrated personality and the synthesis of cultures. She continued: "We were also intensely interested in the newer trends in educational theory and practice . . . In accordance with the principles of progressive education . . ." The teachers in the school were trained in progressive schools, and the general principles of progressive education were used as the basis for educational activity in both the Hebraic and general studies facets of the program. The development of positive attitudes and the transmission of values were important goals of the overall instructional program. In regard to the teaching of Hebrew, she points out: "It is necessary to motivate the study and create a situation in which the learning of Hebrew would be from the child’s viewpoint natural, desirable and easy." Of interest is the approach the school took toward the teaching of religion:

It is contrary to our educational policy to indoctrinate the child with any formal creed . . . Religious belief should be an outgrowth of personal experience and the inner emotional life . . . There is no implanting of religion by decree; no forcing of the pace. We have striven throughout to preserve spontaneity, the joyousness and emotional freedom which should characterize all genuine growth and religious growth in...
particular. We realize that our own treatment of the religious question may not wholly satisfy the orthodox, much less the non-religious parent.100

The American-Jewish progressive school "will surely be quick to utilize the new dynamics which progressive education has discovered just as soon as its adaptability to Jewish education has been demonstrated."101 The author concluded that the teachers at the Center Academy "enjoy something of the zest of the scientist in his laboratory; . . ."102

In a later article, Alice M. Brennan, 103 also of the Center Academy, discusses the problems of the progressive Jewish schools of her era. Attempting to define what a progressive Jewish school represents, she states that they are not as pictured in the stereotypes prevailing at the time. She emphasizes, for instance, that the progressive teacher spends as much time teaching respect for the rights of others as arithmetic, that the basis of progressive education is that we learn best that which we are interested in and feel a need for, that the psycho-emotional growth of children and the well-integrated personality are important concerns, etc.104

In his evaluative essay, "Twenty-Five Years of Jewish Education in the United States," Chipkin105 presented information to the effect that in 1937 the three private, progressive day schools in New York City had a total enrollment of 370 students. The goal of these schools was the development of a well-integrated Jewish personality who would be "at home" and able to live creatively on the American scene. The schools were supervised by experts from Teachers College, and "the activity program and the project method
9. Misgivings and Doubts

During the thirties there still existed a significant body of Jewish educational thought which was not progressive but which was also not militantly anti-progressive. However, open, and in some cases, quite vehement, criticism of progressivism and progressivists in Jewish education came to be more prevalent in this period. At the same time as Jewish progressivists became more vocal and influential, progressivism began to be questioned by some as an effective and valid approach to the educational problems faced by American Jewry. Philosophical and ideological differences as well as the continuing struggle between the "community-oriented educator" and emerging sociological realities (which in some eyes seemed to provide the evidence needed for the rejection of certain assumptions of progressive Jewish educational thought) also were brought sharply into focus during this decade.

The principle of "education as a means of adjustment" came under attack from many quarters. It was felt by more than just a few that the implementation of this principle was becoming more and more tantamount to propagating "education for assimilation."

In 1939, Mordecai Medini used this description as a title for an article which criticized the proposal put forth by Nudelman and Rappaport. Others pointed to the lack of an integrating ideal in the "new Jewish education" and proposed a return to Hebraic-nationalist or traditional-religious ideals. There were those who felt that the "new Jewish education" had minimized the importance of study and knowledge traditionally so central a
part of the Jewish educational process. The "new Jewish education" had substituted an emphasis on feelings and methods for the traditional emphasis on content and the transmission of this content through the original Hebrew sources.  \[110\]

Before dealing with other issues, the effect of the economic depression as a factor working against a widespread transformation of Jewish education along progressive lines must be noted once again. Many congregations and Federations abdicated previously accepted responsibilities and, in so doing, experimentation and freedom to innovate were severely restricted or eliminated as survival became the prime consideration. A few expressions of dismay by rabbis and educators will be sufficient to provide insight into what was occurring and how it was being interpreted by those interested in utilizing to the utmost Jewish education as an instrument of progress and creative spiritual survival.

During these days, terrible inroads are being made into Jewish school work. The policy of economy and retrenchment is destroying the educational standards which it has taken so many years of effort and so many millions of dollars to develop and build up.  \[111\]

The Rabbinical Assembly . . . views with deep alarm the pressure that it is being brought to bear in many communities throughout the country to minimize the support given to Jewish education and to other character building activities. Under the stress of immediate economic difficulties, the work of a decade is being destroyed . . . We decry the attitude of many congregations throughout the country that fail to live up to their traditional responsibility for Jewish education and are resorting to easy opiates: turning over complete financial responsibility to the teachers . . .  \[112\]

It is for this reason, also, that we must combat the practice of having some rabbis assume, for reasons of economy, the position of school principals . . . Difficult task though it may be, the rabbis must help us in pointing out to the congregations that Jewish education is a profession, and that it cannot be engaged in by
anyone, however learned, unless he has proper training and adequate time for it. It is not difficult to perceive how this trying set of circumstances contributed in many ways to the weakening of the "communal-progressive" approach to Jewish education in the United States during the thirties. With the ascendency of congregationalism, denominationalism and organized religion in general as the major constellation of forces present to fill the vacuum that was being created, progressivism, as a philosophical trend in Jewish educational thought, was either becoming subservient to ideological considerations or was being forced to do battle with organized religion on a number of fronts. The confrontation took various forms—community versus congregation, religionism versus secularism, inquiry versus indoctrination, nationalism versus religion, educator versus rabbi, etc. These manifestations of conflict might be construed as indices of the profound change occurring to the character of Jewish education in the United States. Simply stated, organized religion was strongly challenging the authority of the progressively-oriented Jewish educator as well as the progressively and democratically-oriented, communal approach to Jewish education developed over the years in the United States.

In order to counter the attack of many rabbis against the progressivists' "tentative-mindedness" and lack of "sureness," Jacob S. Golub attempted to tie together the religious and secular aspects of Jewish life in order to discover a more meaningful relationship between the two spheres. He stated his case as follows:

We seek not so much secularism as a type of life wherein the religious and the secular shall be a unity, wherein our everyday activity will admit of resolution into a higher synthesis... Above all, in the
religious sphere, we must yet discover that wider orientation which will join our tradition with the soul needs of modern man and, couched in a modern terminology and in a modern ritual, will satisfy our genuine cosmic craving.\textsuperscript{114} However, criticism of the progressivists' uncertainty in the area of teaching religious concepts and beliefs came from both Reconstructionist and liberal-traditional circles. Although Dinin complained about the imposition of authoritarian-traditional beliefs and practices in a non-education manner,\textsuperscript{115} he also was uneasy with the lack of conviction and courage of the progressive Jewish day school in the realm of exposing the Jewish child to a religious orientation to Jewish life. Noting that exposure to and involvement in the more important customs and ceremonies seems to be the vogue in these schools, he felt that a disservice is done to the students when education in concepts and beliefs is mishandled. He intimated that a number of teachers in these schools were either atheists or agnostics; thus, they avoided or did not know how to teach the God-idea. Dinin argued that the child "cannot become completely socialized into society about him unless he knows what ideas people held about God in the past and what ideas people hold about him in the present."\textsuperscript{116} Dinin's bias led him to recommend teaching the God-idea as the Reconstructionist had suggested. He adds: "Many parents and teachers, although they themselves subscribe to a view of God herein described as humanistic, still feel that in explaining God to children they must use personal and anthropomorphic descriptions, on the ground that children do not understand abstract concepts."\textsuperscript{117} Dinin concluded that the inability to teach the God-idea was a sign of bad pedagogy and advised that it be taught when the problem
arises and the need was actually felt by students. An indication of the polarization and struggle for power between organized religion and those educators committed to a more secular, nationalist-Hebraic or communal-progressive approach, is given in Simon Greenberg's article published in 1938 entitled "The Prayer Book in the Elementary School Curriculum." Rabbi Greenberg asserts that the study of the Siddur and aspects of Jewish religion are included in the curriculum of the Talmud Torah only to satisfy parents. The antagonism toward teaching the Prayer Book, which Greenberg seems to discern, is based "more than on mere pedagogic principle." He continues:

There can be no doubt that the increase in the number of Congregational schools, and the wider acceptance among the American Jewish educators of the proposition that Jewish education in this country must be not only Hebraic but basically religious in character, has focused more sympathetic attention on the problem of teaching the traditional Prayer Book. It would be obviously unfair to expect our Hebrew schools alone to overcome all of the tremendous forces operating in the environment against all forms of religious thought and life. But we must at the same time recognize that they did not measure up to what might reasonably have been expected of them. On the other hand, the teachers who had training in pedagogic method and educational psychology had, generally speaking, no place in their own lives for prayer and the Prayer Book and could not, therefore, introduce it effectively into the lives of their pupils. And while the traditional Prayer Book is not the only possible channel wherein the habit can find expression, it is or should be for us the one indispensable, most familiar and most regularly used channel.

Attempting to place the ideological confrontations, which were becoming more pronounced in the thirties, in proper perspective, Dushkin advocates the validity of these differences within the context of pluralism.

To be sure the members of our staff have a definite bent in Judaism and definite Jewish philosophic
outlook. They recognize, nevertheless, that American Jewish life is in the process of formation, that none of us is a prophet or son of a prophet, and that we have no right to impose our own brand of Judaism upon the whole community. All forces in Jewish life—orthodox, conservative and reform, nationalist and anti-nationalist, religious and secular—must be given full opportunity for expression in the education of our children. Wanting a prophet to foretell for us the exact character of American Judaism in the future, each group of Jews has an equal right to educate its children in its own spirit, so that the most valuable and most potent elements in present Jewish life may shape whatever realignments or syntheses may be produced in American Jewish life of the future. 120

However, in another article, 121 Dushkin proposes a developmental approach toward the teaching of God as well as the acceptance of the reality of the growing ascendency of congregational education and the need for Jewish educators to adjust to this trend so as to help the congregational school provide the best Jewish education possible. In a similar spirit, Jacob S. Golub offers a keen and penetrating analysis of the transition taking place in the American Jewish community and in Jewish education and the problems accompanying this transition. 122 All problems notwithstanding, Dushkin and Golub, realists as they were, called for better cooperation and understanding between the profession of Jewish education and the leaders of organized Jewish religious life. Dushkin points out:

Hitherto, we have made considerable progress in relationship to communal organizations—particularly to the Federation of Charities and to the profession of social work. However, in establishing a proper relationship to synagogue bodies or to the profession of the rabbinate in this country, we have not made sufficient advance. 123

Golub expands on this problem and sees the need for better communication between the professions in the interest of Jewish survival in the United States:
Relations between Rabbis and educators have at times been subject to strain, even if only slight. Speaking before related groups, therefore, it is far safer for us to present our practice rather than our theory, for in practice we have made some solid gains but we have something worth telling our friends, the Rabbis. This blanket recommendation for the remaking of the environment is slightly dangerous. We ourselves have not been too successful in remaking the environment. It takes a Hitler or a Mussolini to change an environment. We may point out how desirable it is to work for a change of environment, but we must be equally careful not to cast reflections on anyone who has not been successful. Jewish education in this country has not been too successful. Neither we nor the Rabbis have been able to stem the mighty tide of assimilation which threatens to engulf American Jewry. In the battle against assimilation we need the assistance and confidence of our Rabbinic colleagues. Perhaps a larger period of intimacy may be required before we talk frankly with one another, before we can have reason to believe that it shall be understood that any shortcomings pointed to are ours as well as theirs.

As can be seen, the need for a significant re-orientation among Jewish educators faced with new environmental factors was being called for by important leaders of the profession. The effect of these changed conditions and the changes in general American education and in the world, as viewed by one Jewish educator, were expressed by Samuel M. Blumenfield in May, 1939:

"Recent events have shaken the structure of progressive education to its foundations. There is serious questioning on the part of many whether there is such a thing as 'growth' and 'development' without the deliberate effort on the part of the educator to guide such growth into certain directions and to see to it that the development proceed among certain lines." Blumenfield stated at that time that the faith in the power of human intelligence to solve problems had been shaken. Progressive educators were in a dilemma similar to that of political liberals. Though desiring "free development," it had now become apparent
that to assure continuing freedom "a more deliberate guidance of views and activities" was needed more than ever. Since conditions are not normal (the reality of Hitler and World War II) certain principles of progressive education may have to be sacrificed. Indoctrination against our enemies is being proposed in order to fight totalitarianism and to protect freedom. Similarly, many Jewish educators have been "too ready to imitate the public school."

He continued:

Unfortunately, in our anxiety to be progressive, we have taken from that school even those trappings which have no bearing upon our aims and needs and which do not suit our specific conditions. Under our circumstances, integrated units to include essentials of history, literature, creed and practice all in one course, suited to the age and interest of the students, must be offered.

And last, by education, I mean that the Jewish school must be built around felt needs rather than around rationalized dogmas.

"Revolutionary ferment" elicited the anticipated objection from the more conservative group of educators and representatives of the minority. These two "iconoclasts," went so far as to call for a total abandoning of all existing instructional procedures, including even the more progressive approaches and offered alternatives, complete reconstruction and reform of the intellectual program and curricular designs. The fundamental difference between them and those who resisted their "extremist" views was more a question of their solution of the educational problem.
B. Curriculum Development

As would be expected, as an implication of the divergent philosophical positions assumed by Jewish educators in the thirties, suggestions for curricular change were many and varied. Some questioned the primary assumptions upon which the traditional curriculum had been developed and the relevancy of the subjects included in it. Among them were those who went so far as to virtually re-create the curriculum—form, content, priorities, approaches and methods, etc. Others, acknowledging the need to preserve aspects of the traditional-religious or Hebraic-nationalist curriculum, satisfied themselves with injecting curricular changes prevalent in progressive circles but consciously adapted to the specific needs of the Jewish school. Of course, all this "revolutionary ferment" elicited the anticipated objections from the more conservative group of educators and religious leaders who pleaded for the preservation of the traditional curriculum and course of study so that "Judaism" or "the Jewish People" would not fall into oblivion.

As has been pointed out earlier, the truly radical suggestions, as symbolized by those of Rappaport and Nudelman, were in the minority. These two "iconoclasts," went so far as to propose a total abandoning of all existing instructional programs including even the more progressive approaches and offered an alternative complete reconstruction and reform of the instructional program and curricular designs. The fundamental disagreement that they had with those who resisted their "extremism" or the radical program they offered, or with those who were...
content to "include progressive innovations" in the traditional curriculum, was reflected in the militancy of the words and the sharpness of the criticism incorporated in their proposals. 128

Caustically, but more constructively, they comment:

Perhaps the major reason for the lack of popularity of the present-day school is its intrinsic limitation of program. We can unreservedly state that some of the most vital issues that confront the Jews today do not even figure in the theoretic background of the present schools, let alone in their actual program of study. . . Many parents are either dimly or fully conscious of vital omissions in the program of the present school. Many more, if not most, parents are not convinced that what the school does offer is of vital importance to them or to their children.

We must build a school in America, the advantages of which should be palpably evident to the majority of parents and children. The program of this school must be a flexible one, containing many appeals.

It is with this leisure time that the Jewish school must concern itself, both because it is interested in the wholesome development of its children, and also because of the opportunity afforded to foster those purposes in which it has a special interest. As we conceive it, the Jewish school is to be a leisure-time child center in which as many as possible of the child's recreational needs will be served.

The present-day Hebrew school requires continuous attendance on four week-day afternoons and sustained study on these afternoons for a period ranging between one and two hours. This requirement very definitely interferes with the pursuit of much-needed recreational activities both because of time limitation and because of lack of recreational facilities in the school. The child school-center that we are proposing will not only provide recreational facilities and a recreational program very much needed by children subjected to the stress and strain of urban life, but will demand a minimum of continuous attendance even in the study activities.

It must be borne clearly in mind that the recreational and physical culture activities will not be provided by the school-center as a bait for the instructional program. These activities are considered an integral part of the educational scheme, perhaps equal in importance with the more academic aspects of the curriculum. The game room, the gymnasium, the swimming pool, and the roof-garden are places for character-building and personality

...
integration on a par with the festival group, children’s theater, children’s court, classes in Hebrew and other sustained study units.\textsuperscript{129}

The approach to curricular revision suggested by Rappaport and Nudelman and some other leaders in the thirties both in formal Jewish education and in the Jewish Center field\textsuperscript{130} is one that should not be dismissed entirely. Another noteworthy attempt to create an instructional program with a similar spirit in some respects took place in the progressive Jewish day schools of the era. The language, philosophy and thrust of those who directed and taught in these schools, as well as the record of their accomplishments and failures, must be included in the annals of American Jewish education.\textsuperscript{131} Whether or not these experiments should legitimately be used as evidence to bolster the case for the presence of an all-pervasive movement to totally re-direct the prevalent curricular objectives and approaches in the progressive image so popular in the thirties must be considered in proper perspective. It cannot be denied that changes in curricular patterns were being attempted by a number of progressively-oriented Jewish educators. However, total reconstruction of the curriculum as envisaged by the more radical group of educators never took place on a large scale (especially if we consider what we find in the schools today\textsuperscript{132}). What is more significant is the fact that this total commitment to curricular revision never could have taken place with conditions as they were at the time in America.

The majority of progressively-oriented Jewish educators, though committed to change, were also realistic as to the boundaries beyond which the “new curriculum” could not or should not move (in
The major effort was in the direction of taking into greater consideration psychological and sociological factors as they pertained to the renovation of the curriculum. Thus, the need for correlation of subjects, the construction of units, the introduction of activities and experiences, the importance of the relevance of what is introduced into the curriculum, the inclusion of "new areas of study" and the need to reconsider how and which traditional areas should be taught were, in the main, the subjects of discussion, criticism, exhortation and experimentation. There is ample evidence that some, if not all, of these new approaches began to filter down to selected schools or systems of schools beyond the confines of New York City as the impact of the "new thinking—education" began to increase in the area of curricular construction for the Jewish school. Of Reform religious schools more relevant.

On the other hand progressivism did not run rampant in Jewish schools. For the purpose of pointing out the lack of sufficient movement in the direction of progressive reforms, Israel Eisenberg, after surveying the curricula of fifty-one out of the leading Hebrew schools in New York City, asserted that (a) the reading of Hebrew was still being taught in a mechanical fashion instead of for comprehension and meaning, faced (b) no correlation or integration of subjects was taking place, and (c) current events, music, singing, aggadah, customs and ceremonies and the study of Jewish communal institutions were sadly neglected. His was by no means the only condemnation of the reluctance to change the nature and the spirit of the traditional curriculum in order to meet the challenges of changing times or
changing educational concepts. Y. Steinboim, in a sympathetic
but highly critical evaluation of the Jewish secular school in
America, stated that the study of Yiddish literature was not ful-
filling for students, nor was the study of history or the emphasis
on the study of the Yiddish language. He went so far as to suggest
that the Jewish-socialist-Zionist orientation might possibly be
better achieved through a curriculum taught in English. The
present curricular experiences were not relating themselves to
the real life-needs of students and also were not achieving the
objectives of the movement.

An extensive article in the JTAR Yearbook (1929), dealing
with curriculum and method, "Forty Years of Reform Jewish Education—
Its Achievements and Its Failures," was quite critical of attempts
to make the curriculum of Reform religious schools more relevant
and meaningful. The author, Jacob B. Pollack, pointed out candidly
that the curriculum of the Reform religious school of his time,
showed very little difference from the one followed forty years
before. Current events had taken the place of the catechism but
still the emphasis was on subjects and information to be learned.
Referring to Rugg, in regard to curriculum construction, Pollack
noted the need for a course of study based upon the problems faced
by children, i.e., real needs, and on individualization, such as
grouping, using the "laboratory method," etc. Pollack called the
1924 revised curriculum "a paper curriculum," really only an outline
with no discussion of aims, objectives, appreciations, attitudes,
approaches and projects. He acknowledged the addition of new
subjects and materials but proposed the drafting of a new curricular
plan, one truly centered around children's needs.
Responding to some of the inadequacies in the Sunday school (Reform religious schools) stressed by Pollack, Harry L. Commins offered a so-called "integrated curriculum" for that institution:

"In short, can we devise a curriculum in which all these subjects and activities will appear as various aspects of the child's one central purpose of learning about a unified and integrated period in Jewish life? Integration implies unity of purpose—it means interrelation of subject-matter so that the identities of traditional subjects disappear into one, united whole. It demands that we select one central activity in order to correlate with it all the child's learning."

In 1931, Commins discussed an experimental "activity curriculum" which he had devised and tested. Eight groups were involved in the experiment—three from classes in the Talmud Torah type of school and five Sunday school classes. The basic questions which were to be explored were: "How can we utilize the spontaneous interest of children as the basic motivations for a curriculum? How can these interests be integrated with the facts and attitudes we commonly associate with a Jewish education? ... Can we devise a curriculum whose motivating force is at every point grounded in the genuine needs of children? ... Can we create a curriculum which consists of a series of tasks to perform and ends to achieve?"

"In other words, how can we utilize Jewish content and values so that the children may bring to completion a purpose of their own?"

The subject-matter of this experiment dealt with teaching about early Israelite life, and an attempt was made to reconstruct the early nomadic life of the Hebrews so as to stimulate interest in the children in learning about early Israelite religion."
the experiment, which was considered relatively successful, the
experimenter-educator stated: "Secondly, these innovations represent a comprehensive attempt to rejuvenate the Jewish cur-
riculum and to breathe into it the breath of life. They propose to ground the study of Jewish content upon the basic motivations of childhood. They shift the curriculum from an emphasis upon an adult Judaism to a Judaism which a child can live on his own mental and emotional level." Of past attempts to "vitalize" the curriculum, Commins commented:

Such, for example, are the drama, manual work in the primary grades and occasional projects in the teaching of history. Activities of this nature, however, hold an incidental place. The backbone of our school procedure continues to be learning by means of assignment from textbooks. The more appealing activities are either shunted off to the end of the school period or are given over to the extra-curricular life of the child, where they are hurried through without thought of their potential fruitfulness as motivating forces. They are introduced but never as the motivating force from which all the learnings of the class are to spring.

In concluding his report, Commins affirmed the validity of his "activity curriculum" in the following words: "Our most outstanding achievement was to give the children a favorable attitude towards their Jewish studies and the Jewish school. . . . It is based upon the active needs of the children, and upon the need of acquainting them with how our forefathers lived. . . . History, instead of consisting of a series of verbal images, becomes concrete, real and vivid. History becomes part of their lives. . . ." Dewey supported the need for this new approach to curriculum construction. He pointed out that as early as 1902 Dewey challenged the concept that the curriculum of the
elementary school must have formal organization and that it must be morphologically rather than functionally constructed. He went on:

However, a more important factor in the controversy is the manner in which new theories of curriculum have been put into practice in the progressive schools. The theories of leading educators have been utilized to construct curricula in which formal subjects have been scrapped entirely. Although some of these schools have gone to absurd extremes in reaction to the traditional curriculum, we find that a goodly number have been successful in evolving a curriculum based on the interests and needs of children and the demands of contemporary society... At the present time, it is generally professed by progressive educators that the aim of education is to enable the child to live as fully as possible on his own level in the belief that this will lead to his functioning most effectively from every point of view. The task of education, therefore, becomes one of introducing the child to the greatest possible range of desirable experiences and of guiding him in deriving the most benefit from each one.145

Rabbi Samuel Cohen's curriculum,146 discussed earlier, attempted to present both an activity program and formal instruction in subject areas. The purpose of the activity program was to "engage the children in Jewish living." As can be seen, he was not ready to redesign totally (or even in selected areas) the curriculum as educators such as Nudelman and Rappaport, Commins, Kurzband and those involved with Jewish education in the progressive day school or the Jewish Center were. Of the activities that Cohen discussed, he said that they should be based upon the interests of children and should consist of enterprises in which the children will learn to live together, to cooperate and develop school spirit. The activities should revolve, mainly but not exclusively, around festivals and worship. As examples, he offered the formation of a class "health commission"
to develop rules for "movement" and discipline, the introduction of athletics and a school treasury, the addition of dramatics, school assemblies and involvement in "social service" projects such as a Keren Ami program, deciding on how to disburse the funds collected, visiting orphan asylums and entertaining the orphans at holiday time. Also, activities related to holidays and festivals, utilizing art and dramatics, as well as student-planned class services and holiday services, and a student newspaper were suggested. Cohen, however, did feel that it was important to include formal instruction in subject areas so that the necessary skills for Jewish living would be acquired. Nonetheless, he criticized the traditional curriculum for including too many subjects since much of the information supposedly acquired would not have a great effect on character development, many concepts taught were "above the children," and many extracurricular activities were "imposed from above" and not important to the children." Cohen thought, on the other hand, that the school should be looked upon as a child's "community center." Notwithstanding those qualifications he admitted that "certain information will be needed by all children and it may be helpful to enumerate the most important of them, arranged in accordance with the formal subject in which they would usually be included."

