**INSTRUCTIONS FROM AUTHOR TO LIBRARY FOR THESES AND PRIZE ESSAYS**

AUTHOR James S. Bleiberg

TITLE "The Debate Over Day School Education in Reform Judaism: A Historical Study"

**TYPE OF THESIS:** Ph.D. [ ] D.H.L. [ ] Rabbinic [X]
Master's [ ] Prize Essay [ ]

1. May circulate [✓] ) Not necessary for Ph.D. thesis
2. Is restricted [ ] for ___ years. )

Note: The Library shall respect restrictions placed on theses or prize essays for a period of no more than ten years.

I understand that the Library may make a photocopy of my thesis for security purposes.

3. The Library may sell photocopies of my thesis. ✓ yes ___ no

February 10, 1982
Date

James S. Bleiberg
Signature of Author

Library Record

Microfilmed
Date

Signature of Library Staff Member

# The Debate Over Day School Education in Reform Judaism: A Historical Study

by James S. Bleiberg

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for Ordination

1982

Hebrew Union College - Jewish Institute of Religion,
Cincinnati, Ohio

Referee, Prof. Jonathan Sarna

## DIGEST

The debate over day school education moved through four major stages; a formative stage in which a pro-public school ideology emerged as official policy; a second stage in which educational "maximalists" struggled with the contradictions in this official policy and endorsed the Gary Plan as a new compromise; a transitional stage, in which Emanuel Gamoran moved from opposition to support of the day school idea in order to combat forces of assimilation; a fourth stage, in which the Reform movement officially abandoned the idea that all children should attend public schools, making room for the growth of Reform Jewish day schools. Different forces in every stage shaped the position of the debaters. But one theme does run through all of these stages: the Reform movement's attitude toward day schools was conditioned by a tension between assimilation and identity. On one side of the spectrum, Reform Jews desired to transmit the Jewish heritage to future generations. On the other side of the spectrum, Reform Jews sought to secure a place in American society. Each stage in the history of the day school represents a compromise between these two tendencies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

# CHAPTER I

## AN INTRODUCTION

The attitude of American Jews toward Jewish education has always been one of the chief barometers of the intensity of Jewish identity. Jews concerned with maximizing Jewish education have tended to maximize expression of their Jewish identity. Jews who minimized Jewish education have tended to have minimal Jewish identities. This tendency arises out of a tension between Jewish identity and assimilation that runs through all of Jewish life. This tension is very clear in the debate over day school education within the Reform movement. This debate was nothing less than an attempt to resolve the tension between identity and assimilation for American Jews.

Widespread support for a pro-public school ideology emerged in American society during the 1820's and 1830's. Radical Jacksonian democrats agitated for public schools as a result of their concern for social equality. Frederick Robinson for example argued "the equal mental and physical education of all, at the expense of all ... our emancipation from the power of aristocracy will be effectual and eternal ... when the great mass of the laboring people become wise enough to establish institutions for the equal education

and maintenance of their children in every neighborhood throughout the country."[1]

To nationalist patriots the public school was a means to forge a "homogeneous people". Indiana's first Superintendent of Public Instruction explained: "Our policy as a State is to make of all the varieties of population among us, differing as they do in origin, language, habits of thought, modes of action, and social custom, one people, with one common interest."[2]

Social conservatives saw the public school as a restraining influence on the masses. Members of the New York City Free School Society, fearing an increase in crime, vice and poverty in their expanding city, suggested that the public schools would extend "the benign influence of moral principles, inspiring self-regard, creating respect for the laws, diminishing the sources of pauperism and crime, and preparing for usefulness a large portion of what must soon compose our future active population, who might otherwise grow up in idleness, remain a burden on the community, and become victims to every species of vice and profligacy incident to extensive populous cities."[3]

Protestant clergymen supported public schools even though this meant a sharp limitation of their denominational influence in American education because they saw them as the embodiment of the best in general, tolerant Christianity. The liberal New England minister Reverend

Horace Bushnell wrote:

> We cannot have Puritan common schools - these are gone already - we cannot have Protestant common schools, or those which are distinctly so; but we can have common schools, and these we must agree to maintain, till the last or latest day of our liberties.[4]

Timothy Smith explained this willingness of Protestant clergy to support public education as follows.

> An evangelical consensus of faith and ethics had come so to dominate the national culture that a majority of Protestants were now willing to entrust the state with the task of educating children, confident that education would be "religious" still. The sects identified their common beliefs with those of the nation, their mission with America's mission .... [It] was accepted [that] tax-supporting schools were responsible for those parts of learning, whether secular, moral, or religious, thought to be equally necessary for children in all faiths.[5]

But this Protestant consensus did not stretch far enough to include Catholics and Jews. The ultimate Catholic response was parochial education. The response of the Reform movement in Judaism to this public school ideology is the subject of the thesis.