He listed the following subjects as necessary: History, religion, (customs and ceremonies), liturgy, music, reading Hebrew, Bible (arranged by weekly portion, including the Haftarah and Rashi), Hebrew language instruction and some others. 147

A more liberal spokesman for Conservative Judaism, or, more accurately, for Conservative Jewish education of this era, Mordecai M.
Kaplan, stated that the following should be the objectives of the curriculum of the Jewish school:

- To give insight into the meaning of the spiritual values and into their relevance to life situations;
- To foster an attitude of respect for human personality;
- To give an appreciation of individual and group creativity in the area of values;
- To inculcate ideals;
- To condition "habits" such as reflective thinking, attitudes toward the synagogue, Sabbath observance, the creative use of leisure time, observance of customs and ceremonies, reading books on Jewish themes, identifying with Erets Yisrael, helping community institutions, supporting the Jewish arts, etc.
- To impart the knowledge of the Hebrew language, Bible, Jewish history, Jewish sources, Jewish beliefs and ideals, problems facing world Jewry, Jewish arts and crafts, the importance and character of the Jewish home, etc.

Writing in Religious Education, both Chipkin and Gamoran acknowledged the influence of progressive education on the curriculum of the Jewish school by alluding to the introduction of activity programs, experiences in Jewish living, units and themes, extra-curricular activities, etc. Gamoran, in 1934, stated: "Though the theme of this paper is entitled 'The Curriculum and Character Education,' we would give a wrong impression of the efforts of the Jewish school along character education lines if we did not point out that there is a great variety of extra-curricular activities in most of our Jewish schools ... Assemblies, children's services, dramatic clubs, choirs, arts and crafts groups, book-lovers' societies, Young Judea clubs, and many others all contribute to the process of integration into the group ... and to character education." Later, Blumenfield, in 1939, pointed to the need to revise the
educational experiences of adults along progressive lines, also. Advocating the inclusion in the adult education curriculum of courses in Jewish sociology (with special emphasis upon the present-day Jewish community), the history and appreciation of the Jewish fine arts, Zionism and schools of Jewish thought, he asserted that "American adult Jewish education aims to achieve a synthesis of the classical idealism of yesterday and the social progressive realism of today." Adult Jewish education should allow "students to live in the process of education and educate them in the process of living . . . It is within our power to make the concept of education truly dynamic and progressive by guiding our students into projects and activities which will translate our work of the classroom into deeds and achievements of a better society of tomorrow." Additional proposals to update the curriculum and make it more meaningful were somewhat narrower in scope but still noteworthy as reflections of progressive influence. For example, William Chomsky, in discussing a reading program in Hebrew, presented as some of the specific objectives of the program (a) the cultivation of the ability and desire to read Hebrew literature with understanding and appreciation, (b) the development of abiding tastes and interests in Hebrew literature, (c) the gaining of a clearer insight into Jewish experiences, ideas and attitudes through Hebrew literature and (d) the provision of a basis for integrating and correlating the various subjects of the curriculum into the overall instructional program of the Jewish school. Thus, the knowledge of Hebrew is to be used as the key
to unlock the doors to more meaningful and relevant curricular experiences. In another article, Chomsky discusses candidly the possible conflict between teaching "the book" (meaning Hebrew language and literature), "subjects," "facts," etc. and the building of a curriculum around experiences and activities focusing upon the child and relating them to the real needs of the child who lives in the American Jewish community of his time. Chomsky views the heart of the problem as one of motivation and asks how one fits the study of Hebrew and Torah into an activity program. He concludes that the activity program is beneficial, but it should not replace the teaching of Hebrew and the original Hebrew sources. Because of the limited amount of time the child spends in the Jewish school, Chomsky suggests that reading for ideas be the major focus of the Hebrew language phase of the instructional program. He also suggests that classical material be re-written so that children can read it with a certain degree of ease early in their Jewish educational experience.

A project or activity program related to the teaching of Hebrew was initiated at the progressive day school sponsored by the Brooklyn Jewish Center. At the outset of the report on this endeavor the influence of Kilpatrick and progressive education was acknowledged. The study of the language was informal as Hebraic and general studies were integrated. Emphasis on the present and the festivals was the key aspect of the program. In the first grade the family and neighborhood was studied with the use of stories, songs, dramatics, games and discussions. According to the individual reporting on the experimental program, 283 Hebrew
In the second year, a Hebrew story was used to stimulate interest in learning how to read for comprehension. In another endeavor, Mrs. Elsie Chomsky enabled a class to write their own play in Hebrew. Teaching about Palestine through pupil activity was suggested by another educator. In another school system the Dalton Plan, with its emphasis on individualized learning, was instituted as a major curricular innovation.

In concluding the discussion of curriculum developments, as such, it should be mentioned that during this period the necessity for including the study of anti-Semitism and Jewish identification, and the study of the contemporary Jewish community and Jewish demography were also recognized. Increased emphasis on the teaching of Jewish history in a more meaningful manner, either by means of the laboratory or the "supervised study" approaches or the unit approach, also influenced the nature of curricular experiences championed by those who identified with progressive education. A most interesting concept was the introduction of the unit approach as well as of art, dramatics, music and the discussion of current events and social issues into the Junior Congregation experience. Although total reconstruction of the curriculum was not being put forth in these proposals and reports of successful educational ventures, the attempt to reorganize and re-direct the curriculum, to add new subjects to it and to make it more relevant and meaningful was certainly being supported.
C. Methodology and Psychology of Learning

When proposals or reports of experimental projects in the realm of method recorded in the thirties are reviewed, one is impressed by the increasingly sympathetic but, in many cases, discriminating approach to the utilization of progressive methodological principles and techniques. A deeper understanding of fundamental psychological principles as they relate to methodology also seems to be present. In that this generalization might be disputed, it must be emphasized once again that the evidence for this so-called "conclusion" was culled from what was found in the literature examined (this by its very nature being a selective and limited process no matter how comprehensive the investigation was intended to be). Nonetheless, it is safe to say that, in a number of instances, the field of Jewish education suffered from the indiscriminate assimilation of progressive techniques just as was the case in general education during the thirties and in later decades, and this phenomenon was reflected to a degree in the literature analyzed. Much of what was said and done in the thirties had its antecedents in earlier decades. Therefore, only more sophisticated innovations or seemingly significant statements will be discussed in some depth lest the presentation become repetitive. It should also be remembered that methodological and psychological principles were touched upon in the preceding analysis of philosophy of education and curriculum development during the thirties, and most of these points will not be re-stated though they may be referred to as part of the general discussion that follows.

An important and appropriate statement was made in regard
to teaching the Bible in Hebrew. The statement deals with the role of the "present" and the "past" in the instructional program associated with intensive Jewish education and the function the "right" methods can play in tying the two together. Since many Jewish educators are at this very moment still struggling with problems related to the teaching of Bible, especially in Hebrew, the point of view, while rather simplistic, still has cogency and should be included as part of the unfolding story:

There have recently come into vogue certain trends calling for revision of our school curriculum, with the view of shifting emphasis from the study of the past to that of the present and of the immediate environment. But life, it should be remembered, is not a thing, it is an ongoing process, and it has its roots in the experiences and experimentations of the race with the practical issues of living. Unless the present draws its sustenance from the accumulated resources of the race, its ancient culture and tradition, its values, ideas, it is apt to become barren...

But the problem is really one of methodology rather than of curriculum (italics my own). There is nothing basically wrong with our present curriculum, and no radical revisions are needed. There is need of improving our methodology, of making it more dynamic and life-like, of relating it more harmoniously to the needs and interests of our pupils and to their environment...

An innovation of sorts which tended to support this approach was the series of abridged Hebrew texts of Biblical books which appeared in the mid-thirties. As an example, Pollack's Humash le-Talmidim followed the original text quite closely, leaving out certain passages which were deemed "unimportant" or which dealt with sex and changing the language of the most difficult passages not deleted. Pictures depicting the events and personalities spoken of in the text, questions and review exercises, maps and charts, selections from Rashi (in Rashi script),
summaries of each chapter, appropriate selections from Aggadic literature and a Hebrew-English dictionary at the end of each text were characteristics of this series. The text itself did not dictate the utilization of progressive methodology, but it could be used creatively and in a progressive manner if the teacher had the inclination to do so.

Similarly the series of Jewish history textbooks developed by Dorothy Zelig's provides many possibilities for the progressively-oriented teacher, especially the section called "Things to Do and Talk About." The introduction to Zelig's Child's History of Jewish Life touches upon many of the principles and techniques discussed in many articles and in varying contexts by the progressively-oriented Jewish educator of the thirties.

Underlying Principles

The same plan followed in the first volume of presenting history as a study of group life has been continued here. The teaching of history as a civilization rather than merely as a sequence of political events or a story of great personalities has come to be the accepted viewpoint of progressive educators.

Another principle which the writer has tried to embody in this book is the orientation of Jewish history with the history of other peoples. Her purpose has been to present Jewish life in its world setting, showing the influences of the nations with which it came in contact and the Jewish contribution to other civilizations. In this way it is hoped that children will avoid the difficulty which they so often encounter in associating Jewish history with the contemporary events of other nations.

Throughout the book the development of present life from the past is emphasized so that Jewish life of the present day is seen as an outgrowth of its history.

The material has been carefully selected with a view to child interest and comprehension. Certain movements and influences, like that of the Karaites, for example, have been omitted because they are too abstract and difficult for children of this age. Although of
importance in Jewish life, their study can well be postponed to a later age and grade.

**Method of Presentation**

As is evident from the previous discussions, the book is organized into four large units. This procedure aids in creating a clear and unified impression of each epoch. It makes possible a psychological arrangement of material that is in harmony with the way children think and remember. Instead of a mass of unrelated facts, the units present concrete and unified pictures to the minds of children. The unit plan is also helpful in carrying out an activity program or in following other types of teaching procedure.

Each unit opens with the author directly addressing the young reader. The journey into the past is begun from the present so that the child may identify himself more readily with the history of the people he is studying. In this approach the author sketches in broad outlines the important generalizations of the period. A more detailed study follows in the form of a story. Through the significant experiences of imaginary children or historic characters, the civilization of the period is unfolded. The young reader is able to identify himself with the children in the story and thus relives imaginatively the historic experiences related. A large part of the material is thus in story form, a method which should appeal to the interest of children.

The problems and potentialities of the project approach in teaching Jewish history are discussed frankly by Abraham Segal who elaborates upon an experiment in which his class wrote and published a class newspaper which dealt with the historical "problem" being studied. Another type of project which incorporated many progressive principles and had relative success (and was used as a prototype for similar projects in later years) was Edidin's "Keren Ami Project." Referring to the project approach as related to history, Robert I. Kahn says that the history presented through it "doesn't touch our students . . . We have techniques, . . . but we leave the pupils untouched, simply because the history he studies has no relationship to the present
and immediate environment. Therefore, he suggest a "problem" or "question" approach and supports his proposals with psychological principles acknowledged by progressivists. An exposition of the "Dalton Plan" (laboratory method) as implemented in the Jewish school is presented by Helen Parkhurst; it was revised and simplified to become the "supervised study method" by Soloff; it was evaluated and placed in proper perspective in 1929 by Golub. Talking of the "laboratory system of teaching history," Golub states realistically:

By far the most serious criticism of the method, however, is that it fails precisely at the point where it is theoretically strongest ... But to make a problem vital to children and to develop the inferences of the problem to their lives seems to be far too difficult a task for the average classroom teacher ... The laboratory method offers a far richer variety of problems, every classroom situation being multiplied by the number of pupils in the class. Thus, motivation instead of being a blanket stimulus, must now be adapted to the true interests of the individuals ... The supplementary work affords opportunity for true individual self-expression.

Before reviewing some significant general points made by progressively-oriented educators as they attempted to evaluate—affirm and/or point to limitations—progressive methodology and principles of learning upon which this methodology and related developments in curriculum construction were being based in the thirties, a few words about the teaching of Hebrew and prayer should be included. Louis Hurwich was a proponent of "teaching Hebrew through play." He agreed with Hava Bush that an activity program in early years had great benefits. Though not a "purist" in regard to the "natural method," he asserted that reading, writing and speaking Hebrew are learned as by-products of the games and projects introduced and that after two years of
a relatively intensive but enjoyable and creative approach the students are linguistically ready to study Humash entirely in Hebrew. A major achievement of this type of program, one in which the children sit in a semi-circle and have mobile desks and chairs, is the cultivation of "student interest." However, he had found that the major weakness of such a program was that the transfer from "play" to "work" (studying the Bible in Hebrew) was resisted to some degree.

Libbie Braverman, in a Reform religious school, used real prayer experiences as a stimulus to have students want to learn Hebrew. Though the mechanical reading of Hebrew is the major goal of this so-called "Hebrew prayer program," she contends that the sociability in the classroom compares favorably to that found in the "best progressive schools." William Chomsky was concerned about creating "a generation of Hebrew readers" rather than "Hebrew speakers." He noted the lack of a proper attitude and habits in regard to reading Hebrew for comprehension and meaning, and thus he called for the creation of "controlled vocabulary list," minimizing the emphasis on teaching the child to speak Hebrew while substituting for it the goal of reading for comprehension. These varying viewpoints are illustrative of the continuing controversy concerning the objectives of teaching Hebrew to American Jewish youth—reading (for ideas, meaning, etc.) the Bible in the original Hebrew, reading modern Hebrew literature, speaking modern Hebrew, identifying with the culture and civilization of the Jewish people, acquiring the ability to participate in synagogue services in which Hebrew is used, etc.
and provide some background for today's confusion in this area. Here, as in other basic areas, philosophy of education, curriculum and methodology are deeply intertwined.

Whereas Markowitz considers the composing of original prayers resulting from classroom discussion as a method of training of students "for worship," Feuer summarizes the credo of many a progressively-oriented Reform Jewish educator during the thirties: "since the building of ethical character, as all educators know, is not accomplished merely by precepts handed down from teacher to pupil, every well-tested modern method of motivating active participation by the children and cooperation between teacher and class is utilized. Projects, hand work, dramatization and library periods are all brought into play . . . We aim to be educationally progressive, but we proceed cautiously."  

Some additional general methodological considerations representative of spokesmen of the "Jewish progressivists" articulate during the thirties (and the accompanying psychological principles relied upon to fortify their methodological departures) must be cited for the sake of the record but also so that what followed in later years in the area of methodology and what positions are today being championed can be better understood. Of essential importance is the exploration of questions such as (1) what aspects of progressive method were valued and what questioned during this pivotal period, and (2) how were progressive methods being adopted or rejected and what was the rationale—psychological, philosophical, curricular—that was being presented in order to justify the various views embraced?
As has already been pointed out and documented a degree of sophistication in regard to and critical adaptation of progressive principles and methods was observed in the thirties—much more so than in the early and mid-twenties when the "new education" was still in reality new. In their important essay, already referred to in another context, "Some Guiding Principles for the Jewish School of Tomorrow," Golub and Honor acknowledge that the "project method" is the best instrument so far derived for living and experiencing, projects being (in their eyes) for "true units of life which will call forth whole-hearted, vigorous activity . . . ." 186 However, they add a note of caution, warning that the project method should not be overused: "The method employed must be the one best suited to achieve the objectives which the curriculum strives for and must be constantly adapted in accordance with findings in scientific child study and the technique of teaching." 187 Similarly, Edidin says: "The activity method, too, as practiced in progressive schools, is unreliable . . . ." 188 He then goes on to propose a more profound approach, in this case in the domain of "teaching holidays and customs to high school youth." Soloff, 189 who felt that the "laboratory method" was too difficult to implement in the Jewish school and proposed the "supervised study" program in its place, rejected the "project method" in the teaching of history in the intermediate grades of the Sunday school because it "presupposes teachers who are expert in their knowledge both of Jewish history and of child psychology (our teachers are not either)." 190

In regard to self-discipline, Commins, whose experiments with an activity curriculum have already been discussed,
discipline problems in "traditional" and "project" groups and contends: "Such a problem of behavior is simply nonexistent in our classes. The difficulty is rather to check the exuberance of the children than to discipline lack of attention or mind-wandering. The difference between the atmosphere in the project group and a traditional one strikes one in the face ... They talk to each other and help each other." 192 Oppositely, Shiffman 193 complains about the seeming conflict inherent in the "new education" between "arousing creativity" and the need for order and discipline which, in his opinion, is necessary for true human creative effort. In the spirit similar to which Dewey disassociated himself from the indiscriminate glorification of the label "progressive" (in the late thirties), 194 Zeligs stated in 1932: "Before concluding, it may not be amiss to point out one or two fallacies which have sprung up in connection with some of the terms used in progressive education. Some people believe that by adopting the terminology of the new education, they have thereby caught its essence. There are many courses of study which employ with facility the vocabulary of progressive education. But a more careful analysis reveals the same formality, the same academic organization of subject-matter, the same dominating teacher-purpose that is characteristic of the older education." 195

As an example she examined the concepts of "activity" and "unit." A worthwhile activity is "that activity in which the child participates wholeheartedly, and with interest, which offers opportunity for self-expression along constructive lines, and for which the motive power comes from within the child." 196 Also, "but the mere substitution of unit for course of study does not auto-
matically transform the school into a progressive one... Many other statements affirming methodological and psychological principles (and the limitations of such) of the "new education" were made. In that they tend to repeat, in the main, what has already been stated, they will not be discussed further at this juncture. Needless to say, the literature (theoretical essays and reports of experiments or endeavors at implementation of principles of progressive education is evidence of the growing consideration of the possible application of methodological and psychological principles of the "new education" to American Jewish education. In order to portray accurately the influence of progressive education on American Jewish education this finding must be driven home, no matter what the actual status of progressive methodology and the commitment to related psychological principles in Jewish schools in America was in the thirties. In that the historical aspect of this study is not based upon empirical-statistical-quantitative data but rather upon written materials (published essays, books, reports, curricula, etc., admittedly leaning toward the theoretical and at times the highly subjective) appropriate standards of evaluation must be applied to this portion of the research with some weight being given to the findings arrived at.

Before ending the presentation of ideas and reports on actual school work—experimental and otherwise—which seem to have been influenced by progressive thinking and practice, note should be made of some statements which are germane to "administration and supervision." Israel Konowitz discussed the problem of
He suggested a partial remedy consisting of three administrative and curricular changes: (1) no special classes for weak students *per se*; (2) one overall course of study (the same content) but a differentiated use of Hebrew, based on the Hebraic proficiency of students, so that *language* is not an obstacle to education; (3) three distinct educational programs—one for the first three years, one for the middle years (fourth and fifth grades) and one for the high school years (sixth, seventh and eighth grades). The importance of the teacher-pupil relationship and the development of a "community of interest" is emphasized by Rabbi Eugene Kohn. Teacher-parent conferences and self-evaluation by students with the help of the teacher are suggested in another report on evaluation procedures in a day school.

Under the shadow of increasing world-wide anti-Semitism, Joseph Zubin (1932) states: "What can vocational guidance do for the Jewish school? Modern education separates itself from the past by an insistence that the child rather than the curriculum should be the center of attention ... In view of the importance of the choice of a career in the life of the individual and in view of the many problems involved in this choice, the Jewish school should reckon with it [vocational guidance] more and more ...." Adult education, as a function of the Jewish school or institutional synagogue, as documented earlier in this chapter, seemed to begin receiving greater attention in the thirties. Rabbi Isaac Landman affirmed the vital importance of adult Jewish education in rather strong language: "The principle followed by Jews,
whether modern pedagogy accepts it or not, is that where you have educated parents you will have educated children." Louis Levinthal asserted that the Jewish educational enterprise will be a failure without adequate parent and lay involvement. He boldly put forth an important principle supported by true progressivists, one that is being "re-discovered" on many fronts today: "It is unsafe to entrust the development of any profession entirely to its own members."206

The new approaches suggested by progressivists in regard to the principal, supervision and a valid process of curriculum development involving teachers, specialists, etc., are discussed by Eisenberg, Nudelman and Rappaport. Finally, Maller's suggestions for "needed investigations in Jewish education" (as of 1929) should still be considered for research in Jewish education today and should not be overlooked. Those that are related to the "progressive impact" will be listed even if some exploration of these aspects of the Jewish educational process has already been undertaken or is being undertaken at present. The "agenda" still has relevance and is an appropriate way in which to end this description and analysis of the impact of progressive education on Jewish education during the thirties:

III. Problems in Character Education
VI. Problems in Educational Psychology (content, reading readiness, methods of teaching Hebrew, etc.)
VIII. Preparation for Leadership
IX. Problems in the Philosophy of Jewish Education
A. A reconstruction of the curriculum of the Jewish school with particular emphasis upon (a) purposive behavior, (b) the child's felt needs, (c) changed conceptions in religion and nationalism.
B. An evaluation of the Jewish educational process with emphasis on criteria for evaluation of curricula

C. An examination of the particular principles of philosophy underlying the educational activities of (a) the Orthodox, (b) the Reform movement, (c) the Nationalists, (d) the Radicals

XI. Problems in the Administration and Finance of the Jewish School

5. Modern school equipment to meet the needs of the Jewish school

16. Extra-curricular and recreational work, club management, etc.

19. Conditions of hygiene and cleanliness in the Jewish school

20. An experiment with the junior high school idea

XIII. Miscellaneous Problems

2. A plan for a "double track" curriculum consisting of minimum and maximum courses

3. Philosophical and psychological analysis of the teaching of religion

9. Psychological and philosophical analysis of the value of religious worship for children and suggestions for the organization of such worship

13. The Jewish interests of Jews and their general interests: the relative emphasis upon either aspect and their educational values

14. Does conscious training in Jewish habits and attitudes carry over into later life?

16. Some maladjustments in American Jewish communal life which the Jewish school might correct: defense against anti-Semitism, Jewish experiences and concepts brought to the Jewish school

17. Changes in attitudes in Jewish adolescents traceable to the influence of Jewish knowledge

18. Vocational guidance and the Jewish school

20. Social participation: Does Jewish education influence participation in Jewish youth groups, etc.?

22. Aims and activities of clubs of adolescents
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Zeligs, Dorothy F., "The New Psychological Approach to the Teaching of History in Intermediate Grades," JE, vol. IV, no. 1 (1932), pp. 36-44. Professor William A. McCall, in the preface to Zeligs, Dorothy F., A Child's History of the Hebrew People (New York: Bloch Publishing Co., 1940 [First Printing, 1935]), remarked: "The author has followed sound principles of progressive education not only in her selection and presentation of material, but also in planning the book to be used as the basis of an activity program. The division into six well-organized units make it admirable for that purpose. The last section of the book contains many valuable suggestions for types of activities to be carried on ..." (p. v.).


Chomsky, William, "The Problem of Bible Teaching in Our Hebrew Curriculum," JE, vol. X, no. 2 (April 1938), pp. 85-86. See also, de Sola Pool, Dr. David, "An Experiment in Jewish Education," JE, vol. X, no. 2 (April, 1938), pp. 82-84. This article, a report of an experiment using the Bible as a source, deals with a project attempting to teach the relationship of the Jewish people to Palestine. In addition, Gamoran, E., "Problems in Teaching Bible," JE, vol. II, no. 1 (1930), pp. 16-24 talks to the same concern. Soltes, in his essay, "The Role of the Jewish Center in Jewish Education," addresses himself specifically to this aspect of the proposed revolution in method called for by the progressivists: "There has also been welcome evidence of a growing dissatisfaction with the customary methods and practices in the promotion of educational activities, a searching for progressive techniques which are in consonance with the best of contemporary educational thought and which made adequate provision for purposeful participation in self-initiated undertakings which approximate life situations and afford avenues of release of creative energies" (p. 130). Slavson's article, "Jewish Education in the Jewish Center," is also relevant.
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Chapter VII

An Overview of the Relationship of Progressivism to Jewish Education (1940-1964)

Section A

After examining the varied evidence that is part of the historical record during the forties, fifties, and early sixties—essays, reports, proceedings of conferences, curricula, etc.—it is difficult not to perceive a total spectrum of points of view relating to the place of progressivism in American Jewish education at one or many levels, or, on the other hand, that called for a more selective and increasingly general adaptation of Jewish education in its many forms to the conditions of progressivism in American education, and in turn, they placed their stamp on American Jewish education as well. Cremin’s final chapter, "The Crisis in Popular Education," portrays the situation as it pertained to the general educational climate as it existed in America. In attempting to interpret the development of American Jewish education, the changes in direction in American educational thinking must be kept in mind just as it was necessary to understand the role of early educational progressivism and hence to the development of general and Jewish education during the twenties and thirties. One attempt in this dissertation has been to interrelate, whenever possible, the political, social and ideological changes occurring in American society and, in fact, in the world, as well as in the American Jewish community to the development of general and Jewish education in American society. The evidence examined points to the conclusion that progressivism in its totality—meaning its
philosophical assumptions as well as its more accepted educational innovations—never was really adopted by the bulk of American educators, religious and otherwise. However, that it left an impact, possibly even more significant on Jewish education than on American education, must seriously be considered.

All indications seem to lead to the conclusion that by the late thirties and the early forties an atmosphere was in the process of being created that lent itself to the rejection of Jewish educational progressivism at one or many levels, or, on the other hand, that called for a more selective and increasingly critical adaptation of Jewish education in its many forms to the various principles and innovations of progressive education. The time for radical experimentation had passed, witness the violent reaction on the part of Orthodox and Conservative religious educators and on the part of many Hebraic educators to the report in the early forties of the "Commission on New Approaches to American Jewish Education." This Commission included such well known figures as Professor Salo Baron, the sociologist, Abraham Duker, philosophers Sidney Hook and Horace M. Kallen.

The following excerpts from the actual document, which might be considered one of the "last gasps" of radical Jewish progressivism, are of interest:

Those of us who were asked to join the Board as

This memorandum is published by the Jewish Education Committee of New York on behalf of one of its affiliates, the Commission on New Approaches to American Jewish Education. The Jewish Education Committee of New York has many affiliates representing a wide range of opinion in Jewish Education, and assumes no responsibility for the particular viewpoints expressed by any of its affiliates.
Aims of the Commission on New Approaches to American Jewish Education

1. To undertake an inquiry into the potential contribution of Jewish education to the social and emotional integration of Jewish youth in American life. This inquiry is to be conducted by means of conferences, seminars, and studies with the aid of people who can view the subject from the vantage point of modern education, psychology and the social sciences.

2. To organize our findings into such a form as to be useful to parents, teachers, and institutions in the field, and to undertake publication of any new material that in our inquiry is deemed to be necessary.

3. To conduct various experimental groups and classes for children, adolescents and parents for the purpose of translating our findings into concrete work, and to test out our views and materials in actual experience.

* * *

The membership of this Commission is to be of a representative nature and is to consist of people who are ready to rethink the entire subject of Jewish education from the point of view of the American Jewish child’s needs rather than that of a doctrine of a tradition to impose or defend. (p. IV)

INTRODUCTION

The best way, I think, to "introduce" this paper is tell how it came to be ... To put the money to work upon a scale worthy of the gift a committee was formed ... and on its Board were placed persons chosen as representatives of the various points of view in contemporary Jewish thought. Naturally this meant the inclusion of certain individuals previously not identified with Jewish education, for a substantial body of Jews in this city reject for their children each and all of the types of curricula which are now offered.

Those of us who were asked to join the Board as representatives of the nebulous, inarticulate majority of dissenters soon began to wonder what our function was supposed to be. What we learned of the existing schools did not change our regard for them ... We soon agreed that there was great need for our children to be taught the fundamentals of their heritage which, willingly or unwillingly, was theirs ... The ignorance which some members of our parents' generation thought would solve or at least veil their problem, was rejected by us all.
Our first problem was to find a leader to carry out our plans, and in our search we learned a great deal about the difficulties that would lie ahead. Our simple aim being the development of a curriculum founded in twentieth century American rather than in eighteenth and nineteenth century European soil, our orthodox idea being that personal and communal integration demands that Jews should have an affirmative and not merely negative or even hostile attitude toward their religious and cultural heritage, one would have thought that we could have easily found a young rabbi, or a religious school teacher, or a lay teacher with a background in Judaism, qualified and ready to work from our point of view. More than a year passed, however, before we made contact with a competent educator who shared our views... (pp. V-VI)!

Joshua Lieberman, author of the "memorandum," the leader chosen by the group, stated at the end of the document: "We will have to be guided in our thinking by good psychological and educational standards rather than by a determination to perpetuate traditions regardless of changing needs. Our chief consideration must be: Will our educational plan help American Jewish youth to live and function more effectively and happily as Americans and as Jews?"5

As has been indicated, examination of the bulk of Jewish educational and related literature (other than that of the ultra-orthodox) compels one to propose the generalization that progressivism, as an all-encompassing reconstructive potential force in Jewish education, had been arrested to a noticeable degree during this period rather than being totally rejected. To be more specific, the evidence, literary and otherwise, spells out the following developments.

At the same time that the "Commission on New Approaches to American Jewish Education" was examining the ills of American Jewish education, at work on the American scene were significant sociological changes which were to defeat, at least temporarily,
the implementation of a concept of community as the community-oriented Jewish educator or as the Reconstructionists had hoped for. Kehillah and Kelal Yisrael were being proven more illusory than real. Totalitarianism and the threat to Jewish survival on the international scene served to strengthen the cause for organized Jewish religion centered around the synagogue. Also, the movement of Jews to newer parts of major cities and to "Suburbia" were playing a significant role focusing the Jews' energies upon the new "synagogue-center" and the "religious schools" attached to it. With Jewish physical survival being threatened, reversion to tradition, mysticism and ritualism as well as the trend toward denominational religionism became evident as an important aspect of the effort to preserve the essentials of Judaism in America. The synagogue, ready or not, became the logical symbolic home of refuge for American Jewry and, in so doing, came to meet a great need. Saving the remnant of European Jewry and establishing a Jewish State became all-consuming passions of American Jewry in transition. Also, and more so today, Jewish spiritual survival in America, in terms of the preservation of Jewish identity and of basic religious forms and values, was taking on increasing importance. "Adjustment to the environment" was no longer sufficient as a primary goal of Jewish education. "Creative struggle with the environment"—whether it be Hitlerism, Great Britain or assimilation—was becoming the more and more widely accepted objective, one which was assuming priority status even with most of the more liberal Jewish educators.

There was no longer any question but that Jewish education,
at least on the elementary level, was becoming increasingly
congregational in nature. The congregational school and the
Orthodox day school were challenging the suzerainty of the
Talmud Torah and secular Jewish school; the traditional de-
nomination-oriented educator was challenging the leadership of
the progressive and community-oriented Jewish educator. Never-
theless, as has been noted, notwithstanding the great changes
in the configuration of the American Jewish community brought
on by the so-called "religious revival" which became unmistakingly
apparent after World War II, indications of progressivism's
influence at many levels and with all interpretations and move-
ments, excepting the ultra-orthodox, within American Jewry existed.

When the statements of spokesmen for the various ideologies
of American Jewish life are examined as they spoke out on Jewish
education during this period, it seems that the educational
point of view most in agreement with progressivism-as-a-whole
was that of Reconstructionism, writ large. There was and is a
definite affinity between Mordecai M. Kaplan's conception of
what Jewish education should be and the social reconstructionist
variety of educational progressivism. This does not mean to say
that a one-to-one correspondence existed between the two philosop-
phies after the factors of Jewish uniqueness are eliminated from
the comparison. The key to the high degree of correspondence is
the Reconstructionist's espousal of a naturalistic-pragmatic
view of reality. This "Reconstructionist-progressivist congruence"
is best exemplified in various articles in The Reconstructionist
and in articles and proposals put forth by men such as Rabbi Jack
J. Cohen:
Even more necessary, however, is philosophical treatment of what actually occurs in our classrooms. Can it be said that American Jewish education is relevant to the lives of our children? Does it address itself to their problems and to those of their society? Without being tendentious, does it nonetheless use the universalism and vitality of the Jewish tradition to cast light on contemporary life? Is Jewish education a rejection of the values of American life, a too ready acceptance of them, or a denial that there are any points of difference between them and those of Jewish tradition? What are the implications of the ethics of Judaism for the problems of automation? What contribution can our theological heritage offer to the current reassessment of the idea of God, forced upon man by the advances of science? Do we help our children understand their Christian environment and do we impart to them a healthy respect for the differences between Jewish religion and Christianity?...

If pluralism means anything, it means that educationally speaking, the right to hold a point of view is dependent on the willingness of its proponent to offer it in the open market of ideas for acceptance and criticism. Now the Jewish day school, at least in the Jewish phases of curriculum, shuts off inquiry. On the spurious argument religious behavior requires uniformity of presentation, we organize our whole Jewish educational system along denominational lines... It is time we subject our day school curricula to a critical appraisal in the light of our democratic commitment... A determination of Jewish education to harmonize belief in free inquiry with the desire to insure the creative survival of the Jewish people would transform Jewish education overnight... Certainly there is room for orthodox or liberal responses of all kinds, provided only they exhibit a healthy respect for evidence and for the child's right to exercise his own mind... American Jewry needs an equivalent to halutziyut to hold its youth. Personal fulfillment must somehow be tied in with social purpose.

In addition to Michael D. Alper's summary of the approach developed by Kaplan, Jack J. Cohen, Eugene Kohn, Ira Eisenstein and others less active in the Reconstructionist movement, pronouncements by Kaplan's followers in both the Conservative and Reform wings of American Judaism also reflect a rather strong progressive bias. In the case of Reconstructionist Jewish education, it is safe to say that much of the progressive position, especially of the social reconstructionist variety, has been affirmed because
basic philosophical conflict does not exist.

Another segment of American Jewry, whose educational approach incorporates many progressive tenets but is less totally progressive than that of Reconstructionism, is Reform Judaism. Wherein is Reform educational thinking less progressive than that of the Reconstructionists? The answer seems to lie in the area of theology. Though a significant number of Reform educational thinkers espouse the naturalistic theology and view of reality characteristic of Reconstructionism, supernaturalistic conceptions of God are supported, defended and affirmed to a considerable degree by Reform educators and rabbinic leaders. Some excerpts from "An Outline of The Curriculum for the Jewish Religious School," published by the Commission on Jewish Education and edited by Rabbi Eugene B. Borowitz (1962-1963) will serve to illustrate this point.

Section 1 - Philosophy (from "Guiding Principles of Reform Judaism," adopted by the Central Conference of American Rabbis, May 27, 1937, Columbus, Ohio)

2. God. The heart of Judaism and its chief contribution is the doctrine of the One, living God, who rules the world through law and love. In Him all existence has its creative source and mankind its ideal of conduct. Though transcending time and space, He is the indwelling Presence of the World. We worship Him as the Lord of the universe and as our merciful Father.

Section 1 - Philosophy (from "Guiding Principles of the Commission on Jewish Education," prepared by Dr. Solomon B. Freehof)

It is our duty in the education of adults and children to establish a firm conviction of God's presence. His beneficent governance of the universe, His infinity yet His nearness to every searching heart. This is the aim of all our education and the test of its effectiveness.

We learn of God's revelation and of His mandate to us in the pages of Sacred Scripture. God's blessing is over all His creatures and all are duty
bound to worship Him. But in an idolatrous world
Israel covenanted with God to maintain the purity of the worship of Him and to keep the faith unsullied through the ages. . .

Ultimately no subject belongs in our curriculum which is not a step nearer to the presence of the Eternal God, nor is any subject properly planned which is not a step towards a life-long devotion to Him. 10

Section II - Goals

 Obviously, this generation . . .

VIII. Theology

Knowledge: this development.

1. An understanding of the basic religious problems
   Conservation, which have universally concerned mankind, etc., the Nature of God, the Nature of Man, the relationship of God and Man, etc. 11

Section III - Scope and Sequence

Teaching About God

There is no specific subject designation for teaching about God. That does not mean that God is not taught in this Curriculum, but only that the Commission has made a curricular decision that He is not to be taught as a single subject among other subjects. . . For both pedagogic and religious reasons, we believe that teaching about God is best done indirectly, though with firm purpose, through the entire Curriculum. The literature and the history, the ethics and the observances, which go to make up Torah provide us the concrete and practical situations in which we may come to know and learn about God. Knowing the background of our religious people and participating in its life today renews for us the sense of our continuing Covenant with God and provides us with the living context in which we may understand our relations to Him better. 12

Nevertheless, in most aspects of philosophy of education, curriculum development, methodology, supervision and administration, Reform Jewish education, as reflected in printed curricula, articles in The Jewish Teacher and, to a lesser degree, in articles in the C.C.A.R. Journal, is progressive in spirit and its overall approach to Jewish education. Whether this is because of the nature of "Liberal Judaism," or because the curriculum is less
Hebraic than others, or because those who direct Reform Jewish education are more in the mainstream of American education is an important question to answer. One interesting piece of potential evidence is that there are indications that some attempts at Reform Hebraic education have been far from progressive in many instances. Obviously, this generalization is conjectural in nature, and additional empirical investigation would help in evaluating this development.

Conservative Jewish education's stance vis a vis educational progressivism presents somewhat of an enigma. In many of its writings, including curricular statements and outlines developed in the forties and fifties, it is seemingly dedicated to certain phases of the progressive credo. However, it must be remembered that, by its nature, Conservative Judaism has tended to be eclectic and inconsistent in many areas and has been quite sensitive to changes in the mood and the tempo of the times. This sensitivity and eclecticism may have been a most important facet of Conservative Judaism's strength over the years. Nonetheless, in the areas of methodology, administration and supervision Conservative Jewish education, at least in theory, has been in the main committed to implementing many of the principles and innovations of educational progressivism. This tendency has been reflected more in the periodical, The Synagogue School, than in the more scholarly journal, Conservative Judaism. One might surmise that Conservative Jewish educators, many of whom had been influenced directly or indirectly by Mordecai M. Kaplan, lean more to a progressive-Reconstructionist position than their rabbinic counterparts, especially more than those who have had
a voice in recent years at the Jewish Theological Seminary. There
are certain indications that, whereas Conservative Jewish educa-
tion was beginning to be molded in the progressive-Reconstructionist
image in the thirties and early forties, essentialism and, in
some cases, even neo-mysticism and educational perennialism as
championed by Robert M. Hutchins, are now gaining more and more
respect in Conservative educational circles. However, "moderate"
or "middle-of-the-road" positions seem to have emerged in the
sixties, positions embracing elements of progressivism, essential-
ism and perennialism positions that make a bold attempt to merge
the classical and the "traditional" with aspects of the progres-
sive position that gained general acceptance and with findings
and emphases of the new approaches to teaching "content,"
"concepts," and principles which have made a serious impact on
general education. Extensive excerpts from two sources will
be presented to document these trends. In the spring of 1964,
Dr. Joseph Schwab presented a paper entitled, "The Religiously
Oriented School in the United States: A Memorandum on Policy."
Appearing first in Conservative Judaism, the essay was re-
printed by the Melton Research Center in cooperation with the
United Synagogue Commission on Education. In the reprint the
background of the paper is explained by Rabbi Seymour Fox, then
Associate Dean of the Teachers Institute of the Jewish Theological
Seminary of America. The background statement and excerpts of
significance from the paper itself will now be entered into the
historical record:

Members of the Faculty of the Teachers Institute of the Jewish Theological Seminary, meeting as the Melton Faculty Seminar, have spent three years exploring the
goals of Jewish education. In addition, a group of specialists in the behavioral sciences has joined the Center as an Advisory Board. Together the Seminar and the Board, under the directorship of Louis Newman and with the cooperation of the United Synagogue Commission on Education, have taken steps that we hope, will have desirable consequences for Jewish education.

The staff of the Center was therefore to have been invited by Conservative Judaism to make public through its pages, reports on its work: statements on the goals of Jewish education; developments of specific projects; or descriptions of the results of experimentation. We begin by offering for publication an article by the Chairman of the Academic Board, Professor Joseph J. Schwab, William Painey Harper, Professor of Natural Sciences and Professor of Education at the University of Chicago. Professor Schwab has served as a consultant to Camp Ramah for six years and to the Teachers Institute for four years. In his capacity as Chairman of the Melton Academic Board, Dr. Schwab was one of a group of Jewish and non-Jewish educators called in for consultation regarding a problem of Jewish day school education in Philadelphia... Dr. Schwab's response to the problem set down in his memorandum contains more than a suggestion for the specific day school problem. It is a penetrating analysis of a problem that is relevant to all facets of Jewish education.

What must an education do to prepare men to function in such a world? First, it must impart, as now, the bodies of knowledge and skill generally agreed to be of value: language, mathematics, science, history, and so forth. The fact that bodies of knowledge are subject to change does not alter the fact that they are, at any given moment, the best available basis for understanding and solving problems.

But with this established knowledge and skill must come an array of special skills and special knowledge which will enable men to cope with the kinds of change and novelty we have described. First, since bodies of knowledge are limited in scope and subject to revision, they must be so taught and learned that their limitations are seen and the learner is prepared for the possibility of change. This means that they should be taught, not as delivered truths but as outcomes of enquiry.

In a world which exhibits many different models and codes, something more is needed: a rational as well as a conditioned hold... This means that every act of teaching, quizzing and testing conveys the idea that adequate learning and knowing consist, not of being able to repeat what is learned but of the ability to use it, apply it, modify it...
A signal service might well be done by any group which thoroughly and thoughtfully established a school curriculum which successfully supplied these needs. For many groups, the first move in such service would have to be the manufacture of a lineage and the invention of a day-to-day structure of ritual and action which would have a place for linkage. Judaism, by contrast, is conspicuously marked by an existing lineage and tradition of ... linkage which have been kept flexible and adapted to changing times, places, and conditions.\(^{17}\)

Rational enquiry is not a process of moving from a vacuum or a chaos to solutions to problems, but one of moving from extant material to its useful applications. Thus, an existing or traditional body of material is a highly desirable, if not a necessary part of the idea of tradition that it be treated as immovable and immutable.

The program of instruction in the milieu suggested above should be considered as consisting of two components—tradition-centered activities (learning of ritual, participation in prayer, Hebrew, religious and Jewish-cultural stories and literature, etc.) and secular activities. The tradition-centered activities should be treated (and presented to the child) as extensions of its significant adults, that is, as habits, attitudes, characteristics, or treasured possessions of the teacher and, where possible, parents. These matters will, then, be participated in by the child as a privileged sharing of the adult world, not queried, or "whyed." That is, they become instances of linkage; since doing them becomes the privilege of sharing in the adult world, they become wanted and sought.\(^{18}\)

In the introduction to The Heritage of Biblical Israel by Dr. Nahum Sarna,\(^{19}\) the first substantial publication of the Melton Research Center, Rabbi Seymour Fox discusses the new approach to teaching "content" and "concepts" as it applies to Jewish education:

Those concerned with American education have recognized for some years now that one of its major weaknesses has been in the preparation and presentation of the formal subject materials of the curriculum...

In an attempt to alter this situation in the American schools, millions of dollars were invested to bring together teachers, behavioral scientists and scholars from the various subject areas to prepare new materials that will combine both an effective
pedagogical approach and an adequate treatment of the subject matter. No such development has taken place in the Jewish field. Our situation must be regarded as even more urgent since for several subjects in the curriculum of the Jewish school we have absolutely no materials. It is true that had the teacher the time and inclination to read the many scholarly journals and the many volumes that have been written about the Bible, Jewish history, and Jewish thought, he might be able to extract the relevant ideas from the scholarly work, and translate them into the language and experience level of the child. Very few teachers are sufficiently prepared or have the energy and time.

The influence of the entrance into Conservative educational circles of Jewish educators with an Orthodox orientation may have contributed to the more traditional trend now seemingly present. Notwithstanding this apparent metamorphosis in a particular direction, many of the Solomon Schechter Day Schools still refer to themselves as "progressive day schools." It would seem that the stance of Conservative Judaism, as it pertains to a philosophy and approach to Jewish education, definitely needs further critical investigation although the studies of Conservative Jewish education by Louis Katzoff,21 of the development of the curriculum of the Conservative religious school by Lerman,22 and of the totality of the Conservative movement by Sklare,23 throw some light upon the factors behind the eclecticism and the changes in its tempo and mood during the last thirty years.

Finally, a most interesting if not entirely unexpected development in the literature is the introduction of some aspects of progressivism in the area of methodology and the acceptance of certain progressive principles of education in the Torah u-Mesorah schools and in independent schools as "Ramaz" in New York23a and in the more modern orthodox supplementary schools.
Evidence of this tendency is found in a limited number of articles published in Yeshiva Education and in Orthodox Jewish Life. References to student guidance, to personality development and to the commitment to educate the "whole child" seem to be found more and more in contributions made to the two periodicals previously mentioned. What this phenomenon may in reality represent is difficult to ascertain. Whether it is a resultant of contact with the American environment, especially the educational sector, or whether it is a sign of "liberalization" of "modern orthodoxy," or whether it is a sign of the attempt to modernize orthodox Jewish day school education, so that, at least in the general studies area, it may compete with public education is open to discussion and serious study. Even though there is a lack of a clear-cut explanation, based on evidence found in some of its educational pronouncements, "modern orthodox" Jewish education has been touched to a limited degree by the spirit and some of the insights of educational progressivism.

The more one examines what was occurring in Jewish educational thought, the more one is able to affirm that, if nothing else, the stranglehold of obscurantist educational traditionalism (not to be confused with the respect for Jewish religious and cultural tradition) was truly being brought to an end during this period of reappraisal. This was happening even while certain fads and facets of the progressive approach were being rejected by a number of Jews—educators, rabbis and laymen. Much of what was written and the jargon of Jewish educators of a variety of persuasions was sprinkled unabashedly with concepts, principles, ideas and techniques first put forth by the progres-
sivists. Further documentation of the somewhat muted but continued progressive surge (of the "purist" genre or of the social reconstructionist type), or of more conservative or critical evaluations, or of suggestions for a more socially-oriented or "tough-minded" progressivism as proposed by Dr. Cremin, are readily available. However, no attempt will be made to do so at this time since the nature and amount of material merits concerted and meticulous study. In the concluding statement, an attempt will be made to summarize the overall impact of progressive education on Jewish education in America, past and present. Also some of the problems and possibilities for the future of the progressive approach vis a vis Jewish education will be discussed in the context of the crisis facing American Jewry and the crisis facing an American society dedicated to liberty, justice, freedom under law, the democratic process, the dignity of the individual and the brotherhood of man in these times of uncertainty, turmoil, polarization and extremism, revolution and anarchy, reaction and repression, and anxiety and alienation. The findings of the survey that follows will serve to provide additional evidence of some of the generalizations alluded to in this overview of developments in regard to the relationship of progressivism to Jewish education in America during the forties, fifties and early sixties.
NOTES

1. See chapter III of this dissertation.

2. Cremin, The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957, chapter 9, pp. 328-353. Also see the bibliographical note concerning this phenomenon which is included at the end of Cremin's work, pp. 385-387.


4. Ibid., pp. ii, iv, v-vi.

5. Ibid., pp. 39-40.


7. See Alper, Michael D, Reconstructing Jewish Education (New York: The Reconstructionist Press, 1957). For a detailed summary of the relationship of progressivism to the Reconstructionist philosophy and program for Jewish education as developed by Dr. Kaplan over the years.


9. Ibid., p. 3.

10. Ibid., pp. 7-8.


12. Ibid., p. 19.

13. Schwab, Joseph, "The Religiously Oriented School in the United States: A Memorandum on Policy," Conservative Judaism, vol. XVIII (Spring 1964), pp. 3-14, reprinted by the Melton Research Center (pp. 1-14). Citations from reprint. Excerpts from two of the later statements concerning the evolving nature of Conservative Jewish education best exemplify these tendencies becoming more and more prevalent at the higher echelons of Conservative educational thinking.
The extensive nature of the citations, limited to two authoritative sources, is necessary so that there will be sufficient evidence that no misrepresentation has taken place.


22. Lerman, *op. cit.*


Chapter VII - Section B

Survey of Greater Philadelphia Jewish Elementary Schools
(1963-1964 School Year)

In order to investigate the contemporary status of progressive thinking and practice at the Jewish elementary school level, a survey of Greater Philadelphia Jewish schools was undertaken. The survey entailed three distinct operations: (1) direct interviews with classroom teachers; (2) direct interviews with educational directors, principals or their equivalent; (3) standardized observations (checklist) of the classes of the interviewed teachers.

A. The Universe, the Sample and the Sampling Technique.

At the outset of the study certain procedural questions were asked: Should all levels of the Jewish educational enterprise--nursery and kindergarten, elementary, secondary (intensive and extensive), Hebrew Teachers College, etc. --be explored? Also, should all types of Jewish schools--Yiddish, Talmud Torahs, day schools, Orthodox, Conservative, Reform--be visited? Fourth, are all "education-related" personnel--rabbis, teachers, educational directors, school boards, congregation presidents, student representatives, parents of students and members of the PTA--to participate in the survey? The answers to these questions were pivotal in defining and delimiting the nature of the study as it was eventually carried out in its final form.
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It was determined that, for the purposes of the present study, not all Jewish schools in Greater Philadelphia could be surveyed. According to the "Directory of Jewish Religious Schools," in the Greater Philadelphia area ninety-nine different schools were conducting classes (not including nursery schools, extensive post-Bar Mitzvah classes, or adult education classes as separate units).

The schools were divided as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>No. of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservative Elementary</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reform Sunday and Weekday</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folkshein</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workmen's Circle (including High School)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew Sunday School Society (including High School)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbinical Association (Orthodox)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaffiliated</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Schools</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Hebrew Schools and Yeshivos (Talmud Torahs)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative High Schools (Regional and Institutional)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew Teachers College (Gratz)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Observation and Practice (Elementary)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Department</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac Meyer Wise Department (Reform)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Department</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>99</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Schools not in the immediate suburban areas were eliminated. It was further decided, even at the risk of losing some of the representativeness of the data, to (a) visit only elementary schools, (b) to select for investigation the two largest systems of schools—Board of Jewish Education Schools (United Synagogue—Conservative) and Federation of Reform Synagogue Schools, and (c) to visit schools of each system on the basis of a twenty per cent stratified sample. The above delimitations made the study feasible and realistic as
related to the amount of time available for collecting the data.

After discussions with expert educational personnel, it was decided to sub-divide the schools of the two major systems into three categories based on differences in the size of their student populations as of the Fall of 1963. Thus, the schools affiliated with the Board of Jewish Education (BJE) were sub-divided as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>No. of Students</th>
<th>No. of Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>44 to 176</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>177 to 400</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>401 to 1072</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31 Total(^3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated by the "twenty percent formula," two schools were chosen from category A, three from category B, two from category C—a total of seven schools of 22.6% of BJE schools included in the universe being investigated. Within each of the categories, the schools to be studied were chosen completely at random. The same type of stratification was undertaken in regard to schools affiliated with the Federation of Reform Synagogues (FRS):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>No. of Students</th>
<th>No. of Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>165 to 221</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>327 to 540</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>630 to 1508</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11 Total(^3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In accordance with the "twenty percent formula," one school was chosen completely at random from each of the three categories—a total of three schools or 27.3% of FRS schools included in the universe being investigated.

Also, two elementary day schools (one of Orthodox orientation, the other endorsed by the Philadelphia Branches of the United Synagogue and Rabbinical Assembly) as well as a supplementary elementary school conducted by the Hebrew Teachers College were selected. All in all, a total of thirteen schools were chosen for visitation and observation.

Investigation of every class in each of the thirteen schools as well as discussions with all "education-related" personnel was considered out of the question. However, the following approach was determined as satisfactory for the purposes of this research project: Two classes, one at the eight year old level (Aleph in Conservative congregational schools, Third grade in Reform congregational schools) and one at the eleven year old level (Daled in Conservative congregational schools, Sixth grade in Reform congregational schools) were to be visited by the investigator. In the case in which two or more classes existed at a given level in a selected school, the class to be visited was randomly chosen from among the existing possibilities. Half-hour observations and an interview with the teacher of the class of about twenty minutes duration took place. In addition, a more lengthy interview with the principal, educational director or rabbi responsible for the educational program of the school was conducted.

It must be admitted that the research process outlined above is quite crude. First, the universe that was studied, though multi-
colored and varied, cannot be assumed to be representative of the
total universe of American Jewish schools since it was geographically
limited to Greater Philadelphia Jewish schools. Extrapolation from
any and all findings must therefore be extremely tenuous. Second, by
delimiting the universe and eliminating from it various types of schools,
the overall sampling becomes even less representative of the universe
of American Jewish schools. Third, in visiting only approximately 25%
of the schools remaining in the delimited universe, further risk of
misrepresenting the true picture was taken.

From another vantage point, once the schools were selected,
certain additional problems arose. Many questions remain and a
multitude of factors entered the picture which most certainly limit
the validity of the findings. Viewing the results from the point of
view of the comparability of responses, we would expect that the
responses of the educational directors would be most significant.
However, the gnawing question as to whether or not these educational
leaders truly reflect in their daily practice the ideas and points-of-
view subscribed to during the interviews remains unanswered. The
problems related to comparability of data and how to minimize the
effect of additional unaccounted-for variables take on even greater
magnitude when an attempt is made to compare data from teacher-
interviews and classroom observations. Can classes in two different
schools in any instance be compared? Does the selection of classes
and teachers as outlined above allow for comparability? Can schools
with different objectives and philosophical outlooks be compared?
What are the common attributes that all teachers possess that allow
for comparison of their responses?

Furthermore, since each class is unique and different from every other class, generally and at the given moment of observation, and since the presence of the investigator acts as a contaminating factor, the comparison of classes and schools based on the results of the observations is extremely dangerous. Also, because similar but different questions were asked of teachers and educational directors, it is apparent that the comparability of their responses may be limited.

The limitations of the selection and research procedures are quite obvious. These limitations of necessity prohibit giving the results of the survey any stamp of comprehensive, general validity. The process outlined above and described in more detail below was devised as an experimental process, as a possible means of gathering potentially significant data. No excuses are to be made for its shortcomings. The approach was used because it was felt that it may have worth and might possibly contribute to the overall study. One hopes that it will be evaluated in the spirit of scientific research and exploration as well as in the light of its acknowledged inadequacies.

B. The Formulation, Refinement and Administration of the Interview Schedules and Observation Checklist.

An exhaustive study of "progressive" and "progressively-oriented" educational literature had been undertaken to serve as a basis both for this contemporary survey as well as for the analysis of Jewish educational literature utilized to trace the influence of progressive ideas and practices on Jewish educational thought and
This analysis provided 101 potential items to be included in the interview schedule. These items (statements of principle and practice) were classified into the following categories: philosophy of education; curriculum and curriculum development; methodology and psychology of learning; administration and supervision. The items included many "anti-progressive" statements as well as "progressively-oriented" items.

All 101 items were read to members of a graduate Thesis Seminar. With the help of the members of the Seminar, many items were completely discarded, others refined and re-written. Thirty items were finally selected to be used in the interview with the educational director of an area synagogue school not included in the study. These items dealt with philosophy of education, curriculum and curriculum development, administration and supervision. Likewise, twenty-seven items, in the areas of methodology and psychology of learning, were selected to be used with teachers in the "pilot school" mentioned above.

A series of "response categories" were defined and listed on a card so as to attempt to standardize the responses and make them comparable. The card was used by the respondents in determining their responses. The "response categories" as listed on the card were as follows:

1. Agreement--complete or general agreement
2. Partial Agreement--a. mainly agree, but there is a point of disagreement
   Which one? Why?
   b. mainly disagree, but there are one or two points with which you agree
3. Disagreement--complete or general disagreement
   Why?
4. No Answer--language too technical
do not have enough information to venture opinion
   Which one?
Also, two series of "definitions" were formulated at the Thesis Seminar, one for the "educational director form" and one for the "teacher form." These definitions were also written on cards and can be found in the Appendix. As a result of the "pilot study," the "educational director interview" was limited to twenty-six refined items and the "teacher interview" to twenty refined items.

The following statement (with minor deviations) was used as the standard introduction to both the educational director's and teacher's interview session:

"As you know, I'm engaged in research in Jewish education as part of my doctoral dissertation being written at Dropsie College.

"All information and opinions given will be entirely confidential. No names will be mentioned in the study. Also, this study will not be used to evaluate a school or a teacher in terms of "good" or "bad." Information collected from interviews and observations will be used statistically to attempt to describe current educational ideas and practices. Your frankest opinions would be most helpful.

"There are a few questions to which I need answers before we begin the interview itself. Would you please answer them to the best of your ability?

(Introductory, background questions)

"I would appreciate your reading carefully the following statements and telling me whether or not you agree, partially agree, disagree with them or have no answer.

(Show "response category" card)

"Do you have any questions?

"When you read the statements you may see some underlined words or phrases. Definitions of these words and phrases will be presented on cards. I would appreciate your using these definitions in responding to the statements. Let me know if you disagree with the definition and why you disagree with it. Also, if you disagree completely or partially with the statement, I would appreciate knowing
Also, two series of "definitions" were formulated at the Thesis Seminar, one for the "educational director form" and one for the "teacher form." These definitions were also written on cards and can be found in the Appendix. As a result of the "pilot study," the "educational director interview" was limited to twenty-six refined items and the "teacher interview" to twenty refined items.

The following statement (with minor deviations) was used as the standard introduction to both the educational director's and teacher's interview session:

"As you know, I'm engaged in research in Jewish education as part of my doctoral dissertation being written at Dropsie College.

All information and opinions given will be entirely confidential. No names will be mentioned in the study. Also, this study will not be used to evaluate a school or a teacher in terms of "good" or "bad." Information collected from interviews and observations will be used statistically to attempt to describe current educational ideas and practices. Your frankest opinions would be most helpful.

"There are a few questions to which I need answers before we begin the interview itself. Would you please answer them to the best of your ability?

(Introductory, background questions)

"I would appreciate your reading carefully the following statements and telling me whether or not you agree, partially agree, disagree with them or have no answer.

(Show "response category" card)

"Do you have any questions?

"When you read the statements you may see some underlined words or phrases. Definitions of these words and phrases will be presented on cards. I would appreciate your using these definitions in responding to the statements. Let me know if you disagree with the definition and why you disagree with it. Also, if you disagree completely or partially with the statement, I would appreciate knowing..."
which aspect of it is disturbing to you."

Cooperation from participating schools \(^{10}\) and their educational directors, principals and rabbis was excellent. Interviews with teachers were held before and after classes, and, at times, schedules and teacher assignments were changed in order to accommodate the interviewer. Appointments were made with educational directors and principals, some during school sessions (part-time personnel), and others before school sessions had begun (full-time personnel). Though there were interruptions and delays and though sometimes an interview had to be completed on another day, all interviews were completed successfully.

The observation checklist (see Appendix) was lengthy and quite comprehensive. It was formulated through discussions at the Thesis Seminar, through conferences with Dr. William Chomsky, chairman of the writer's faculty committee, and refined during the "pilot study." Results and limitations of the observation checklist have already been alluded to, but they will be discussed in more detail later.

C. The Interview--Educational Directors (Principals, Rabbis)

In order to better understand and interpret the responses of the educational directors or their equivalents and to attempt to find possible relationships between their responses and their experiential and educational backgrounds, certain specific questions were asked of all interviewees. The answers to these questions were thought to be potentially significant in aiding in the understanding of the activities and atmosphere of the school under consideration as well as in
comprehending the context of the practices and thinking of the teachers.

1. Status in School--Three respondents were full-time educational directors, six were part-time principals, three were rabbis (no principal employed). 11

2. Years at Present Position--The respondents had been in their present position from one (just beginning) to fourteen years, nine of the twelve having been six or less years in the position. Of these nine, three were in their first year.

3. Age--The respondents ranged in age from their thirties to their fifties. Three were in the thirties; seven in the forties; two in the fifties.

4. Jewish Educational Background--Three respondents were ordained rabbis; one had a Bachelor of Hebrew Literature degree from Gratz College; two were graduates of the Teachers Institute of the Jewish Theological Seminary; two had a degree of Bachelor of Hebrew Pedagogy from the Teachers Institute of Yeshiva University; two had received Teachers' Certificates from Gratz College; one had received a Diploma from the Jewish Theological Seminary Israel Friedlander Classes (now the Seminary School of Adult Jewish Studies); one was educated in congregational schools in the Philadelphia area; one was in the process of getting certification in an "In-Service Program for Teachers in Reform Religious Schools" at Gratz College.

5. General Educational Background--One principal did
not have any general educational degree although courses
had been taken at Teachers College, Columbia University,
and at the New School for Social Research; three had BA or
BS degrees (two of these were rabbis); eight had Masters'
degrees in education, psychology, or educational adminis-
tration; four were working towards degrees of Ph.D.

6. Jewish Teaching Licenses--One respondent had a
Principal's License (National); one a "B" license; one
a "C" license (Phila.); one a "Provisional D" license (Phila.);
one a license (no rating given - Phila.); seven had no license
whatsoever. Three respondents were members of the
National Council for Jewish Education.

7. Additional Background Concerning Selected Schools--
a. Number of Students--The number of students
in the selected schools ranged from 138 to 805, the median
being 273 students.

b. Range of Classes--The range of classes in
Reform religious schools was Kindergarten to Sixth grade
in two and First to Sixth in the other. In Conservative
schools, two schools had classes from Primary (six-seven
year olds) to Heh (Fifth grade), four schools, Kindergarten
(five year olds) to Heh and one school had a range of Kinder-
garten to Daled. The range in the day schools was Kinder-
garten to Vav (Sixth grade) in one, Nursery to Daled (Fourth)
in the other. The supplementary school sponsored by the
Hebrew Teachers College had a range of Primary to Heh.

c. Grade Distribution of Classes--Two schools had only one section of each grade; the others mostly two sections of each grade; some of the larger schools had from four to seven sections at a given grade level.

d. License Status of Teachers--Most teachers had "C", "D" and Special Public School Teachers' Licenses or were being urged to apply for licenses. "A" and "B" licenses were glaringly absent.

e. Eight schools had both intensive and extensive programs, three had only intensive programs.

f. Five schools had "mixed" groupings, five had a "double track" system and three had homogeneous groups at varying levels.

Responses to Individual Items

As has been explained earlier, those interviewed could respond in four different manners: total agreement, total disagreement, partial agreement, no answer. Since an explanation was asked for in cases of partial agreement, the writer was able to evaluate the reasons for partial agreement and thus determine whether or not the respondent's answer tended toward either the category of "agreement" (Ag) or of "disagreement" (Ds). The writer used his judgment in instances of "partial agreement" and attempted to be as unbiased as possible.

Certain instances of "partial agreement" were considered to tend in neither direction. The reasons for "partial agreement" and "disagree-
ment" were also recorded and were of value in the interpretation of the responses. For reasons of clarity the responses of the educational directors will be grouped into three major areas: philosophy of education, curriculum development and administration and supervision.

I. Philosophy of Education

As was determined in the case of all items, a progressive orientation was indicated by either agreeing or disagreeing with a given statement or by indicating some variety of "partial agreement." The following item elicited the greatest acceptance:

"21. Since we wish our society to be as democratic as possible, pupils must be educated in democratic thinking and conduct."

Eleven of twelve respondents agreed completely with the statement (91.67%). Three items achieved an 83.33% consensus: #4, #7, #28. Seventy-five percent disagreed with item #16 and agreed with item #2. Two items showed complete disagreement in seven of twelve cases (items #11 and #14). The items which commanded the greatest consensus (in a progressive direction) were those dealing with democratic thinking and conduct (#21), non-acceptance of intact transmission of the American heritage without critical analysis and the acceptance of using the school to build a new America (#4); the acceptance of change, the relativity of truth and the tentative nature of knowledge (#7); and characteristics of American education--co-ed classroom, etc. (#28). Those items exhibiting the greatest variation of response dealt with:

(1) change, relativity of truth, tentativeness of knowledge, and the natural as opposed to the supernatural as it affects Judaism (#11), and
(2) the relationship of the human mind to ultimate faith and belief (#14).

A traditionalist bias on the part of some (a significant minority) as related to a philosophy of Judaism and as reflected in Jewish education seems to be evident in these latter instances. It may be that in some cases a dichotomy in thinking exists between conceptions of general education and those of Jewish education. In other words, the context influences the degree of progressive thinking espoused. An intermediate item, #2, may indicate the ambivalence present. This item dealt with the importance of taking into consideration reliable evidence in the educative process, even in the religious educational process. Nine of the twelve respondents agreed with the statement. Those that disagreed mentioned that religious truths are not necessarily testable, i.e., that reliable evidence need not be a factor in determining religious truths, and that changes are to take place infrequently, reliable evidence not being an important criterion. The negation of reliable evidence in the realm of religion, the unquestioning acceptance of the authority of a supernatural tradition, the suspicion of change and of the relativity of truth and of the use of the human intellect as these are related to matters of faith and belief all point to an anti-progressive orientation when a philosophy of religious education is considered. The conflict between religious naturalism and traditional supernatural dogmas may be reflected in the responses to those items. However, the fact that "progressivism" is generally accepted, especially in the area of general educational thinking is buttressed by the responses to item #16.

"16. Progressive education suffers from aimlessness
and lacks real values; it is beyond repair."

Nine respondents completely disagreed with this statement, one "partially agreed" ("has its drawbacks, but we can learn from it"), and one "partially agreed" and tended toward disagreement. The matter of ambivalence, dichotomous thinking, inconsistency, etc. will be discussed further when the responses from given individual interviewees will be looked at as a total syndrome.

II. Curriculum and Curriculum Development

Items in this area may reflect a philosophy of education or they may reflect reality (what exists). They may also be indicative of the conflict between practice and ideal conceptions. The following table summarizes answers to statements in this area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Agree (100%)</th>
<th>Disagree (91.67%)</th>
<th>Partial Ag. (91.67%)</th>
<th>Partial Ag. (83.33%)</th>
<th>Partial Dis. (83.33%)</th>
<th>Partial Dis. (91.67%)</th>
<th>Partial Dis. (100%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>11 (91.67%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>11 (91.67%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10 (83.33%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>10 (83.33%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 (75%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9 (75%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6 (50%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 (50%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses to the various items show an interesting variation. On the one hand unanimity exists in regard to correlation or grouping together of subjects—all feel it a commendable practice (#15). On the other hand, only one-half of the respondents completely reject the advisability of promoting the use of a "course of study which is logically
organized and which specifically states the subjects and texts to be used, the exact pages to be covered, and the time per week to devote to the subject" (#12), a course of study which would do little to encourage correlation of subjects. Though 83.33% of the educational directors agree with the progressive conception of curriculum ("3. The curriculum is the total living of the child insofar as the school can influence it or should take responsibility of influencing it."), 50% (including a "Partial [Ag]") agree that activities, clubs, trips, assemblies, etc., "are much less important than the conventional classroom procedures." (#8). This may be only a statement of priorities as demanded by reality, or it may represent a narrow conception of curriculum which is in opposition to the conception espoused in item #3. Generally speaking, however, the majority of respondents seemed predisposed to accept progressive innovations in regard to curriculum development as evidenced by their affirmation of the inclusion of individual student guidance in the curriculum (#13) and of the utilization of audio-visual aids and the fostering of creative expression in the program of the Jewish school (#17); by their support of a point of view that looks at curriculum building as a joint and cooperative endeavor involving lay people and educator, teachers and rabbis (#22); by their acceptance of the use of student experiences, interests and needs in curriculum formulation (#5); and by their acknowledgement of innovations at all levels as having validity (#26).

III. Administration and Supervision

A greater degree of consensus seemed to exist
in this area than in the preceding areas. Four items, reflecting a progressive orientation, elicited almost unanimous complete agreement:

Table II (See Appendix)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Partial (Ag)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These items dealt with goals, functions, and methods of supervision and administration. Items dealing with the stimulation of leadership on the part of others (#19) and the fostering of professional growth and creative teaching (#27) achieved complete unanimity of agreement. Items describing the most modern conceptions of supervision (#30) and the formulation of educational policy (#25) received an extremely high degree of consensus. One other item (#1) affirming the role of the faculty in the over-all decision-making process, also achieved a high degree of consensus (seven "complete" agreements, five "partial" agreements in the direction of "agreement"). If "complete" agreements are combined with "partials in the same direction," it would seem that there exists in the area of supervision and administration a higher degree of progressively-oriented thinking than in the other two. The average proportion of progressive responses in the three sectors has been computed:

| Supervision and Administration | 86% |
| Curriculum                     | 83% |
| Philosophy                     | 82% |
Although the differences are not great and may not be statistically significant, they may be indicative of a greater degree of acceptance of progressive thinking in the one area. Greater divergency of opinion was manifested in regard to statements reflecting more traditional views in the area of administration and supervision. The conflict between theory and practice as well as differences in emphasis seemed to characterize the responses to these items:

Table III (See Appendix)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Partial</th>
<th>Partial (Ag.) or (Ds)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nonetheless, the prevalent bias of the group-as-a-whole was in a progressive direction as evidenced by the last of "complete agreement" responses. This may further substantiate the inference in regard to the greater impact of progressive thinking in this area.

Summary Questions (end of interview):

In order to better understand the responses of the group of educational directors and the responses of any given director, three final questions were asked:

"1. Have you ( ), your children ( ), your students ( ) had any experiences with progressivism in general education? If yes, what are your feelings about it?"

Of the group of twelve principals-rabbis-educational directors, five answered the question in the negative and one was unable to
answer the question. One individual had served on the board of a
private, progressive elementary school and had sent her children to
this school; three had children who were attending Jewish Day Schools
(elementary and secondary) which had a supposedly progressive
orientation; one had sent his child to a day camp sponsored by a
private, progressive elementary school; and one had been exposed
through courses and observations to progressive education as part of
a Master's program. Though all approved of the potential worth of
progressive education, all but one of the six stated qualifications as
follows:

"in theory, acceptable, but good students needed."

"favorably disposed, but it must constantly be
re-evaluated and geared to reality."

"has great value and has produced excellent
results, but it has limitations."

"it's fine with good students and a good teacher;
it'ss objectives should be well-defined (not open-ended)."

"OK if not 'watered-down'."

"II. How would you classify your philosophy of
education (all factors--time, etc.--being equal)?
Classical-literary, Progressive, Traditional-
religious, Reconstructionist, Hebraic-Zionist,
Yiddishist-secular, other."

The respondents were encouraged to make any combinations
which would best describe their educational philosophy. Eleven of the
twelve identified themselves as "progressive." Six of these specifically
limited their "progressivism" to method. The remaining classifica-
tions were as follows:
Many respondents made a distinction between content and method, the most frequent combinations being "progressive in method" and "traditional-religious" or "Reconstructionist" in content. As might be expected, the three Reform educational directors/rabbis classified themselves as "Reconstructionist-religious-progressive" whereas five of the eight Conservative educational directors/rabbis classified themselves "traditional-religious and progressive." Two considered themselves "progressive-Reconstructionist," one of these also ascribing to his philosophy a "traditional-religious" coloration. The remaining person looked at himself as "classical-literary" and "traditional-religious" while commenting that he was a conservative in educational thinking. Though there seems to be some overlapping, it seems that a distinction between Reform and Conservative educators was present in the area of "content," whereas a unity seemed to exist in the area of "method." This phenomenon will be discussed more thoroughly at other points in the dissertation.

"III. Your interpretation of modern Jewish life corresponds most closely with that of: Isaac M. Wise, Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik, Mordecai M. Kaplan, Solomon Schechter, David Ben-Gurion."

Combinations of these personalities were encouraged. The man most frequently mentioned was Mordecai M. Kaplan (nine).
However, he was mentioned without an additional personality in only one-third of these instances. Also, two individuals definitely dissociated themselves from Kaplan's theology. Of interest is the fact that in two instances in which Kaplan was named, the respondent also identified with Soloveitchik, the Orthodox leader. Other instances in which Wise and Kaplan, or Schechter and Kaplan were combined (five) are not that surprising. Isaac M. Wise attracted support from the three Reform educators; Rabbi Soloveitchik was identified with by four Conservative educators, Solomon Schechter by four Conservatives, and Ben Gurion by two Conservative educators and one Reform.

Conclusions

Among the educators interviewed there seems to be a definite "progressive bias." This bias may be stronger in some areas (administration and supervision, method) than in others (content, philosophy of education, curriculum) though even in these areas a progressively-oriented approach is prevalent, witness the high degree of identification with Kaplan as well as the relatively high proportion of "pro-progressive" responses. However, limitations of progressivism (time, reality, educational objectives, etc.) are recognized and articulated. No total commitment to progressivism is present as no total negation of its validity and potential worth is present.

Though most Reform and Conservative educators are ready to identify with Kaplan in a general way, some take exception to his theology, and others do not consider themselves Reconstructionists in regard to their Jewish educational philosophy. The degree of overall accept-
tance or rejection of progressivism will now be looked at in terms of individual patterns or syndromes.

Individual Patterns; Degree of Progressive Orientation

In order to accurately compute the degree of acceptance or lack of acceptance of progressive practices and principles as well as the number of responses in each direction, responses to individual items were weighted:

- Complete agreement: plus 3
- "partial" in direction of agreement (Ag): plus 2
- Partial: plus 1 or minus 16
- "Partial" in the direction of disagreement (Ds): minus 2
- Complete disagreement: minus 3

The scores on each item were added together and a "progressive quotient" was arrived at for each respondent. Also, the degree of "pro-progressive" response and the degree of "anti-progressive" ("pro-traditional") response was determined separately. Finally, the number of "pro-progressive" responses and "anti-progressive" responses was determined. 17

I. Number of Responses 18

The range of "pro-progressive" responses was nineteen to twenty-six (potential range being zero to twenty-six). The median number of "pro-progressive" responses was 22.5, the mean 22.7. The range of "pro-traditional" ("anti-progressive") responses was zero to seven (the potential range being zero to twenty-six). The median number of the "anti-progressive" responses was 2.5, the arithmetic mean being 3.2.
II. Degree of "Pro-Progressive" Response

When all "pro-progressive" responses were weighted and added together a median score of 64.5 was arrived at for the group. The range was determined to be from a minimum of fifty-one to a maximum of seventy-five (the potential range being zero to seventy-eight). The arithmetic mean was 63.2.

III. Degree of "Anti-Progressive" Response

The range of "anti-progressive" responses was zero to minus thirteen (the potential range being zero to minus seventy-eight). The median degree of "anti-progressive" response was minus 4.5; the mean was minus 5.8.

IV. The "Progressive Quotient"

The weighted scores of the "pro-progressive" and "anti-progressive" responses were combined to arrive at a "progressive quotient" for each individual. It was felt that this score would be the most sensitive indicator of one's acceptance of progressive principles and practices:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>P.Q.</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>P.Q.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from the above data, the range was plus seventy-four to plus thirty-nine (potential range, minus seventy-eight to plus...
seventy-eight). The median score was plus sixty; the mean was plus 57.2.

V. General Summary

After examining the above data ("progressive quotient") a threefold grouping seems to be present: A to F; G to J; K to M. The variation for the total group is thirty-five. The variation in the four other secondary measurements is less than this figure. This variation is relatively small when one considers that the potential maximum variation is 156. Furthermore, all scores fall within the upper 25% of the potential range, that being plus thirty-nine to plus seventy-eight. This would indicate a strong "pro-progressive" bias for the group-as-a whole. Also, the fact that variation does exist and that three groupings can be determined indicates that though the bias is generally strong it is not extreme nor of uniform intensity for the group of respondents interviewed. These findings are similar to those reached after the earlier item analysis.

VI. Individual Patterns as Related to Religious-Educational Orientation

Of the first grouping, A to F (74 to 65), three were Reform educators (B, C, D); one was the principal of the supplementary elementary school sponsored by the Hebrew Teachers College, one was the principal of the Conservative Day school which looks at itself as a "progressive" school, and one was the principal of a Conservative congregational school having a very high educational rating. The distinction between the second (G to J) and third (K to M) groupings
and the first (A to F) seems to be a real one (ten points). Also, the first grouping seems to be relatively homogeneous. The lower "progressive quotients" of the Conservative educators in groups G to J and K to M most probably are a result of the greater traditionalism of the Conservative movement and a correlative traditionalism in the areas of educational philosophy and curriculum development. Also, all those in the first grouping (A to F) identified with Mordecai Kaplan and "progressive" in questions #3 and #2 respectively found at the end of the interview schedule. Experience with general progressive education or having children or students exposed to it does not seem to be a factor, B, C, and D answering "no" to question #1 at the end of the interview schedule. In the case of the combined G to M group only three of the seven identified with Kaplan and all those who identified with Rabbi Soloveitchik were in this latter grouping. Two in the A to F grouping identified with Schechter as did two in the G to M combined grouping. The only identifications with Ben Gurion and Wise occurred in the more progressive group, also. In the area of philosophy of Jewish education, "traditional-religious" and "classical-literary" was much more prevalent in the G to M group, even though all but one of this group identified with "progressive" in the area of method. All those in the more progressive group identified with "progressive" in the area of method, but only one of the educators (affiliated with the Conservative movement) considered his philosophy "traditional-religious." Four others considered their philosophy just "religious." The significant differences, from an over-all point of view, seem to
be: The more progressively-oriented (A to F) identify much more unanimously with Kaplan; those in the G to M combined grouping, the less progressively-oriented, identify more with tradition and Soloveitchik. In the area of method no significant difference exists.

VII. Individual Patterns as Related to Other Factors

The average number of years that the more progressive group was in their present positions was a little less than three. The average number of years for the less progressive (G to M) was almost seven. Oppositely, those in the less progressive group were younger. The only difference that seems to exist among the other background factors is the fact that those in the less progressive group were educated in more orthodox institutions such as Yeshiva University, whereas those in the more progressive group were educated at the Teachers Institute of the Jewish Theological Seminary, Gratz College, Hebrew Union College, the New School of Social Research, etc. It comes as no surprise that this is the case. The individual who had the highest "progressive quotient" (A) had taken courses at the New School of Social Research in New York and at Teachers College, some of the instructors being Dewey, Kilpatrick, Kallen, and Thorndike.

VIII. Inconsistency, Eclecticism, and Contradictions

It would be expected that complete consistency and a totally progressive syndrome would be the exception. Respondents A and C seem to be these exceptions. Respondent B seemingly manifests some eclecticism as he rejects the progressive emphasis on the equal status of so-called "co-curricular" activities. Respondent D
(progressive quotient of 69) seems to be inconsistent as he rejects the validity of curriculum innovations at the elementary school level but is quite critical of the logically organized, subject matter, time and text oriented course of study so prevalent in most schools. The converse is true of respondent E who is progressive in all areas but that of the course of study (item #12 is accepted). Respondent F questions the role of reliable evidence and criticism especially as cherished beliefs are concerned but, other than this, is progressively-oriented. This trend toward eclecticism or ambivalence in philosophical and curricular areas increases as the responses of the less progressive educators are examined. Respondent G agrees that the search for reliable evidence, even in the area of religious education, is an important aspect of the educational process. However, he then feels that there should be limits beyond which the human intellect should not proceed in the area of ultimate faith and belief. The tendency toward a more consistent eclecticism is evident in the third grouping (K, L, M). It should be noted that certain items expectedly were more sensitive to "anti-progressive" or "more traditional" orientations. These were as follows: Philosophy (items #2, 11, 14); Curriculum (Items #5, 8, 12, 26); Administration and Supervision (items #1, 6, 10, 20, 24).

D. The Interview—Teachers

As was the case in regard to the educational directors, certain background information was requested of the teachers interviewed. These questions can be divided into those concerning the
teacher and those concerning the class which had been observed. Information gathered from the latter questions will be examined later as it relates to the observations which took place.

1. Age--The teachers interviewed ranged in age from their early twenties to their middle sixties. Thirteen of the twenty-six (50%) teachers were in their twenties. Ten teachers were in their thirties. Two were in their forties, and one was in his sixties. The group of teachers as a whole was relatively young. Twenty-three of the twenty-six interviewed were under forty. Whether this group is representative of all teachers in Philadelphia Jewish schools or whether significant age differences exist among groups of teachers teaching in different types of schools was not ascertained.

2. License Status of Teachers--

Orthodox (Day school)-One teacher had no license whatsoever, the other a "certificate" from the Beth Jacob Seminary from which she had been graduated.

Reform—Two teachers were graduates of the College of Jewish Studies sponsored by Gratz College, and two were graduates of the Isaac Mayer Wise Department of the College. Three had no license or license equivalent whatsoever.

Conservative—Sixteen teachers were teaching at schools affiliated with the Conservative movement (including
Two had "B" licenses, two had "C"; two teachers had earned "Permanent D" licenses; two had a "Provisional Permit;" two had received a "Special Teachers' License" from Gratz. Of the six who had no license one was evaluated to have the equivalent of an "A" or "B" status, one a "B" or "C" status, and one was working toward a "Special Teachers' License."

Community-sponsored school--Both teachers had "Temporary Certificates."

3. Experience in Teaching in Jewish Schools--The average number of years of teaching experience (twenty-six teachers) was 7.8 years. Ten teachers had less than five years of teaching experience in Jewish schools. Ten had between five and ten years experience. Four (all from Conservative schools) had between eleven and twenty years experience, and two (Conservative) had more than twenty-one years experience. Of those in the "less than five" group, two were from the community-sponsored school, one was Orthodox, three Reform and four Conservative. Of those in the "five to ten" group, one was Orthodox, three Reform and seven Conservative. In addition, seven teachers reported that they had had between two and sixteen years of experience in the field of general education. The average teaching experience in Jewish schools of teachers interviewed was:
Community-sponsored school 2.25 years
Orthodox (Day school) 5.75 years
Reform 4.50 years
Conservative 10.80 years

4. **College Degrees**--A total of fourteen (over 50%) teachers had no college degree. Of the four Reform teachers in this category, three were Juniors or Seniors in college. Two were Orthodox, one having had two and one-half years of undergraduate work. Seven were Conservative, four being Juniors or Seniors in undergraduate school. One teacher from the Community-sponsored school was a Senior in college. Twelve teachers had received a BA or BS degree. In addition, two teachers in Reform schools had earned an MA (MS) degree, whereas four teachers in Conservative schools had earned similar degrees. Two teachers (Conservative) were ordained rabbis (Yeshiva University).

5. **Teacher Education**--The group-as-a-whole had many and varied experiences in being educated to be teachers. The two Orthodox Day school teachers received training (method, theory of education and practice teaching) at the Beth Jacob Seminary in New York. One teacher had also done extensive additional reading in educational psychology. Two teachers in Reform Jewish schools had received a Master of Science degree--one in education and the other in psychology. Two other teachers were undergraduates in elementary education programs, one of these getting specific training in Jewish education at the
A fifth teacher had taken courses in education and psychology in undergraduate school, and a sixth had done some informal reading in education but had not taken any formal coursework at a college level.

In the Conservative schools visited, only one teacher was found to have had no courses in education. This individual was an ordained Rabbi. Another teacher had taken a course at the Hayyim Greenberg Institute in Israel but had had no additional training. Two Israelis had taken courses to prepare them to be leaders of youth groups in Israel, one of these getting additional training in the teaching of mathematics in the Israeli army. Two teachers (Day school) were graduates of Teachers Seminaries in Israel. One teacher had taken courses at Gratz and in Israel. One had received a "Special Teachers' License" from Gratz and had taken additional coursework in education at undergraduate school and at the College of Jewish Studies in Chicago. Two teachers were taking "in-service" courses at Gratz working for certification ("Special Teachers'"). One teacher had taken coursework at Gratz through her Sophomore year but had not received her Teachers' Certificate. She had also taken twelve undergraduate credits in education at a state university. Another teacher had received her Teachers' Certificate from Gratz and was taking additional "in-service" courses.
Finally, three of four teachers with a Master's degree in education or psychology were taking courses in the "Special Teachers'" program at Gratz.

Of the two teachers interviewed at the community-sponsored school, one had received a Bachelor of Hebrew Literature degree and the other was about to complete an elementary education program at a local university and had also received a Teachers' Certificate from Gratz College.

6. Jewish Education--The two Orthodox Day school teachers were graduates of the Beth Jacob Girls School in New York. The teachers teaching at the community-sponsored school were both graduates of Gratz College, one having received a Bachelor of Hebrew Literature degree. Two teachers in the Reform Schools were graduates of the I. M. Wise Department and two were graduates of the College of Jewish Studies (Gratz). One was a graduate of Akiba Hebrew Academy, and the other had received a Hebrew high school education in a Conservative synagogue school (three years). In the Conservative schools, four teachers had completed or were in the process of taking the "Special Teachers'" program offered at Gratz. One of these also had taken additional courses at the College of Jewish Studies in Chicago. One teacher had spent a half year at the Teachers Institute of the Jewish Theological Seminary. Another teacher had almost completed her Sophomore year at Gratz. One teacher had received a
Teachers' Certificate at Gratz and was taking additional "in-service" courses at Gratz. Two teachers had received smicha from Yeshiva University. Another teacher had been educated in Talmud Torahs and had taken courses at Gratz. Finally, five were Israelis--two with a Teachers' Seminary education, one with some courses having been taken at Gratz, and two with no additional Jewish education other than that given in Israeli schools.

Responses to Individual Items

Responses were categorized as was the case with the responses of the educational directors. However, there was no differentiation of items into three areas as was done in the former instance. All items dealt with method or the psychology of learning, and their analysis will take place with an assumption of underlying unity. Items #19, 16, 24, 2, 20 achieved a high degree of consensus (a minimum of twenty "complete agreement" or "disagreement" responses in one direction). 23

All but one respondent agreed that the best type of student-learning should be "purposive" in terms of student purposes. The group of responses were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>NAn</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Partial</th>
<th>Partial(Ag)</th>
<th>Partial (Ds)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>25(96.2%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>24(92.3%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>24(92.3%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>23(88.5%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20(73.1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to "purposive learning," (#19) the other items affirmed the principles of individual differences (#16), the need to consider the whole child in the educative process (#24, 2), and the potentialities of the "problem-solving" approach for Jewish education (#20). No definitive consensus as found with regard to the above items occurred thereafter. It is interesting to note that the high consensus items are important but rather non-controversial principles of progressive education. As evidence that there exists on the part of the teachers interviewed a significant degree of difference of opinion is the fact that only five of the twenty items on the schedule achieved high consensus. This finding will be explored later as the responses to the other items are analyzed.

Two additional items that earned general acceptance (but not high consensus) were items #7 and #27. The index of general acceptance was arrived at only as a result of combining different response categories that tended in the same direction. No significant number of "complete" responses were present. Thus, after some "partials" were included in the total number of responses, a percentage of 73.1 in "general agreement" was determined. The items were the following:

"7. The teacher in a democratic classroom is in reality a helper and a guide to student learning rather than a dispenser of knowledge. The teacher in the Jewish school must be democratic."

"27. The writing of original prayers and the creation of a class Siddur or Haggadah are excellent activities at the elementary and secondary levels of the Jewish school."
Table VI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>NAn</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Partial</th>
<th>Partial(Ag)</th>
<th>Partial(Ds)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>13(±2)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The "general agreement" manifest in the responses to item #7 is more clear-cut than that in the case of item #27. It could be hypothesized that the affirmation of democracy in the classroom (in general terms) is less controversial than the so-called "tampering with tradition" implicit in item #27. One individual expressing "partial agreement," commented that we can "add to but not replace in the context of tradition." It is to be noted that there were no "complete disagreements" with item #7.

The range of responses in a given direction to the remaining thirteen items was 65.4% to 34.6%. In many cases categories of response had to be combined to arrive at a meaningful trend; in some cases two trends seemed equally significant; in some cases the "partial" category was most popular. The most significant fact seems to be the great variability of response present in the case of nearly two-thirds of the items:
Table VII (See Appendix)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>NaN</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree(Pt)</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Partial (Ag)</th>
<th>Partial (Ds)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17(65.4%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7(1DsPt)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15(57.7%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2(4DsPt)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11(42.3%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13(50%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1(1DsPt)</td>
<td>12(46.3%)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12(46.2%)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11(42.3%)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table VIII (See Appendix)

Summary of Response Trends

- #19: 96.2% Agreement
- #16: 92.3% Agreement
- #24: 92.3% Disagreement
- #2: 88.5% Disagreement
- #20: 73.1% Disagreement
- #7: 73.1% Agreement and Partial (Ag)
- #27: 73.1% Agreement, AgPt<sup>24</sup> and Partial (Ag)
- #22: 65.4% Disagreement
- #14: 61.5% Disagreement and Partial (Ds)
- #25: 61.5% Agreement, AgPt<sup>24</sup> and Partial (Ag)
- #10: 61.5% Agreement and Partial (Ag)
- #13: 57.7% Agreement, AgPt<sup>24</sup> and Partial (Ag)
- #18: 57.7% Disagreement and Partial (Ds)
- #11: 53.3% Disagreement and Partial (Ds)
- #9: 53.3% Agreement, AgPt<sup>24</sup> and Partial (Ag)
- #4: 53.3% Disagreement and Partial (Ds)
- #5: 42.3% Agreement
- #17: 46.2% Partial Agreement
- #15: 46.2% Agreement and Partial (Ag)
- #38: 42.3% Partial Agreement
- #8: 34.6% Disagreement and Partial (Ds)
The first seven items, as was indicated above, manifested high consensus or general agreement. Items #22, 14, 25, and 10 also exhibited a possible significant trend when related categories were combined. These four items dealt, respectively, with the place of criticism of beliefs in religious education, the validity of extrinsic motivation or incentives such as grades, etc., the place of indoctrination in education, and the importance of originality and inventiveness in Jewish education. Three of these four items address themselves to the struggle between authority and authoritarianism in Jewish education, on the one hand, and democracy and creativity in Jewish education, on the other. The other item brought to the fore the omnipresent question of motivation. Here, traditional and modern education were pitted against each other. It would seem that in these latter four instances modern education and its progressive democratic, creative-critical tendencies were victorious. However, the margin of difference was far from being of convincing proportions as was the case with the first seven items.

Five individuals agreed completely that criticism of established religious beliefs and practices should not be permitted (#22). One person who disagreed stated that "student-criticism is acceptable so that it can be countered." Another respondent who disagreed completely pointed out that "in theory criticism is fine, but in practice neither the students nor the teacher can be too outspoken. Matters of theology, especially, should be left to the Rabbi." An individual who "partially agreed in the direction of agreement" stated that "acceptance of beliefs
and practices are basically a matter of faith" with the critical-intellectual powers being of secondary importance.

Though eleven respondents were not willing to disagree completely with the use of grades and rewards as incentives for learning, only two individuals accepted Item #14 without qualification. This is indicative of either ambivalence in regard to grades as incentives or is a reflection of the reality situation in which grades and rewards play a significant role. The high number of qualifications—either total rejection, an acknowledgement of the limitations of such extrinsic motivation and the possibility of other more meaningful types of motivation, etc.—indicates a certain degree of sophistication in this area.

Seven people totally disagreed that indoctrination should not be part of Jewish education. Indoctrination was defined (on a card) as the "imposition of a point of view, set of values or attitudes upon the learner without providing to the learner the opportunity to evaluate all evidence as it pertains to that point of view." The individuals who affirmed the role of indoctrination as defined above felt "indoctrination in the principles of religion is necessary," "it is part of Jewish education," etc. Persons who "partially agreed in the direction of agreement" felt that "some indoctrination has to occur," "a point of view should always be presented." One who "partially agreed in the direction of disagreement" felt that "indoctrination is part of Jewish education but discussion should be allowed. However, the difficult questions should be left up to the Rabbi." Another, in the same category felt that
beliefs are to be transmitted.

The final of these four intermediary items (#10) dealt with the status of student-inventiveness and originality as a goal. It elicited fifteen complete agreements. Those that took exception to the statement pointed out that (a) it may be a goal but is not a primary one as implied in the statement; (b) that it is a factor, a concern, a means, a facet, etc.; (c) that knowledge is needed first and therefore student-inventiveness is more appropriate as a goal for older children. The most extreme negation came from a Day school teacher who pointed out that "it should be at a minimum, especially where it encourages deviation from the teachings of the Torah and that it is an acceptable goal for general education but not for Jewish."

Item #13--The Direct Confrontation with Progressivism

"13. Progressive education has some techniques worthy of incorporation into Jewish education, but its overall method is too radical." (For definitions see Appendix, pages 604-605)

The percentage of respondents who agreed with this statement was 57.7-"complete agreement"-(11), "agreement in the direction of partial agreement" (1), "partial agreement in the direction of agreement" (3). One respondent "partially agreed." Three persons "partially agreed in the direction of disagreement." Two individuals totally disagreed. Four of those interviewed disagreed but tended toward "partial agreement." Finally, one teacher declined from venturing an opinion.

More significant than the actual percentages in regard to this
item were the tone of the comments. Not one respondent rejected progressivism completely. Nine respondents (34.6%) accepted more of progressivism than was implied in the statement (complete and partial disagreement). However, only four of these nine explicitly disagreed with the characterization of "too radical." Some of the respondents accepted progressivism totally in theory but had reservations about a completely progressive program in practice. One was worried about excesses in practice. Another questioned its validity for the teaching of prayer, and one felt that skills had to be taught in a non-progressive manner. Those who agreed in some manner with the statement also talked in terms of ideals and reality. However, they were more explicit about limiting its introduction into the Jewish school. One respondent emphasized that it would not work in an afternoon Hebrew school since it was too time-consuming. Another person pointed out that children are not exposed to it in public school and that it would be "too different."

Four other items were unable also to elicit a definitive trend in responses. Though "progressively-oriented" responses were in the majority, categories had to be combined in order to arrive at this determination, and the margin of difference was slight and tenuous. These items dealt with the controversial problem of teacher-authority (#4) and some specifics of progressive methodology--the use of student-committees (#18), discussion and decision-making as part of democratic method (#11), and the project method (#9). (26)

Though fully 50% of the respondents "disagreed" with item #18,
item were the tone of the comments. Not one respondent rejected progressivism completely. Nine respondents (34.6%) accepted more of progressivism than was implied in the statement (complete and partial disagreement). However, only four of these nine explicitly disagreed with the characterization of "too radical." Some of the respondents accepted progressivism totally in theory but had reservations about a completely progressive program in practice. One was worried about excesses in practice. Another questioned its validity for the teaching of prayer, and one felt that skills had to be taught in a non-progressive manner. Those who agreed in some manner with the statement also talked in terms of ideals and reality. However, they were more explicit about limiting its introduction into the Jewish school. One respondent emphasized that it would not work in an afternoon Hebrew school since it was too time-consuming. Another person pointed out that children are not exposed to it in public school and that it would be "too different."

Four other items were unable also to elicit a definitive trend in responses. Though "progressively-oriented" responses were in the majority, categories had to be combined in order to arrive at this determination, and the margin of difference was slight and tenuous. These items dealt with the controversial problem of teacher-authority (#4) and some specifics of progressive methodology—the use of student-committees (#18), discussion and decision-making as part of democratic method (#11), and the project method (#9), 26

Though fully 50% of the respondents "disagreed" with item #18,
thus inferring an affirmation of the encouragement of student-committees, no real conviction as to the educational implications of student-committees seemed evident from the comments elicited. One respondent stated that committees are very important since they can be useful to the teacher. Others, who "partially agreed," "partially disagreed" or "agreed" with the statement also presented the pragmatic argument of lack of time. Two individuals were against student-committees in principle. Others limited them to the higher grades, and one person argued that they "have enough of it in the public schools."

The response-pattern to item #11 was quite similar. No striking affirmation of democratic method as spelled out in item #11 was present. Eleven respondents "disagreed" that it should be used "sparingly and with the utmost caution." Nobody argued that it was not difficult to implement. Many expressed the feeling that it has its limitations but should be used wherever possible. The age of the students and the level and interest of the class were pointed to as important considerations in using "democratic method." Four individuals totally agreed with the statement. One person stated that it can "do more harm than good sometimes." One individual excepted theology from being amenable to "democratic method." Another affirmed questions and discussion but rejected decision-making and arguing points with the teacher.

Item #9, dealing with the project method as it may pertain to the teaching of the concepts of God and Torah, elicited a great variation of response (see Table VII). No category received less than
two responses, and no category received more than nine responses. The three "no answers" were the highest of any item. This in and of itself is indicative of the confusion and lack of knowledge about the project method that seemed to exist. Once a definition was given (asked for by more respondents than in the case of any other item) most respondents agreed that the project method had possibilities, theoretically at least. A number of respondents also felt that it should be limited to older students. Those that completely disagreed stated that it was "definitely not acceptable" and "because questionable sources might be used it should be limited to general studies (non-Hebraic) only." Based on the reactions, responses and comments elicited by this item, the positive significance of this item is to be questioned. However, the overall response-pattern may be indicative of a lack of knowledge about this cardinal pillar of progressive method. Thus, the responses may be of negative significance, but significant in the total picture nonetheless.

The responses to item #4 indicate that the teachers interviewed were almost evenly split as to the degree of overt authority that is to be exhibited by the teacher. A definition of high degree of authority was offered (on a card) --- "the exercise and use of authority in such a manner as to always have the class keep in mind 'who's the boss!'" Eleven individuals agreed ("complete agreement") that a high degree of authority, as defined, is to be exercised if effective learning is to take place. One teacher commented that there should be "no fooling around." Another stated that without a high degree of authority being
exercised there would be "thirty-three bosses." Those that "partially agreed but in the direction of disagreement" (10) or "completely disagreed" felt that the authority of the teacher should be present, not dictatorially or in an authoritarian manner, as implied in the statement, but it should be exercised with discretion, subtly wherever possible and with sensitivity. No teacher completely abdicated his authority to the of control/the learning process. The ambivalence of teachers as a group may reflect the problems a democracy faces in regard to the responsible and appropriate use of authority, and a reaction to the permissiveness of the twenties and thirties as well as to the confusion and controversy found on the present scene. One should also keep in mind the excesses of some brands of progressivism in regard to student freedom as it reacted to the authoritarianism of traditional education.

The last four items exhibited less than a 50% consensus in any direction. These items dealt with method, competition and a concept of learning. Eleven respondents felt that competition was a desirable and appropriate stimulus for learning (item #5). Twelve felt they partially agreed with the statement. They qualified their agreement by explicitly calling attention to the outcomes of excessive competition, to the need to use it selectively, to the possibility of it being damaging to some children, to the need to emphasize competition between groups and with oneself. Two persons totally disagreed with the statement, one of them commenting that, though they were against competition in theory, "you can't get away from it in practice." Generally speaking, there was an acceptance of competition as a reflection of our societal climate.
There was no great cry for cooperative procedures to replace competition.

Feelings about the "assign-recite-test" method were put to the test in item #17. Though only four respondents agreed that it is appropriate for teaching the subject-matter of the Jewish school, less than 50% disagreed completely with the statement. Twelve respondents ("complete disagreement," "partial agreement," "partial agreement in the direction of agreement or disagreement") felt that it had a place, but that other approaches were better at times. Age and subject were pointed out as necessary considerations. Generally, the "assign-recite-test" method was held unacceptable even though many respondents thought that it was appropriate or that it might be used in certain situations.

Items #15 and #8 talked of education and learning. Both statements mirrored points of view which oversimplify the learning process and which would be rejected by progressivists. Item #15 is couched in the language of traditional education and even indicates a bias in the direction of faculty psychology. It negates totally the concept of the whole child.

"15. Education, as thought of in the Jewish school, consists mainly of training the mind and imparting knowledge to be assimilated by it."

Fully ten respondents agreed completely with the statement. The remaining sixteen respondents ("partial agreement," "partial agreement in the direction of disagreement," "complete disagreement") rejected this view of Jewish education, partially (accepted "imparting"
but rejected "training") or completely. Of these, only seven rejected the statement completely.

Item #8 talks of learning in "stimulus-response" terminology and sounds like a description of simple conditioning. Four respondents partially rejected the statement on the grounds of its being tantamount to equating human learning with simple conditioning. One of these pointed out that learning is fundamentally a "change in behavior." Though some rejected the mechanical experiencing of reward and punishment, most of the criticism was directed at the inclusion of punishment. Many of the respondents would have accepted the statement if punishment had been left out. In addition to the four who rejected the statement because of its similarity to conditioning, another five were critical of the omnipresence of reward. The significant statistic may be that only five (three "completely," two "partially") accepted the statement with little reservation. Taking items #15 and #8 as an index of thinking on the meaning of learning and education, the evidence would indicate that a significant minority (13 of 52 responses, 25%) view learning in traditional terms. Approximately 40% of the responses (21 of 52) reject the two traditional statements. The remaining 35% reflect an eclecticism of sorts, qualifying or limiting their acceptance of the traditional conceptions for one or more reasons.

Individual Patterns; Degree of Progressive Orientation

The same method was used with the responses of the educational directors was used in this instance to compute the degree of acceptance or rejection of progressive principles and practices. Each category of
response was weighted. A "progressive quotient" as well as the number of "pro-progressive" and "anti-progressive" responses was ascertained. 28

I. Number of Responses

The range of "pro-progressive" responses was three to nineteen (potential range being zero to twenty). The median number of "pro-progressive" responses was fifteen, the mean 13.5. The range of "anti-progressive" responses was one to seventeen (the potential range being zero to twenty). The median number of "anti-progressive" responses was five, the mean being 6.1.

II. Degree of "Pro-Progressive" Responses

When all "pro-progressive" responses were weighted and added together a median score of thirty-eight was arrived at for the group. The arithmetic mean was 35.4. The range was determined to be from a minimum of nine to a maximum of fifty-five (the potential range being from zero to sixty).

III. Degree of "Anti-Progressive" Response

The range of "anti-progressive" responses was from minus one to minus forty-two (the potential range being from zero to minus sixty). The median degree of "anti-progressive" response was minus 11.5; the mean was minus 13.8.

IV. The "Progressive Quotient"

The weighted scores of the "pro-progressive" and "anti-progressive" responses were combined to arrive at a "progressive quotient" for each teacher. It was felt that this score would be the
most sensitive indicator of one's acceptance of progressive principles and practices:

Table IX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Plus</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>Plus</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Plus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Plus 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Minus 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Minus 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from the above data, the range was plus 54 to minus 33 (potential range being plus 60 to minus 60). The median score was plus 27; the mean was plus 21.7.

V. General Summary

It is difficult to ascertain any distinctive groupings in the above data. A difference of ten exists between A and B. Generally, however, an even distribution seems to exist. Possibly U to Z may constitute a grouping, those with a strong "pro-traditional" educational orientation. Whereas the maximum interval from B through T is four, it increases to nine between T and U. However, the intervals between U and Z are rather large, in general. The variation for the total group is eighty-seven. The potential maximum variation is 120. The degree of variation is rather high, but it is biased to a considerable degree in the direction of a progressive orientation. Only five respondents had a "progressive quotient" of an "anti-progressive" character (V to Z).

VI. Individual Patterns as Related to Religious-Educational Orientation
The teacher who achieved the highest "progressive quotient" was affiliated with a Reform religious school and was a student (Senior) in an Elementary Education Department of a local university. The second highest "progressive quotient" belonged to another teacher in a Reform religious school who had received a BS in education and an MS in psychology. The lowest "progressive quotient" of any teacher affiliated with the Reform movement was twenty-five. The two lowest of the Reform group, M and O, either had no college education (M) or had majored in a field other than education (O, English). The other teachers in the Reform schools had degrees in education or were students in education departments. Their lowest "progressive quotient" was 32 (K). The "progressive quotients" for teachers in Conservative schools ranged from forty (C) to minus fifteen (Y). Within the Conservative group, the level of preparation in regard to secular teaching did not seem to be a factor. One individual with an MS in education had a "progressive quotient" of sixteen (S); another with an MS in guidance and counselling has a "progressive quotient" of twenty (R). These latter two individuals had been teaching or were presently teaching in the city public high schools. The two teachers in the Orthodox Day school had relatively low "progressive quotients." V had a "progressive quotient" of plus six. There were four teachers in Conservative schools who had lower quotients. However, Z, with a score of minus thirty-three, had the lowest "progressive quotient" of all respondents. Of the twenty items, Z answered seventeen in an "anti-progressive" manner. This, along with the observations of her class, confirmed that she was the most
"anti-progressive" teacher included in the survey. Those responses that she made in a "pro-progressive" direction dealt with the concern for all types of problems a child brings to the Jewish school (#2), with a rejection of the "assign-recite-text" method, especially for younger children (#17), and with the affirmation of the best type of learning as being "purposive" in terms of student needs (#19). It is interesting to note that there was a difference of thirty-nine points between the "progressive quotients" of U and Z, both of whom taught in the same Orthodox Day school. U, however, taught an Aleph class (5-6 year olds), and this may have influenced her thinking. There was no question in the mind of the interviewer that U had greater conviction about certain principles of modern education and was able to merge her traditional bias with certain of these principles. Z, on the other hand, represented "true conflict" and in so doing helped establish the validity of the items and the total schedule. Neither of the teachers in the Orthodox Day school had college degrees in education. U had done considerable reading in educational psychology, whereas Z had two and one-half years of an undergraduate college education but had taken no education courses at that level.

Generally speaking, the teachers in the Reform religious schools were more "progressive" in their thinking as well as being better prepared and oriented from the vantage point of general education. Greater variation in "progressive thinking" and in educational orientation and preparation existed among teachers in the Conservative religious schools. The two teachers in the Orthodox Day school had
an average "progressive quotient" of minus 13.5 as compared with an average of plus 18.4 for teachers in Conservative schools, plus 37.2 for teachers in Reform schools and plus 36.5 for the teachers in the community-sponsored school.

VII. Individual Patterns as Related to Jewish Education and Background

Though, as a group, the teachers in the Reform religious schools had the "least intense" Jewish education and background, it should be pointed out that some teachers in Conservative schools had poor credentials in this area, especially those involved in the "Special Teachers' Program" at Gratz College and those holding a "Provisional Permit." Some of these latter had extremely low "progressive quotients" (V, Y, etc.). Therefore, it may be hypothesized that the Reform orientation rather than the lack of intense Jewish background or education is related positively to the level of the "progressive quotient." Liberal Judaism may be more conducive to a progressive educational orientation than any of the other interpretations of Judaism.

The two teachers in the Orthodox Day school, having both an intense Jewish education and background, had low "progressive quotients."

Older Gratz graduates or full-time students (those that attended the institution many years before) as compared with more recent Gratz graduates or full-time students (not including "Special Teachers' Program," I. M. Wise Department, etc.) scored lower in regard to their "progressive quotient" (compare E, H, and I to G and X). The average "progressive quotient" of the "older" students was plus eleven;
the average "progressive quotient" of the "newer" students was plus thirty-six. Because of the raising of standards and requirements, it can be assumed that the "newer" student is possibly better prepared. Also, he has been exposed to a more "modern" approach to pedagogy.

The "older" students are older and therefore may be more conservative in their educational thinking as well as in their interpretation of Judaism. Their Jewish background (observance, family life, etc.) may, however, have been more intense, i.e., traditional in quality and quantity. Since only five respondents are involved in this analysis, all these potential inferences are mere conjecture but may be shown to have some validity in a further study.

The two Israeli teachers who are Teachers' Seminary graduates (teaching in the Conservative Day school) have an intense Jewish educational background (F and J) and a rather high average "progressive quotient" (plus thirty-five). In addition, a high degree of variation as to the "progressive quotient" exists among those ordained as rabbis, those who have taken isolated courses or partial programs at Gratz or at other similar institutions, and those who were raised and educated in Israel.

It would seem that the most significant factor influencing the level of the "progressive quotient" is the religious orientation of the institution. The highest grouping surveyed in the study were the Reform religious school teachers. Next came the teachers in the community-sponsored afternoon school. After this grouping came the teachers in the progressive Conservative Day school (plus thirty-five). The next
grouping is that of teachers in Conservative supplementary schools. When the two teachers in the Conservative Day school are eliminated from the Conservative grouping the average "progressive quotient" of this group is reduced to plus 16.1. Only one teacher in a Conservative supplementary school scored higher than thirty-five. Either the teachers in these schools are less progressively-oriented or their thinking is influenced by the educational and Jewish orientation of the institutions in which they teach. Most probably it is a combination of institutional educational orientation, the interpretation of Judaism espoused by the institution, and the inclination and educational approach of teachers choosing to teach in the Conservative elementary school. The need to preserve and transmit tradition, to teach a classical language and literature without adequate motivation on the part of students and without adequate time at the school's disposal, and to indoctrinate belief and practice may all contribute to the relatively traditional educational orientation of the teachers in these schools. General educational sophistication does not seem to be a factor. In fact, more than a few teachers pointed out that they must handle certain matters in line with the philosophy of the institution rather than as they would if they were given greater freedom and latitude. In fact, it may be that in regard to certain items the institutionally correct response was given even though the interviewer pointed out that the responses would not be shared with the educational director and the most honest answers would be appreciated. It is possible that the same responses would not be received if the interview were to take place in a setting other than
VIII. Eclecticism, Inconsistency and Contradictions

The one "anti-progressive" response of the respondent with the highest "progressive quotient" (A, 54) was in reference to item #5 ("partial agreement"). B and C also responded to this item in a so-called "anti-progressive" manner. Since a measurement of educational progressivism was being attempted rather than one of educational reconstructionism, the acceptance of competition by progressively-oriented teachers does not represent a drastic inconsistency. If anything, it may be a manifestation of our social climate, an index of some degree of eclecticism, a reflection of reality, or a symptom of a high level of commitment rather than of complete commitment to educational progressivism in its ideal form.

B (plus 44) responded in an "anti-progressive" manner to item #5 also. In addition, an "anti-progressive" response was given to items #8 and #15 also. These latter two items dealt with definitions of "learning" and "education in the Jewish school," respectively. Item #8 was a behavioristic definition of the learning process and #15 represents a traditional view of education. Both are accepted in the field of general education, if not at the theoretical level then at least at the practical level. This may be an instance of eclecticism or of a progressive orientation without a well-articulated theoretic sub-structure. C (plus 40) also responded negatively to item #5, but in addition questioned the primacy of originality and student-inventiveness as a goal of Jewish education (item #10). Also, the questioning of the validity of
student-committees was reflected in his response to item #18. D deviated from the "pro-progressive pattern" in items #8 and #15 (definitions).

As the "progressive quotient" of individuals becomes lower, deviations from the "pure" progressive syndrome occur in items dealing with authority, democratic method, the incorporation to some degree of traditional method, the place of criticism of beliefs, etc. Also, the appropriateness of a total commitment to progressive education in the Jewish school begins to be questioned (G, 35; item #13). Inconsistency also begins to make its presence felt. G is not willing to permit "criticism of established beliefs and practices" (item #22) but questions the use of indoctrination (item #25) and affirms all aspects of democratic method as stated in item #11. J is the first respondent to allow for indoctrination. L is the first one to show partial acceptance of the use of grades and rewards as the "most efficient incentives for student-learning." (item #14).

Generally speaking, this first grouping of so-called "high scorers" from a progressive vantage point (A to L, plus 54 to plus 32) tend strongly toward a progressive orientation. Eclecticism increases progressively, but inconsistency exists in only a few instances. The "medium scorers" (M to T, plus 28 to plus 15) exhibit no striking differences in kind from the first group but rather one of degree as the "anti-progressive" responses increase in number to seven. The same items are questioned as in the original grouping (A to L), but the role of the teacher as helper is not affirmed for the first time by O
student-committees was reflected in his response to item #18. G deviated from the "pro-progressive pattern" in items #8 and #15 (definitions).

As the "progressive quotient" of individuals becomes lower, deviations from the "pure" progressive syndrome occur in items dealing with authority, democratic method, the incorporation to some degree of traditional method, the place of criticism of beliefs, etc. Also, the appropriateness of a total commitment to progressive education in the Jewish school begins to be questioned (G, 35; item #13). Inconsistency also begins to make its presence felt. G is not willing to permit "criticism of established beliefs and practices" (item #22) but questions the use of indoctrination (item #25) and affirms all aspects of democratic method as stated in item #11. J is the first respondent to allow for indoctrination. L is the first one to show partial acceptance of the use of grades and rewards as the "most efficient incentives for student-learning." (item #14).

Generally speaking, this first grouping of so-called "high scorers" from a progressive vantage point (A to L, plus 54 to plus 32) tend strongly toward a progressive orientation. Eclecticism increases progressively, but inconsistency exists in only a few instances. The "medium scorers" (M to T, plus 28 to plus 15) exhibit no striking differences in kind from the first group but rather one of degree as the "anti-progressive" responses increase in number to seven. The same items are questioned as in the original grouping (A to L), but the role of the teacher as helper is not affirmed for the first time by O.
(item #7) and the appropriateness of writing original prayers is criticized for the first time by S. T responded negatively to item #16, which deals with the role of individual differences in the teaching-learning process. Obviously eclecticism and inconsistency become more prevalent as the "progressive quotient" decreases.

The final grouping, U to Z, represents those individuals who, in key areas, definitely exhibit an "anti-progressive" or "pro-traditional" bias. Increasingly, these individuals respond in a "pro-traditional" manner to the items dealing with indoctrination, criticism of established beliefs, the writing of original prayers, the place of originality and inventiveness, the use of democratic method, the acceptance of the place of rewards and grades as motivation, the questioning of the validity of introducing progressive education in its totality into Jewish education, etc. However, inconsistency in this trend exists also. The principle of dealing with the whole child (item #2) is accepted by most, as is that of the "teacher as helper" (item #7). Also, the concept of individual differences (#16) seems to be accepted by most. As has been pointed out before, inconsistency and eclecticism reaches a minimum with Z (minus 33). All but three responses were made in an "anti-progressive" direction.

E. The Classroom Observations

In order to better ascertain the degree of progressive practice prevalent in the schools to be visited and in order to possibly validate the responses on the interview schedule, it was decided to formulate an "observation checklist." This "checklist" was created with the help of Drs. William Chomsky and Meir Ben-Horin. The writer's own
experience and research were of import in this process, also. Thirty-seven major items were included with sub-items present in many cases. Two major divisions were included: "Atmosphere and Procedure" (17 items) and "Relating Learning to the Learner." The "checklist" was tested out in a "pilot school," and was acceptable.

I. The Nature of the Classes Observed

The age range of students present in the classes observed was five to fourteen years old. Those in Aleph and Third grade classes ranged from 7-1/2 to 11 years old, most being between 8 and 9 years old. Students in Day school Aleph classes were from five to seven years of age. Students in Daled and Sixth grade classes ranged in age from 10 to 13, most of them being in the 11-12 category. Students in Day school Daled classes were in the main nine years old. The number of students in the classes ranged from 11 to 33. The average size was 21. The average number of boys was 11.4 per class; the average number of girls was 9.2 per class. The Day schools had the smallest classes, averaging 14.5 students per class. No significant difference existed between the size of classes in Sunday and supplementary schools of the Reform and Conservative congregations.

Eleven classes were rated by their teachers as being of "average" or "mixed" ability. Six classes were considered as "slow" or "below average." Nine classes were considered as "bright" or "above average." It remains to be seen if (a) grade and age, (b) class size, or (c) ability or achievement level have any relationship to the responses in the interview schedule or to the degree of "progressivism" present in the classroom.
II. The Observation Process and its Limitations

Each class included in the study was visited for approximately one-half hour. Obviously, only one or two activities occurred or subjects were studied. In some cases the total observation period was devoted to preparation for a holiday observance (Pesach) or to linguistic drill. An evaluation had to be made by the observer as to what points on the checklist could potentially pertain if a totally progressive program were to be implemented. Certain areas were not evaluated unless a specific event happened or a specific reference were made to it in the class. Examples of this are homework, students leaving the room, planning of trips and the use of the community as resource, examinations, language learning in those instances in which content in English was emphasized (especially in the Reform schools). Aside from these areas all other major (numbered) items in the checklist were scored in all observations.

Another limitation was the relative lack of experience of the observer as observer and evaluator. Possibly certain indicators were not noticed, or, on the other hand, an event or occurrence was misinterpreted or "over-interpreted." Also, although the observer attempted to discipline himself, some bias or predilection toward or against a given teacher could have influenced the evaluation. Observations, using the same checklist, by a "neutral" or objective observer in addition to the writer were not possible.

Another difficulty was the determination of the "degree of presence" of a certain indication or trend. Whether an item was scored "I" (intermediate) or "H" (high) depended on (a) frequency and (b) intensity or quality of the manifestation. An "L" rating was given to an item if
III. The Results of the Observations

Certain indications of a progressive orientation were more manifest (in frequency and intensity) than others, though no indication was universally present in all classrooms. Among the more prevalent progressively-oriented indices were a relatively healthy classroom atmosphere (#1), a functional and sympathetic use of authority by the teacher (#2), the presence of questions, discussion (#3 and #4), a lack of preoccupation with competitive devices to stimulate learning (#9), the lack of reprimand and punishment for wrong responses (#13), the use of bulletin boards and the presence of the products of student creativity (to a lesser degree) (Part 2, #7 and #15), some indication of the attempt to make learning relevant and some degree of satisfaction on the part of the learner as he recognized his achievement (Part 2, #11). Aside from these trends, the impact of the insights, principles, methods, and objectives of progressive education was conspicuously absent in the case of most classes. One need only refer to the checklist in the Appendix to ascertain what was not happening in the classroom.

In order to better compare teachers in regard to the progressive tendencies found in their classrooms, an "observational index" was established. Each response by the observer was weighted:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Present</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of items scored was determined. This ranged for the group-
as a whole from 46 to 57. The number of items scored was divided into
the total score determined by the observer. The resultant figure was
the "observational index." Using this formula the following data can be
presented:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prog. Quotient</th>
<th>P. Q. Ranking</th>
<th>Observational Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The highest "observational index" was 2.13(J). The lowest was
1.18 (N). The total variation was .95 of a potential variation of 3.00.

The total range of scores was just about in the middle section or third
of potential scores. Generally, the "observational indices" were in the
"low" to "intermediate" range. It must be remembered that a tendency
for a "low" rating was great in the case of many individual items, and thus this fact would be expected to reflect itself in the "observational indices."

The average "observational index" of the teachers with the nine highest "progressive quotients" (39.6 av. "prog quotient") was 1.79. On the other hand, the average "progressive quotient" of the teachers with the nine highest "observational indices" (1.92 av. "observational index") was 37.6. Generally, those with the highest "progressive quotients" had relatively high "observational indices." Also, those with the highest "observational indices" had relatively high "progressive quotients" also.

Of course as can be seen from Table X, exceptions to this generalization did occur, and no one-to-one relationship exists between "progressive quotients" and "observational indices."

The same trend is indicated with the "low scorers" among the twenty-six teachers observed. The teachers with the seventeen lowest "observational indices" (av. "obs. index" of 1.49) had an average "progressive quotient" of 14.3. On the other hand, those teachers with the seventeen lowest "progressive quotients" (av. "prog. quotient" of 12.2) had an average "observational index" of 1.56. The small difference (only .07) between the average "observational indices" of the two configurations of seventeen "low scorers" (while the difference between av. "progressive quotients" is quite noticeable [-2.1]) may indicate that a greater divergence between thinking and practice exists in this grouping than exists in the nine "high scorers" and that there exists a less definite relationship or correlation between "progressive quotient" and "observational
index" in this latter grouping. If this be so, it may be stated that a greater correlation between "theory" and "practice" exists among the "higher" third of the teachers than exists among the "lower" two-thirds of the teachers observed and interviewed.

The teacher with the highest "observational index" (2.13) taught in the Conservative Day school. The next three highest were teachers in Reform religious schools (A, B, and O). Of the nine teachers with the highest "observational index," four (67% of the Reform teachers observed) were teaching in Reform religious schools and two taught in the Conservative Day school. The remaining three (G, L, and Q) taught in Conservative supplementary schools. Generally speaking, teachers in the Reform religious schools (A, B, D, K, M, and O) had a relatively high "progressive quotient" also. It is interesting to note, however, that K (1.49) and M (1.46) had "observational indices" below the median score for the total group (1.61) and the average "observational index" for the total group (1.63). Nonetheless, the group of teachers in the Reform religious schools had an average "observational index" of 1.80. Only one other grouping had a higher average "observational index"--the teachers in the Conservative Day school (1.96, J and F).

Teachers in the supplementary afternoon schools sponsored by Conservative congregations had an average "observational index" of only 1.53. The median "O. I." was 1.545. The range of "O. I. 's" was from 1.92 to 1.18 (the lowest "O. I." of all those observed).

The teachers in the Orthodox Day school (U, Z) also had an
average "observational index" of 1.53. This was exactly the same as that of the teachers in the Conservative supplementary schools. However, the "progressive quotients" of two groups differed by 31.9 points one from the other, the Conservative group having an average "progressive quotient" of 18.4 as compared with a "P. Q." of minus 13.5 for the teachers in the Orthodox school. Admittedly, only two teachers from an Orthodox school participated in the survey. Nonetheless, it can be hypothesized that, though teachers in Conservative schools may be more liberal in their thinking because of their more liberal auspices, their less traditional background, etc., no difference exists in the realm of practice. Both types of schools remain more traditional than progressive.

Another interesting situation involves the two teachers in the Community-sponsored school affiliated with Gratz College. The average "observational index" of the two teachers was 1.67, just slightly above the average for the total group of 1.63. In contrast, the average "progressive quotient" of this grouping of two was 36.5, just slightly lower than the highest average "P. Q.," that of the teachers in the Reform schools (37.2). Two factors may have influenced the relatively low score for the "observational index": the size of the group (only two teachers) or the fact that one class was one of late beginners and problem students (Aleph) and the other was devoted almost completely to linguistic drill at the time of the observation. However, another explanation may be offered. Though the educational director (A) of the school was almost completely progressive in her thinking ("P. Q."
of 74), the school itself, concentrating mainly on linguistic achievement, may not be reflecting to the expected degree the principal's philosophy. This may be because of the linguistic emphases and the pressures to achieve maximum linguistic growth in order to prepare students to move quickly up to the high school department of Gratz College or because of the lack of adequate background of the teachers and their inability to translate into action the philosophy of the principal and to merge the need for maximum linguistic achievement with sound, progressively-oriented educational practice. It should be remembered that both teachers were still undergraduates in college and thus relatively young and inexperienced as teachers.

One other set of factors may have influenced the degree of progressively-oriented practice in the classroom. The nature of the classes of teachers with the nine highest observational indices was examined closely. Six of the nine classes had children six to nine years of age (Aleph classes, Third grade classes in Reform congregational schools and a Daled class in the Conservative Day school). Also, four of the classes were rated "bright" or "above average," and three classes were considered of "mixed" ability. More significant may be the fact that only two of the nine classes were considered "average to slightly below average." Finally, whereas the average size of all classes observed was 21 students, the average of these selected nine classes was 18.4 students. Moreover, if the classes with the two lowest observational indices are eliminated, the average size of the classes for the highest seven "O.I.'s" is reduced to 15.6 students.
Thus, it may be possible to hypothesize that class size (smaller classes), the age of students (younger students) and ability of students (average to bright students) influence the degree of progressive practice introduced into the classrooms of Jewish schools. Comments of teachers emanating from responses in the interviews would indicate that there may be some validity to these projected tendencies.

As would be expected, the "observational index" of the teachers-as-a-whole as well as an analysis of the individual items on the observational checklist indicated a far lower degree of progressively-oriented practice than of progressively-oriented thinking. This could be interpreted as due to the natural gap between theory and practice, or due to the reflection of ideal educational conceptions as contrasted to the difficult realities of Jewish education in America, especially of the supplementary variety. Also, the type of class a teacher is teaching, the orientation of the educational director and of the institution, the motivational problems of students, and the lack of preparation of the teacher would be expected to manifest themselves more in the actual teaching situation than in the relatively "detached" interview.

When everything is taken into consideration, the question of the validity of such short observations may well be raised. The quantification of the results of the observation checklist may also be questioned critically. Scientific considerations demand that the hypotheses, interpretations and relationships proposed in the preceding paragraphs be viewed only as conjecture, and that the conclusions based on these conjectures be viewed as both tenuous and tentative, hypothetical
in the most exact sense of the term.

F. The Relationship Between the Thinking of the Educational Directors and the Thinking and Practice of Teachers

I. Comparison of Responses on the Interview Schedules

Any comparison between the responses of educational directors and of teachers interviewed is extremely difficult. The same interview schedule was not administered to both groups. There was no single item that appeared on both schedules.

Nonetheless, if the items on the two schedules are thought to be similar, i.e., to reflect the continuum of thinking and opinion from complete traditionalism to complete progressivism in Jewish education, a qualified and limited comparison might be attempted. It must be kept in mind that items on the educational director's schedule dealt with philosophy of education, curriculum, supervision and administration, whereas items on the teacher's schedule dealt only with method and the psychology of learning. The most appropriate manner to attempt a comparison seems to be to examine and compare the "progressive quotients" of each group—their general level and the extent of their distribution or variation.

The variation of "progressive quotients" of the educational directors was relatively small (35). Even more important, all scores fell within the upper 25% of the potential range (39 to 78, pot. range; 39 to 74 actual range). This would indicate a "progressive" bias of significant proportions for the group—as—a whole. This situation did not repeat itself in regard to the responses of the teachers.
The potential range for teachers was less than that for educational directors (120, plus 60 to minus 60 as opposed to 156). However, the variation of response for teachers was eighty-seven, as compared to thirty-five for the educational directors. The "progressive quotients" of the group fell in approximately the upper 75% of the range as compared to the upper 25% of the range in the case of the educational directors. It may be concluded, thusly, that teachers, though tending somewhat toward a progressive orientation, were far less committed to this orientation than the educational directors. In other words, traditional educational ideas and practices were far more strongly entrenched within the group of teachers interviewed than within the group of educational directors interviewed. Also, there was a much greater divergence of thought among teachers than among educational directors, who may be thought to have expressed something of a consensus in their responses to the interview schedule.

If these trends are valid, questions should be asked as to why they manifested themselves. The fact that educational directors are further away from the actual realities of classroom life may have allowed them to respond in more ideal terms than their teaching colleagues. Also, the background and professional education of the educational directors was more adequate and uniform; thus a tendency to more sophisticated educational thinking and a consensus in that area is more likely. In general, the training of the teachers was inadequate and exhibited a tremendous diversity. These factors may help to explain the trends described and documented above.
II. Comparison of Responses of Teachers in a Given School to those of the Educational Director of that Institution.

It has been already indicated that there may exist a relationship between the orientation of an institution and the Jewish educational orientation of its faculty—educational director and teachers. A final important question related to the impact of an institution upon thinking and practice still remains to be answered: What is the relationship between the thinking of the educational leader of an institution and the thought and practice of his staff?

Since non-comparable data are involved in any attempted analysis of such a question, a method of "rank equalization" had to be utilized. Educational directors were ranked according to their "progressive quotients." Teachers were ranked previously according to their "progressive quotients" and their "observational indices." It was decided to quantify the rankings, combine and average the teachers' cumulative ranking ("P. Q." and "O. I.") and then compare the two final figures, determining the difference between the two and the direction of the difference. Thus, the proximity and divergence in thinking and practice, the degree of proximity or divergence and the direction of divergence could be computed.

For teachers, the highest score received a weight of one, the second highest (B for "P. Q." and b for "O. I.") a weight of two, and so on. Since only thirteen "progressive quotients" existed for educational directors, the highest received a weight of 1.5, the second highest or B a weight of 3.5, the third highest or C a weight of 5.5 and so on.
the lowest, received a weight of 25.5. Using this method of quantification, the following determinations were made:

Table XI (37)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ed. Director</th>
<th>&quot;O. I. &quot;</th>
<th>&quot;P. Q. &quot;</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td>A(74)</td>
<td>R/1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td>B(72)</td>
<td>R/3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td>C(71)</td>
<td>R/5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td>D(69)</td>
<td>R/7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td>E(66)</td>
<td>R/9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td>F(65)</td>
<td>R/11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td>G(55)</td>
<td>R/13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td>H(50)</td>
<td>R/17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td>I(50)</td>
<td>R/17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td>J(50)</td>
<td>R/17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td>K(42)</td>
<td>R/21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td>L(50)</td>
<td>R/21.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(0) No Divergence

Ed. D. 7.13

Ed. D. 5.18

Ed. D. 1.38

Ed. D. 8.25

Ed. D. 5.25

Ed. D. 3.25
Table XII (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&quot;O. I.&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;P. Q.&quot;</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Divergence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L(40)</td>
<td>R/23.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Ed. Director Teacher</td>
<td>f(1.86)</td>
<td>GH(35)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teacher Teacher</td>
<td>wx(1.32)</td>
<td>V(-3)</td>
<td>CR/14.75</td>
<td>T. 8.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Ed. Director Teacher</td>
<td>e(1.92)</td>
<td>LK(32)</td>
<td>R/25.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>wx(1.32)</td>
<td>Y(-15)</td>
<td>CR/16.25</td>
<td>T. 9.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assuming that the quantification of responses and observations has some validity, the following points may be made:

(1) Differences exist between the educational orientation of educational directors and teachers on their staff. The lowest average divergence of any grouping belonged to Reform religious schools (av. 2.19; b, c, d). Conservative supplementary schools exhibited an average divergence (irrespective of direction of divergence) of 5.82. The Orthodox Day school had a divergence of 4.25; the Conservative Day school manifested a divergence of 5.50. The community-sponsored school had a divergence of 7.13. Many reasons, as has already been indicated, may have contributed to this divergence. Also, divergence, on the one hand, may create severe educational problems, or, on the other hand, it may be viewed as an indication of the presence of varying views in a school, a manifestation of educational pluralism so necessary in a democracy and a democratic Jewish community. This writer is of the opinion, however, that a high degree of divergence between teacher and administrator-supervisor or among teachers without a basic consensus on fundamental issues, is more of a detriment than of an aid.

This point of view does not negate the validity and necessity of constructive difference among professionals. It does, nonetheless, question the
probability of setting direction, achieving common objectives, and of stimulating united action in a situation in which great divergence of views and acts exists.

(2) In some cases, educational directors were more progressive than their teachers. In other cases, the opposite was true:

Table XII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers more Progressive</th>
<th>Ed. Directors more Progressive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M 9.25</td>
<td>E 8.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 8.75</td>
<td>A 7.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 5.50</td>
<td>G 5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 3.00</td>
<td>B 5.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI 3.00</td>
<td>IH 3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J 2.25</td>
<td>D 1.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No Divergence
(No difference between degree of progressivism of teachers and ed. director)

C 0.00

The case of C might indicate that a general consensus (if not complete agreement) exists between administration and staff in the particular school under consideration. Obviously, since only two teachers from the school were included in the survey, the conclusion could be proven spurious if more teachers were to be interviewed. Nonetheless, the information gathered could serve as evidence for considering this school to be one with a general unity of outlook and action.

All schools in which the teachers were shown to be more progressive than the educational directors were affiliated with the Conservative movement. Of the schools in which the educational
directors were more progressive than the teachers, only two were affiliated with Conservative movement. In the schools affiliated with the Reform movement, educational directors were somewhat more progressive than their teachers or no divergence existed (C). Also, the educational directors of the Orthodox Day school and the community-sponsored school were more progressive than their teachers. The teachers in the Conservative Day school were significantly more progressive than the principal of the school.
NOTES

   Published by the Division of Community Services, Gratz College,
   10th and Tabor Road, Phila., Pa. (1963) Mimeographed. Eighteen
   pages.

2. It was determined, upon consultation with Dr. William B. Schwab,
   visiting lecturer in social anthropology and the member of the writer's
   faculty committee who was acquainted with statistical procedures,
   that a "20% sample" would be sufficient if the universe was large
   enough, relatively homogeneous; if the sampling was completely
   random among valid stratifications; if direct interviews and
   observations under relatively controlled conditions reduced the
   possibility of potential error. These conditions were met as is
   described.

3. Three individuals were extremely helpful in determining the method
   of selection and stratification of school systems to be investigated.
   These men were:
   
   Dr. William B. Lakritz, Educational Director,
   Board of Jewish Education, 1701 Walnut St., Phila., Pa.

   Mr. Daniel Isaacman, Registrar, Gratz College,
   10th and Tabor Road, Phila., Pa.

   Mr. Abraham Segal, formerly Consultant for
   Reform Religious Schools, Division of Community
   Services, Gratz College, 10th and Tabor Road,
   Phila., Pa.

3a. Three schools had been eliminated because of their being outside
    of the immediate suburban area.

3b. Five schools had been eliminated because of their being outside
    of the immediate suburban area.

4. See page for the description of the actual "age-grade breakdown"
    of the observed classes.

5. See Chapter II for an analysis of the development of American
    progressive education and "progressive educational" literature.
    See Chapters V, VI, VII (Section A) for an analytical discussion
    of progressive influences upon Jewish education, in theory and
    practice.

6. The Thesis Seminar conducted by Dr. Meir Ben-Horin was
invaluable in providing help in this area as well as in other areas. Dr. Sef-Horn functioned as the leader of the Seminar in a stimulating manner. His incisive criticisms were judged beneficial.

7. A fairly large Conservative synagogue school in the Camden, New Jersey area was used as a "pilot school" in order to test out and refine the interview and observation instruments being developed. The cooperation of Mr. Jacob Levin, Director of the Camden County Bureau of Jewish Education, was indeed helpful. Also, the educational director and faculty of the above synagogue were very cooperative.

8. See Note #6.


10. The following were instrumental in allowing the writer to visit the necessary schools and should be commended for their help:

- Dr. William B. Lakritz
- Mr. Abraham Segal
- Dr. Henri Front, Federation of Reform Synagogues, Phila., Pa.
- Dr. Felix Freifelder, Director, Beth Jacob Schools, Phila., Pa.
- Mrs. Elsie Chomsky, Principal, The School of Observation and Practice, Gratz College, Phila., Pa.

11. Though thirteen schools were visited, only twelve educational directors, principals, rabbis were interviewed. This was because one principal of an afternoon Congregational school was also the principal of a branch of a Day school visited.

11a. See Appendix, p.612 for a description of license qualifications and criteria for rating.

12. The numbers of the items (#) referred to correspond with the items listed in the Educational Director's Interview Schedule found on pp 593-596 of the Appendix.

13. See the Appendix for the items as found on the Schedule.

14. The fact that little importance was given to students in the curriculum development process is not surprising though it may be considered inconsistent with other fairly progressive and modern views held. The danger of having a curriculum revolve around "current felt needs" was expressed more than once by the respondents. A
curriculum based solely on "current felt needs" would have little validity for Jewish education which must create needs and "sell itself." This does not say that the needs, interests and experiences of students were not considered important (See Item #5 and the discussion about it on page 541). Again, this seeming inconsistency may point to a lack of a total acceptance of progressive educational principles, a reflection of the pressures of reality or a valid point of differentiation based on the peculiar circumstances and needs of Jewish group life in America.

15. In the area of philosophy of education, the responses to only one item exhibited "polarity," instances of complete agreement and complete disagreement being present for the same item (#14). This item dealing with the role of the human mind in determining matters of ultimate faith and belief produced the following responses: seven disagreements, one partial acceptance, one "partial" in the direction of disagreement, one complete agreement and two "partials" in the direction of agreement. Interestingly, four items in the area of curriculum development exhibited "polarity": #3 (quite minor), #26 and #12 (more pronounced), and extreme divergence in regard to #8 dealing with the relative importance of so-called co-curricular activities as compared to conventional activities: five agreements, one "partial" in the direction of agreement, and six disagreements. Since no instances of "polarity" existed in the area of supervision and administration, it might be surmised that greater unanimity of progressive orientation exists in that area. However, this conclusion should be considered as nothing more than conjecture based upon tenuous evidence.

16. In the case of a partial agreement with no obvious tendency in the direction of "agreement" or "disagreement," the writer used his judgment in order to categorize the "partial agreement" responses. An analysis of the comments of respondents proved helpful in this regard.

17. Whether or not a response was classified as "pro-progressive" or "anti-progressive" depended upon (1) the expected response if a progressive point of view were to be present; (2) the expected response if a traditional point of view were to be present. These included "complete" and "partial" agreement or disagreement. Actually, six degrees of response were present. Each response was scored. Thus, the number of "pro-progressive" and "anti-progressive" responses could be easily computed.

18. Actually, there were only twelve respondents. However, the score of one was doubled. This resulted from the fact that this individual held two positions, each one in a school included in the survey. See Note #11.
19. See pages 523.

20. See pages 525-526 and 524-525.

21. See Appendix, Table A, page 611. Note percentages per each response category.

21a. Prior to the development of the Isaac Mayer Wise Department of Gratz College, the College of Jewish Studies provided the teacher training program in Philadelphia for prospective and practicing teachers for the one-day-a-week Reform religious schools. With the inception of the Isaac Mayer Wise Department a curriculum for the Department was developed in consultation with the Federation of Reform Synagogues of Greater Philadelphia. Classes meet one evening per week at Gratz College and on Sunday mornings at the student's home congregation, where students are provided a supervised program of study and student teaching. The course runs over a period of two years (twelve semester hours). Students must be at least sixteen years of age and must have a reading knowledge of Hebrew. Courses include Education (and supervised practice teaching), Hebrew, Bible (in translation), Jewish and Hebrew literature (in translation), History and Music Education (See pages 39-41 of the Gratz College Bulletin [1967-68] for further details).

22. According to a statement prepared in 1963 by the Philadelphia Community Board of License the so-called "Provisional Permit" is "neither a license or a certificate. It is granted for one year, during which time it is the obligation of the candidate to advance his professional preparation through further study." A person so-rated may have adequate general education but lacks Jewish school experience and does not have a Teacher's Certificate from Gratz or a similar institution. In many cases these individuals are already teaching in a Jewish school. Those teachers with the "Provisional Permit" usually are teachers in the city's public schools. They are encouraged to enroll in the "Special Teachers' Program" at Gratz College. Classes are held one evening per week. Twenty credits in Hebrew language are required. Since four semester hours are given each year, the overall program runs five years. During this period reading in five areas of Judaica and appropriate examinations are required. At the conclusion of this course a "Special Teachers' License" may be granted. Requirements for the other certificates (licenses) as well as for "Special Teachers' License" and "Nursery Teachers' License" are found on pp. 613-618 of the Appendix.

23. See pages 601-603 for these items.

24. Some responses deviated somewhat from "complete agreement" or
"complete disagreement." This deviation was ascertained from the comments of the respondents. Thus, categories of "agreement in the direction of partial agreement" (AgPt) and "disagreement in the direction of partial disagreement" (DsPt) were added.

25. See page 573 for the explanation of the development of the definitions and pages 604-605 in the Appendix for the total listing of the definitions.

26. See above, p. 541.

27. See pages 604-605 in the Appendix for total listing.

28. See pages 527-529 for a more detailed description of the method of computation of the "progressive quotient."

29. See pages 570-576 for a comparison of the distribution and variation of "progressive quotients" of teachers and educational directors.

30. See Note #22 and page 534.

31. The Solomon Schechter Day School should not be considered in the same light as the Conservative supplementary afternoon school. Though endorsed by the United Synagogue and having a general Conservative orientation, its Education Committee consists of professional and lay people representing the gamut of religious views from Neo-Orthodox to Reconstructionist to Labor Zionist. In addition, the school, attempting to emulate the best in private elementary school education, considers its educational approach "progressive." Thus, it is not surprising that its teachers may be more sophisticated and progressively-oriented than most teachers in Conservative supplementary religious schools.

32. See Appendix, pages 606-610.

33. See Note #7.

33a. See pp. 542-543 for an explanation of this tendency.

34. See pages 553-554.

35. See pages 527-532.

36. See pages 527-532 and 550-560.

37. Lower case letters are used for the "observational index" rankings and capital letters for the "progressive quotient" rankings. "R" represents "rank" (ed. directors). "CR" represents "cumulative rank" (of both teachers). "Divergence" represents the difference between "R" and "CR."
"Ed. D." represents "educational directors more progressive."
"T." represents "teachers more progressive."

38. HI and IH refer to the same educational director who was the
director of two schools included in the survey. See note #11.
Chapter VIII

Conclusions

In conclusion, it can be seen from the preceding presentation of progressive trends, tendencies, innovations and principles in action that progressive education in its generalized form or forms has stimulated changes in the areas of methodology, philosophy of education, and curriculum development. Also, it can be stated that it has represented a dynamic influence in the evolution of the theory and practice of the administrative and supervisory functions. It is an indisputable sociological fact that Jewish education in the United States has developed in the environment in which this seeming educational metamorphosis has taken place, and also that Jewish education has been vulnerable to many of the same environmental forces that have left their mark upon general educational theory and practice. However, it is not accurate or valid to state as fact that Jewish education in all its congruent ramifications (methodology, curriculum development, philosophy of education, etc.) has been influenced by the "progressive transformation" in the same manner as was general education. It is quite possible to conceive that "X" environmental factor may have affected Jewish education in a unique fashion, different from the way that it affected general education. It is more than mere conjecture to state for the record that in certain cases a high level of mutual adaptation and accommodation between
Jewish education and general progressive education has occurred, whereas in other areas insulation from, resistance to and total negation of progressive tendencies may be evident. This point deserves further elucidation, especially as it parallels a situation encountered as one studies trends in the development of thinking in general educational philosophy.

As has been alluded to before, essentialism in general educational philosophy, by virtue of its eclectic nature, has accepted quite a few principles and innovations that have emanated from progressivist theory and practice. Though this "borrowing" has been selective, it is an incontrovertible fact. In one of his later books, Robert Ulich, one of the most "progressive" of essentialists, enumerates various postulates of teaching. The postulate of totality implies that "good teaching, therefore, must address the total personality of the student in both his intellectual and emotional aspects . . . Naturally, the postulate of totality applies also to the relation of body and soul."

In addition, he discusses the postulates of individualism of method, the postulate of adequateness or motivation, the postulate of many-sidedness, the postulate of mental order, the postulate of correlation of subject-matter, the postulate of self-activity, and the postulate of ethical direction. Progressivist inclinations (admittedly mixed with more traditional biases) are obvious. Of Ulich and of Herman Horne, another "liberal" essentialist, Brameld says:
But even Ulich, perhaps the most cosmopolitan and forward looking of living American essentialists, accommodates in his curriculum proposals considered traditional subject matter and method. Training in foreign languages is particularly stressed for its "thoroughness and exactness," and he insists of course, upon religious understanding of the spiritual universe ...

Horne, too, reveals the influence of progressivist thought in the curriculum area. He urges us to consider the needs and abilities of children; and his "essential studies" include the scientific method, the inorganic and organic physical world, the human environment, and appreciation as well as skill in the arts ...

Nonetheless, the underlying framework of assumptions of both Horne and Ulich in regard to reality, knowledge, and values, though it may have some validity, is certainly not "progressive." The true nature of the approach of these so-called "enlightened" essentialists becomes evident in the following statements by Ulich:

In reality, however, the gospel of change is only partially true, and if the partial claims totality, it creates dangerous fallacies. History is not merely change and adjustment; it is also tradition, preservation, a continuum. Without a certain order, system, and essentiality of values, life would become chaotic and meaningless ...

If right teaching promotes in the young the right kind of learning, the discovery of values lies to a large extent in the process of learning itself. For it involves more than contact with subjects. Rather, it awakens the sense for thoroughness, truth, justice in judgment, and love of inquiry which may end not only in desire for new knowledge but also in respect for the great laws and mysteries of life.

The attraction of certain progressive emphases to the even more retrogressive perennialist school is evidenced in the inspection of writings of one of the foremost Catholic
educational philosophers of our time, Jacques Maritain. Of him, Brameld says:

His (Maritain's) own writings on education are characteristically broad and appreciative of other points of view, although they also strongly reflect the supernatural and revelatory aspects of Thomist doctrine... Maritain, with characteristic breadth, suggests work experience as desirable learning experience, and he is insistent that, up to a point, elementary education should encourage the free play of imagination, the "kind of bounding, temperamental, and lucid freedom" that is natural to the child.5

The point to be made here is a vital one for this study. The assimilation of principles, techniques, even selected beliefs of progressivism by other schools of thought does not make these other schools of thought "progressivist" in general orientation. It gives evidence rather of (1) the attraction of aspects of progressivism to more conservative approaches, (2) the ephemeral victory of progressivism as alluded to by Cremin,6 and to (3) the eclectic and somewhat paradoxical nature of both perennialism and essentialism, essentialism being by far the more ambiguous of the two.7

Evidence presented in chapters V, VI, and VII of this dissertation might be considered sufficient to "prove" that "progressive education"—at various levels and to varying degrees—has made over the years a significant impact upon Jewish education in the United States. However, since this study was limited in nature, any conclusions drawn must be carefully considered and viewed with a sense of questioning and tentativeness. The purpose of the study has never been
to present evidence for a case that the Jewish school has been radically "transformed" by the progressivists who over many turbulent years have entered the ranks of the profession at diverse levels and have left their influence in schools, systems, communities and on the national level. Such interpretations would do a grave injustice to truth, research of a respectable nature, to those who have worked diligently and, in a number of cases, given their lives, to reconstruct Jewish education, as a profession and program in order to adapt it to the cultural realities of the first six decades of the century. Such an attempt, if ever it should be made and no matter how sincere it should be, would have to be considered suspect and in the realm of propaganda. Research in Jewish education must be just that—the collection of valid and reliable evidence, reasonably critical and analytical interpretation as objective scholarship demands, and the drawing of conclusions which will enhance the status of that scholarship, the nature of the profession and Jewish education as program and process.

One cannot withhold the observation that too little of the latter has been accepted in the name of "cause," "cultural survival," and "urgent necessity." For those who have looked to this study to provide significant recommendations or "earth-shaking" solutions, the author, after reviewing the selected evidence and after examining the various forces at work in the world, in American society, in the general educational community, and in the field of American Jewish education is wary and
hesitant about discussing sweeping conclusions and making profound prognostications.

Nonetheless, the following might be stated. The ultimate fate of progressivism's influence upon Jewish education may be a function of two major future developments: on the one hand the direction taken by that education known as "American education" and, on the other, the new realities and challenges that will face American Jewish life in the "space age." The past history of the confrontation would justify this prognosis. If American education moves in a reactionary direction, as some people and pressure groups would have it do, Jewish education will be influenced by this development. Likewise, the place and the quality of religion in Jewish life will affect the Jewish educational process. If neo-mysticism wins out over a more rationalistic-naturalistic theology and world-view, then Jewish educational progressivism will be put even more on the defensive than it is at present. These and other contingencies must definitely be taken into consideration as one attempts to assess the future of progressivism in Jewish education.

The degree to which progressivism has improved Jewish educational practice, is obviously open to further inquiry. It would seem that as progressivism is critically and scientifically evaluated on the American educational scene, so should it be on the Jewish scene. All principles and innovations should be experimentally and empirically investigated. The latest findings in general education and in the behavioral and social sciences should be utilized to evaluate the data
gathered. Certain aspects of progressivism as they pertain to the needs of contemporary American Jewish education will be affirmed and others rejected, if the evidence warrants it. No matter what transpires, the essential spirit of progressivism should be recognized and studied. Research in the areas of philosophy of education, curriculum development, method, supervision and administration should be encouraged so that Jewish education might become self-analytical and self-critical and so that Jewish educators might understand those forces that subtly influence their educational decisions. The objectives of Jewish education, generic and specific, should be stated, and then the Jewish educational process should be strenuously evaluated in the light of these objectives. A meaningful Jewish education is what is being asked for, not just an education that is lauded because a magical label has been attached to it.

If these projections seem limited, especially after all the research that has preceded them and if more questions seem to have been raised than expected, such are the conclusions that can be honestly presented at this time. The period in which we exist, confused as it appears to many tempts hyper-analysis and projection of "a master plan" for the future. However, as disturbing as it might seem, the nature of our era, the adherance to truth as we see it, the reliance upon evidence and the factors at play in our society leave us no alternative but to be tentative and searching. The author would rather have it said of his work that he attempted to
tell it as it appeared to him than that it provided the ultimate solutions to the problems of Jewish education within American society.
NOTES


2. Ibid., pp. 209-224.


APPENDIX
Interview Checklist -- Educational Directors

Full-time Educational Director _____ Part-time Principal _____
Rabbi-Educational Director _____ Rabbi _____
Head Teacher _____
Number of years present position _____ Age ___ 20-29; 30-39; 40-49; 50-59; 60 and above.

General Background (education and related):

Jewish Background (education and related):

Degrees BA(BS) MA Ph.D. Degrees:____________
Teacher's License _____ Principal's License _____ NCJE _____
Number of Students in all programs
Elementary_________ High school and extension _____

Range of classes (from what grade to what grade)

Grade distribution of classes
K. Pre-Heb. Prim. Aleph Bet Gimel Daled Heh

Status of teachers (license ratings)
A_____ B_____ C_____ D_____ other_____ Non-licensed_____ Intensive and extensive program?

Homogeneous groupings (two levels), three or more levels or "mixed groupings"?

1. The administrator of the Jewish school, even though he may be held responsible for all major decisions related to the instructional program, should consult with his instructional staff when major decisions are to be made. Ag-Pt-Ds-NAn
2. The search for reliable evidence is one of the most important characteristics of any education, including religious education.

3. The curriculum is the total living of the child insofar as the school can influence it or should take responsibility for developing it.

4. In order to preserve American Society, the American heritage must be transmitted intact and without critical analysis from one generation to the next. The building of a new America is beyond the province of the school.

5. Using the experiences, interests and needs of students in Jewish schools to help formulate a curriculum will result in a "watered-down" and inadequate Jewish education.

6. Efficiency rather than democratic procedures must be the administrator's chief concern.

7. An education which accepts the primacy of change, the relativity of truth, and the tentativeness of knowledge weakens American democracy in its struggle against totalitarianism.

8. Activities such as Keren Ami, assemblies, trips, clubs, etc., have their place but are much less important than the conventional classroom procedures.

10. In order to have a good school, the principal must create and effectively implement strict lines of authority from himself down to the lowest echelon.

11. An education which accepts the primacy of change, the relativity of truth, the tentativeness of knowledge and the natural as opposed to the super-natural underminds Judaism as a distinct way of life.

12. A course of study which is logically organized and which specifically states the subjects, and texts to be used, the exact pages to be covered, and the time per week to devote to the subject will best actualize the objectives of the Jewish school.

13. A program of individual student-guidance must be included in the formulation of the curriculum of the secondary Jewish school and of institutions of higher Jewish learning.
14. Education should be democratic in classroom procedure; but in the matter of ultimate faith and belief, the human mind cannot be trusted.

15. The grouping together or integration of related subjects such as the History of Ancient Israel and Bible, History and Current Events, the study of Modern Israel with Hebrew Language and Literature, is commendable.

16. Progressive education suffers from aimlessness and lacks real values; it is beyond repair.

17. The use of audio-visual aids and the fostering of creative expression in language, music, arts and crafts, and prayer are desirable in the good Jewish school.

19. Administrative leadership should have as one of its major goals the stimulation and encouragement of the leadership on the part of others.

20. The superior wisdom and experience of the supervisor is the most important part of supervision.

21. Since we wish our society to be as democratic as possible, pupils must be educated in democratic thinking and conduct.

22. The rabbinate and the informed laity should have the decisive word in curriculum construction; the views of the educational director, teachers and students are of secondary importance in this area.

24. Supervision consists mainly of visitation of classrooms and conferences with teachers in order to point out the teacher's weaknesses and to help deal with the teacher's personal problems with the hope that the teacher will improve his practice.

25. In the formulation of educational policy the administrator should attempt to gain the consent of opponents and of vested interests rather than attempt to outmaneuver and overpower them.

26. Curriculum innovations may have some worth at the Hebrew high school and Teacher's College level; however, the subject-matter, skill-centered, information-imparting curriculum is still best at the elementary school level.
27. Continual professional growth and the fostering of creativity on the part of teachers are fundamental goals of supervision.

28. The co-ed classroom, good lighting, adequate ventilation, accessibility of books and other reading materials through a classroom library or through frequent and spontaneous visits to the school library, attractive textbooks, etc., are necessary requisites for a superior Jewish educational experience.

30. Good supervision calls for consultation with experts, group-workshops and seminars, problem-solving sessions; it will attempt to de-emphasize the personal weaknesses of individual teachers and attempt to utilize and give recognition to the strengths and talents of the staff.

Have you ( ), your children ( ), your students ( ) had any experience with progressivism in general education?

If yes, what are your feelings about it?

Your interpretation of modern Jewish life corresponds most closely with that of: Isaac M. Wise, Rabbi Soloveitchik, Mordecai M. Kaplan, Solomon Schechter, David Ben-Gurion.

None of these (please describe)

How would you classify your philosophy of education? (all factors--time, etc. --being equal)

Classical-literary    Progressive    Traditional-religious
Reconstructionist    Hebraic-Zionist
Yiddishist-secular   other
1. major decisions  decisions that will effect the form and structure of the educational process, that will enunciate new principles or reject old ones, that will effect the functioning of teachers, that may demand a reorientation in regard to educational objectives and methods.

2. reliable evidence  facts, principles, knowledge about which there is general agreement and which has been used and tested and been shown to stand up in the face of searching scrutiny.

3. total living  All aspects of life, even those occurring outside the school but which should or could be influenced by the school.

4. American heritage  principles of the Constitution, the American historic experience, aspirations and hopes, institutions, literature and folklore, art and music, socio-economic and political structure, the essence of American civilizational experience.

new America  a plan for America that is based upon a critical understanding of the past and the present; an attempt to chart future directions in which the country should go, implying changes and modifications of principles, values, attitudes, etc., if conditions warrant it.

intact  without modification; unchanging and unchangeable.

5. "watered down"  lowered to the level of current felt needs and thus superficial.

6. democratic  a form of joint living in which members choose courses of action based on the inspection of the best available evidence and in the spirit of mutuality and compassion.

7. primacy  has priority as a major principle of life.

8. conventional classroom procedures  questioning, reciting, discussion, drill, explanation, reading, etc.
10. **strict lines of authority**  the machinery for decisions made at the highest levels to be carried out at lower levels with consequent responsibility for carrying out these decisions without any flexibility or opportunity to question, amend or disregard.

11. **natural as opposed to supernatural**  a point of view that regards everything as an event in nature and not outside the realm and control of nature (its known principles and its "future-known" principles). Natural events or phenomena have the quality of discoverability and are amendable to processes of human understanding and intelligence.

13. **individual student-guidance**  a structure by which learning and learning-related (emotional, social, home, public school, interests, etc.) problems can be worked upon by a trained staff-member and the student in order to meet the specific needs of the individual student.

14. **ultimate faith and belief**  those verities that cannot and must not be tested by external verification (human experience and intelligence) and have the qualities of absoluteness and eternity; those fundamental assumptions or axioms that are at the base of a philosophical or theological system.

16. **progressive methodology**  as an example: problem-solving, projects, units or other motivational techniques such as games, the use of the arts, etc.

**progressive philosophy of education**  that philosophy which deals with free inquiry, the instrumental use of intelligence, change, a pluralistic universe, the tentativeness and relativity of truth and knowledge, democracy, the nature of the educational process and the curriculum, evolution and the world of natural events, etc.

**aimlessness, lacks real values**  no clear-cut direction, socially and culturally; no long range objectives of further education and individual growth; does not base objectives of education on pre-existent or emerging values which symbolize what the civilization feels is important.

17. **audio-visual aids**  maps, recording, films, etc.
creative expression  original or novel products of student initiative emanating from interaction with subject-matter and with people (students, teachers, etc.).

20. superior wisdom  great learning and a fund of knowledge resulting from higher education, reading, etc.

21. democratic thinking and conduct  thinking which takes into consideration other points of view, group consensus and minority dissent, responsible expression of thought; conduct controlled by group decisions, taking into consideration the next person, the needs of total group.

22. informed laity  those lay people who have an interest in Jewish education and who know something about it, usually serving on an education or school committee; supposedly they know something about its content and have some knowledge about the educational process.

secondary importance  views that may have some validity but can and should be overruled by the rabbinate and informed laity if disagreement exists.

24. visitation of classrooms  the presence of a supervisor or consultant or principal with the purpose of either passive observation and/or active demonstration in order to help the teacher improve his teaching.

25. educational policy  major guidelines and decisions that influence the determination of educational objectives and the methods of achieving these objectives.

consent  free and critical acceptance of the point of view of the administrator or taking on that point of view and making it their own.

vested interests  groups that have certain acknowledged or hidden motives or concerns and who actively fight for their cause or manipulate people or things secretly in order to achieve their objectives, much of the time not considering basic educational requirements but rather focusing on tangential concerns.

outmaneuver and overpower  the attempt to trick or beat down opponents and vested interests, to "beat them at their own game," rather than attempt to stand on principle and win them over.
27. professional growth development in understandings, skills and knowledge necessary to carry out the teaching role in a more effective manner.

30. consultation advice from or discussion with an expert.

group-workshops thought and/or activity sessions dealing with specific problems or areas of the curriculum.

problem-solving sessions a brain-storming session to deal with a problem of importance and of general concern.
Interview Check List -- Post-Observation

Classroom Teacher

License ________ Years of experience ________ Age ________

College Degrees ____________________________________________

Teacher Education (general, courses) ____________________________

________________________________________________________________

Grade ________ Ages ________ Boy-Girl Composition ________;

Special Characteristics of Class:

2. Jewish education, being a specialized type of education, should not concern itself with the emotional, physical and social problems the child brings with him since the child spends so little time in the Jewish school.  Ag-Pt-Ds-NAn

4. The teacher must be able to exercise a high degree of authority in order to assure effective learning.  Ag-Pt-Ds-NAn

5. Since we live in a competitive society, competition among students is desirable and, in many instances, is an excellent stimulus for achievement and preparation for life.  Ag-Pt-Ds-NAn

7. The teacher in a democratic classroom is in reality a helper and a guide to student learning rather than a dispenser of knowledge. The teacher in the Jewish school must be democratic.  Ag-Pt-Ds-NAn

8. Learning is basically a matter of providing stimulation by the teacher, evoking a response on the part of the pupil, and providing a reward for the right response and some sort of punishment (or no reward) for a wrong response.  Ag-Pt-Ds-NAn

9. The project method should be used in teaching the concepts of God and Torah.  Ag-Pt-Ds-NAn

10. Student-inventiveness and originality should be a primary goal of Jewish education.  Ag-Pt-Ds-NAn
11. Democratic method—discussion, decision making, helping and encouraging students to examine evidence and then make tentative choices, encouraging students to ask questions and argue points even with the teacher—is difficult to implement. Since Jewish education has so much at stake it should use democratic method sparingly and with the utmost caution.

13. Progressive education has some techniques worthy of incorporation into Jewish education, but its over-all method is too radical.

14. Grades and rewards are the most efficient incentives for student learning and provide for the highest quality of learning.

15. Education, as thought of in the Jewish school, consists mainly of training the mind and imparting knowledge to be assimilated by it.

16. The individual interests, needs and capacities of a group of learners should influence teaching methodology, different techniques being used with different students.

17. The "assign-recite-test" method is generally quite appropriate in teaching the subject-matter of the Jewish school curriculum.

18. The use of student-committees as part of classroom procedure and as a teaching-device is time-consuming and therefore cannot be practiced in the Jewish school.

19. The best type of learning in the Jewish school is known as "purposive" learning. By that we mean learning which has a purpose that the students accept as being important to them and not only to the teacher.

20. "Problem-solving" leaves little room for learning those skills, facts, and ideas so necessary for the perpetuation of Judaism. Its learning outcomes are often unpredictable and difficult to measure, and, therefore, it has relatively little value for Jewish education.
22. In religious education, change can occur in the use of modern educational psychology and methodology, whereas criticism of established beliefs and practices may not be permitted or desired.

24. Basically the individual's acquisition of factual material and skills is the focal point of all teaching. His character and personality development cannot be the concern of the Jewish school.

25. Good method in the hands of a qualified and skilled teacher will not allow for indoctrination of the learner no matter how strong the convictions of the institution or the instructor are.

27. The writing of original prayers and the creation of a class Siddur or Haggadah are excellent activities at the elementary and secondary levels of the Jewish school.
Definitions -- Teacher Schedule
(as found on cards shown to respondents)

2. specialized
   dealing with a delimited area of life as opposed to all aspects of life.

3. high degree of authority
   the exercise and use of authority in such a manner as to always have the class keep in mind "who's the boss."

7. democratic
   a form of joint living in which members choose courses of action based on the inspection of the best available evidence and in the spirit of mutuality.

   helper or guide
   learning takes place at behest of the learner who must take an active part in the process; the teacher gives direction, stimulates, motivates, gives support to the student as he attempts to learn, but learning takes place within the learner; the teacher can only be a helper, nothing more.

   dispenser of knowledge
   the teacher presents the "truth" to the learner in an authoritative way; the teachers and the books he uses are the source of knowledge and cannot be questioned.

9. the project method
   that method, based on student-purposes and being student-generated, by which many types of learnings take place as the students in a group (and in sub-groups) attempt to carry out operations in order to reach an objective important to them.

10. student-inventiveness
    the use of imagination on the part of the student in dealing with challenging situations, real or contrived (problem-situations).

13. (re: techniques)
    progressive methodology
    as an example: problem-solving, projects, activities, content or experience units or other motivational techniques such as games, the use of the arts, etc.

    progressive philosophy of education
    that philosophy of education which deals with free inquiry, the instrumental use of intelligence, change, a pluralistic universe, the tentativeness and relativity of truth and knowledge, democracy, the nature of the educational process and the curriculum, evolution and the world of natural events, etc.
13. **radical** deviates too much from the traditional values and procedures of Jewish education.

15. **training** providing experiences in the use of one's intellectual apparatus so that it becomes sharp and keen.

17. **assign-recite-test** method a method which has as its basic components having students read some material at home or in class, then asking them to "give back" the material orally or by means of a written quiz, and finally, giving them a test in order to motivate them to know the material even better and to evaluate their retention of the material.

18. **student-committees** a group of students working on part of a total classroom project or being responsible for some specific aspect of classroom life.

20. **problem-solving** that method by which students attempt to arrive at solutions to unanswered questions that are artificially posed or stem from their actual experiences.

**perpetuation** extension of its existence into the future in its traditional form.

22. **established beliefs and practices** concepts and assumptions, folkways and mores that have permanence because of authority of tradition, history or convention.

24. **character** that part of personality which signifies an independent persistence in patterns of conduct which allows for predictability.

**personality** the sum total of socio-psychological response patterns that has come into existence as one has reacted (cumulative effect) to all types of environmental stimuli.

25. **indoctrination** imposition of a point of view, set of values or attitudes upon the learner without providing to the learner the opportunity to evaluate all evidence as it pertains to that point of view.

27. **creation of a class Siddur or Haggadah** reorganization, addition to, changes in regular Siddur and Haggadah in line with interests, age level, talents, etc. of class.
Checklist for Classroom Observation

Atmosphere and Procedure

1. Does the atmosphere in the classroom indicate sound interpersonal relationships (teacher-student, student-student) based upon mutual acceptance and mutuality of purpose?
   
   Indication of Presence
   
   H-I-L Not

2. Authority
   
   a. Do students have the opportunity to develop and practice their own controls and rules of procedure?
   
   H-I-L Not

   b. Does the teacher use his authority functionally, sympathetically and only when the need arises?
   
   H-I-L Not

3. Are students allowed to ask questions?
   
   Are they encouraged to do so?
   
   H-I-L Not

   Is discussion an important aspect of method?
   
   H-I-L Not

4. Are the students given an opportunity to express themselves?
   
   Can they disagree and be critical of the teacher?
   
   H-I-L Not

   Can they disagree with and be critical of fellow students?
   
   H-I-L Not

5. Does the teacher allow for student decision making in:
   
   a. Administrative areas?
   
   H-I-L Not

   b. In reaching a judgment or consensus related to subject-matter?
   
   H-I-L Not

6. Does the teacher show concern for individual differences in interests, capacities, etc. ?
   
   H-I-L Not
7. Does the teacher show concern for individual problems (intellectual, physical, social, emotional)? H-I-L Not

8. Does creating healthy social relationships and stimulating student-creativity seem to be important? H-I-L Not

9. Are competitive practices encouraged and utilized in order to attempt to secure more efficient learning? H-I-L Not

10. Are cooperative procedures, utilizing the class esprit de corps, social-mindedness, class-pride, utilized or attempted? H-I-L Not

11. Does the seating arrangement lend itself to freedom of interaction and movement? H-I-L Not

12. Do sub-groups or committees exist which work on different projects or handle specific tasks? H-I-L Not

13. Is teacher-evaluation of students taking place during the class session? H-I-L Not


   If so, freely? H-I-L Not

   As a class? H-I-L Not

   In a restrictive manner? H-I-L Not

17. Are homework assignments used to help students? Do they entail creativity, imagination or reflective thinking? H-I-L Not
Are they planned by students?  H-I-L  Not
Do they emanate from classroom life?  H-I-L  Not
Are they discussed in advance and afterwards by the teacher?  H-I-L  Not

Relating Learning to the Learner

1. Is language-learning functional and motivated?  H-I-L  Not

Does it allow for self-expression and creativity?  H-I-L  Not

Does the total class environment act as stimulation for satisfying language-learning and expression?  H-I-L  Not

2. Is the teacher concerned with extrinsic or "long-range" (you can use it in the future, you should know it, traditional or grades, stars, points, etc.) motivations?  H-I-L  Not

3. Is the teacher concerned with intrinsic (interests, relevance of subject-matter to students, existing and "created" student purposes, etc.) motivation?  H-I-L  Not

4. Are students involved with projects, activities, etc.?  H-I-L  Not

Are they teacher-initiated? -- student-initiated?  H-I-L  Not

Are they "drill-centered" and for the purposes of habituation?  H-I-L  Not

Are they reflective and creative?  H-I-L  Not

5. Are the plastic arts

   musical arts  H-I-L  Not
   dramatic arts  H-I-L  Not
   literary arts  H-I-L  Not

   incorporated into the program?
Are they naturally related to subject-matter? H-I-L Not

Are they a separate area of study? H-I-L Not

6. Is a problem-solving approach ever used? H-I-L Not


Are they a product of student-creativity? H-I-L Not

8. Are controversial topics discussed? H-I-L Not

9. Does criticism of society, the Jewish community, institutions, practices, attitudes, values take place? H-I-L Not

10. Is the reconstruction of Jewish life discussed? H-I-L Not

11. Does learning seem to be relevant? H-I-L Not

satisfying? H-I-L Not

purposeful? H-I-L Not

teacher? H-I-L Not

student? H-I-L Not

12. Is the teacher sensitive (any evidence) to the current happenings in the world as they are related to the student as Jew and person? H-I-L Not

13. Is content presented so that it relates to the present and is relevant to the student? H-I-L Not

14. Does the teacher handle well the merging of spontaneously aroused curiosity and discussion with the planned-for presentation of the subject-matter as directed by the curriculum? H-I-L Not

15. Is there anything on walls and window sills? teacher-created? H-I-L Not

student-created? H-I-L Not
16. Is there a class library?  H-I-L  Not

17. Are audio-visual aids used?  H-I-L  Not

18. Are trips planned and taken?  H-I-L  Not

Related to subject-matter of study?  H-I-L  Not

19. Is the community used as a resource?  H-I-L  Not

as a source of study?  H-I-L  Not

limited to religious institutions?  H-I-L  Not

own denominational institutions?  H-I-L  Not

similar non-religious institutions?  H-I-L  Not


Are they a test of the fixation of subject-matter?  H-I-L  Not
### Table A

Responses of Educational Directors (Schedule) According to Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>NAn</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Partial</th>
<th>Partial(Ag)</th>
<th>Partial (Ds)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7(58.3%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5(41.7%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9(75.0%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10(83.3%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10(83.3%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9(75.0%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8(66.7%)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10(83.3%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6(50.0%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8(66.7%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7(58.3%)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6(50.0%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11(91.67%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7(58.3%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12(100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9(75%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10(83.3%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12(100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9(75%)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11(91.67%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6(50%)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10(83.3%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12(100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10(83.3%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9(75%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10(83.3%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10(83.3%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10(83.3%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate Type</td>
<td>Requirements</td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Certificate</td>
<td>Completion of regular course at Gratz College or equivalent.</td>
<td>Two years College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Certificate &quot;P&quot;</td>
<td>Completion of Sophomore year at Gratz College or equivalent.</td>
<td>Two years College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Certificate &quot;C&quot;</td>
<td>Further Jewish study; Completion of Junior year at Gratz College or equivalent (Teacher's Diploma)</td>
<td>Two years College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Certificate &quot;B&quot;</td>
<td>Further Jewish study; Completion of senior year at Gratz College or equivalent (B.H.L. degree or equivalent)</td>
<td>Bachelor's Degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Certificate &quot;A&quot;</td>
<td>Master's Degree of equivalent</td>
<td>Six credits graduate study in Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**JEWISH SCHOOL EXPERIENCE**
- Qualified Supervision
- Two years satisfactory teaching under approved supervision.
- 3 yrs. satisfactory teaching under responsible supervision after receiving permanent license "B".
- 2 yrs. satisfactory teaching after receiving permanent license "C".
- 3 yrs. satisfactory teaching after receiving "B" or a total of 10 yrs. teaching experience.
LIST I

Certification Requirements for Teachers in a) One-Day-A-Week Schools and b) Reform Congregational Schools

Class V:—Temporary Certificate: (Valid for Two Years only)

1. High School Graduate, and
2. a) Graduation from Isaac Mayer Wise Dept. of Gratz College, or
   b) Completion of 2nd year in Normal Dept. of Gratz College, or
   c) Equivalent

Class IV:—Temporary Certificate: (Valid for Four Years only)

1. Fulfillment of Class V Requirements, and
2. a) One year of approved formal Jewish studies of at least one and one-half hours per week for 30 weeks, beyond Class V requirements, or
   b) Graduation from Normal Dept. of Gratz College, or
   c) Equivalent, and
3. One year of Religious School teaching experience under approved supervision.

Class III:—Permanent Certificate

1. Fulfillment of Class IV Requirements, and
2. a) Two years of Religious School teaching experience under approved supervision, beyond Class IV requirements, or
   b) Two years of full-time experience as a secular school teacher.

Class II:—Permanent Certificate

1. Fulfillment of Class III Requirements, and
2. Two years of Religious School teaching experience under approved supervision, beyond Class III requirements, and
3. One year of approved formal Jewish studies of at least one and one-half hours per week for 30 weeks, beyond Class III requirements.

Class I:—Permanent Certificate

1. Fulfillment of Class II Requirements, and
2. Two years of Religious School teaching experience under approved supervision, beyond Class II requirements, and
3. One year of approved formal Jewish studies of at least one and one-half hours per week for 30 weeks, beyond Class II requirements.

Notes:

a) Academic requirements for all certificates may be fulfilled by passing an examination on an appropriate level.

b) Class III permanent certificate will be automatically granted to all teachers with fifteen years of satisfactory religious school teaching experience by June 1965.
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REQUIREMENTS FOR THE SPECIAL CERTIFICATION FOR PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS

I. HEBREW:

The ability to read with complete understanding the vocalized sections of such texts as Shaar LaSifrut by Scharfstein (Shilo Publishing Co.), and Mikraah by Rubenstein & Benari (Jewish Education Committee, N.Y.).

The knowledge of the Hebrew grammatical material found in a text such as Elements of Hebrew Grammar, by Blumberg & Lewittes (Hebrew Publishing Co.).

A knowledge of the basic principles of teaching Hebrew as found in a text such as How to Teach Hebrew in the Elementary Grades by Wm. Chomsky (United Synagogue Commission on Jewish Education, out of print, available in library collections) or Teaching Hebrew by Wm. Chomsky (Jewish Education Committee).

II. BIBLE:

A knowledge in Hebrew of the narrative portions of the Five Books of Moses and the early prophets. Successful passing of examinations in Hebrew in at least four books of the Bible. An overview acquaintance with the entire Bible in English.

An acquaintance with traditional and modern interpretations of the Bible based on such texts as the following:


III. PRAYERBOOK:

Familiarity with the Standard Prayer Book; an understanding of the meaning of given prayers - Shacharit, Mincha and
III. PRAYERBOOK: (continued)

Maariv of week-days, Sabbath and holidays; and fluency in the reading of prayers.

The knowledge of basic principles of teaching prayer based on such texts as Teaching the Siddur by Abraham Segal (Jewish Education Committee) and Service of the Heart by Evelyn Garfield (National Academy for Adult Jewish Studies - United Synagogue of America).

IV. HISTORY:

Familiarity with Biblical History as found in a text such as Ancient Israel by Harry Orlinsky (Cornell University Press). A general knowledge of highlights of Jewish history based on such texts as History of the Jews by Solomon Grayzel (Jewish Publication Society).

A knowledge of basic principles of teaching Jewish history based upon such a text as Teaching Jewish History by Eisenberg and Segal (Jewish Education Committee).

V. JEWISH RELIGION:

a) A knowledge of the Sabbath and Festivals, Customs and Ceremonies of Judaism. An acquaintance with their historical development, their observances, and their meanings. A knowledge of the basic concepts of Judaism.

Suggested Texts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schauss</td>
<td>Jewish Festivals</td>
<td>U.A.H.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eddin</td>
<td>Customs and Ceremonies</td>
<td>Hebrew Pub. Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenstone</td>
<td>Jewish Religion</td>
<td>Jewish Chautauqua Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steinberg</td>
<td>Basic Judaism</td>
<td>Harcourt, Brace &amp; Co.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) A knowledge of the different positions taken by the various ideological groups in American Jewry on basic ideas of Judaism. These include such matters as religious authority, the purposes of prayer, and the authorship of the Bible.

Some suggested text readings, according to ideology, are as follows:
V. JEWISH RELIGION: (continued)

Conservative:

Judaism for the Modern Age by Robert Gordis —
(Farrar, Straus and Cudahy)

Orthodox:

The Modern Jew Faces Eternal Problems by Alan Barth
(Religious Section — Youth and Hechalutz Depart-
ment of the Zionist Organization, Jerusalem)

Reconstructionist:

Judaism Without Supernaturalism by Mordecai Kaplan
(Reconstructionist Press)

Reform:

Judaism As a Way of Life by Samuel S. Cohen (U.A.H.C.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Jewish Education</th>
<th>Nursery School Teaching Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permanent License</td>
<td>Certification in early childhood education by the State Board of Private Academic Schools of the Department of Public Instruction of Pennsylvania or equivalent.</td>
<td>Completion of High School IV at Gratz College or equivalent and a Course in Methods and Principles in Jewish Nursery Schools and a Course in Objectives and Principles of Jewish Education.</td>
<td>Three years of qualified experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Certificate</td>
<td>SAME AS ABOVE</td>
<td>SAME AS ABOVE</td>
<td>NONE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Jewish Education</th>
<th>Nursery School Teaching Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permanent License</td>
<td>Bachelor's degree, with major in early childhood education or equivalent.</td>
<td>Completion of sophomore year at Gratz College or equivalent, Candidate's preparation should have included a course in Methods and Principles in the Jewish Nursery School.</td>
<td>Three years of qualified experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Certificate</td>
<td>SAME AS ABOVE</td>
<td>SAME AS ABOVE</td>
<td>NONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td><strong>Nursery School Teaching Experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General and Professional</td>
<td>Completion of senior year at Gratz College or equivalent (BHL degree or equivalent). Candidate's preparation should have included a course in Methods and Principles in the Jewish Nursery School.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent License</td>
<td>Three years of qualified experience.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree, with major in early childhood education or equivalent.</td>
<td>SAME AS ABOVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Certificate</td>
<td>SAME AS ABOVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAME AS ABOVE</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There shall be a basic four-year special education degree, for instance, a four-year degree in early childhood education or a five-year specialized degree for permanent license.
PROCEDURE FOR NURSERY SCHOOL TEACHERS CURRENTLY IN SERVICE

Experience

Teachers currently teaching in Jewish nursery schools who will have had three years of qualified experience by June, 1966, will be given special consideration for eligibility for licenses.

These three years must be during the period from 1963 to 1966. Retroactive credit for all prior experience will be granted at the formula of two-thirds of the actual number of years.

Provisional Permit

All teachers meeting the above experience requirements will be granted provisional permits renewable annually provided (1) that they continue teaching in a Jewish nursery school, and (2) that they take some in-service courses in the areas listed on the first page under the requirements for permanent certification.

Regular Permanent License G 3

Provisional permits given to teachers in service will be convertible into a regular permanent license Category G 3 upon fulfillment of the following requirements:

a. Three 3-credit courses at Temple University or any other recognized school, in early childhood and nursery education.

b. Three 3-credit courses at Gratz College (two of which must be Hebraic courses) or

c. One summer session in nursery education workshop at Bank Street College in New York City or similarly accredited institution and

d. Three 3-credit courses at Gratz College (two of which must be Hebraic courses)

Time Limit

There shall be a time limit of three years, expiring in June, 1969, for fulfillment by teachers currently in service of the special requirements for permanent license G 3.
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