The debate over day schools can be divided into four basic periods. The first period or formative stage, ran from Isaac M. Wise's first statement in 1850 to the mid-1870's when a consensus emerged in favor of public schools.

The second stage began with the mass immigration of Eastern European Jews to America in the 1880's till World War I. Some Reform leaders despaired of serving the needs of the expanding Jewish population through Sunday schools.

They sought a middle ground between the one-day-a-week school and the all-day-school in the "Gary Plan".

Emanuel Gamoran was the central figure in the next period that ran from World War I to the period immediately following World War II. Gamoran moved from opposition to support of day schools, shattering the old consensus within the Reform movement.

The 1960's and early 1970's, the fourth period, saw the triumph of day school proponents. Two Reform day schools were founded and the movement officially endorsed the day school idea.

## DEFINITIONS

### Day School

In this paper the term "day school" refers to an all-day, private school which includes in its curriculum, Jewish and secular subjects. The term "parochial school", although sometimes used by Jews, is inappropriate in the Jewish context since it originally referred to parish schools under the charge of a priest or minister.

Jewish day schools have a long history in America. The first day school was founded in 1731 by Congregation Shearith Israel of New York City. Its curriculum included Hebrew, Spanish, English, writing and arithmetic.[6]

Thus the day school predates the rise of the public school in the 1830's. In fact Shearith Israel received public funds from the municipality of New York City before the notion of a secular publicly supported school gained currency.[7]

### Sabbath School/Sunday School

In this paper the terms "Sabbath School" and "Sunday School" refer to one-day-a-week schools that do not include secular subjects in their curriculum, focusing on religious, moral and Hebrew education. In 1828, a group of Philadelphia women headed by Rebecca Gratz created the first Jewish Sunday School, a Jewish equivalent of the Protestant Sunday School. Similar schools were established in

Charleston, Baltimore and New York City soon afterwards. These schools usually met on Sunday, but occassionally met on Saturday. They were originally designed to give poor Jewish children some formal Jewish education which they otherwise would not have received. The curriculum of these schools included catechism, Hebrew songs, prayers, history and ethics.[8]

By the 1870's when the Union of American Hebrew Congregations was founded, the Sunday/Sabbath School was the mainstay of formal Jewish learning in America.

## Talmud Torah/Community Hebrew School

A Talmud Torah or Community Hebrew School included a mid-week session or sessions in addition to weekend classes. Samson Benderly was their champion at the beginning of the century.[9] During the past thirty years, most Reform religious schools have moved toward this format as they added mid-week sessions to their Sabbath school programs. They have not, however, adopted the notion of "community based" schools.

## CHAPTER II

## VICTORY FOR THE PUBLIC SCHOOL IN THE REFORM MOVEMENT

The debate over day school education in the American Jewish community began in 1843 when Isaac Leeser published a series of articles supporting the day school idea in the Occident. The debate could not have started much before this date. There was no regular Jewish publication in which the debate could take place before the Occident's first issue in 1843.[1] But even if such a publication had existed, there were few public schools in the United States before the 1840's.

The first of Leeser's many articles on the subject was entitled "Jewish Children Under Gentile Teachers." Expressing an idea that was to reappear again in the generations after him Leeser warned parents against sending children to

> a public or private school which is essentially Christian; they hear prayers recited in which the name of a mediator is invoked; they hear a book read as an authority equal if not superior to the received word of God; ...Beside all this, we are in a great error if we suppose that Christian teachers do not endeavor to influence actively the sentiments of their Jewish pupils; there are some, at least, who take especial pains to warp the mind and to implant the peculiar tenets of Christianity clandestinely.[2]

The quality of public schools was one of the chief determinents of Jewish opinion on day schools in this period.

Lesser recommended that Jews establish Jewish elementary schools wherever they lived in sufficient numbers, and

elsewhere to watch the public schools closely. Leeser also promoted the idea of Jewish Sunday Schools.

Opposition to Leeser's ideas on separate schooling appeared in a Jewish periodical for the first time in 1851. Isidor Busch (later Bush) a Jewish journalist and publisher wrote a defense of public schools in an article called "Tasks of the Jew in the United States." In addition to some general comments concerning ways to maintain Jewish identity Bush encouraged parents to:

> Support as much as you can the public school system, and lend no help whatever to sectarian institutions: do not send your children, neither your sons nor your daughters, to such, and don't complain about heavy school taxes; - establish no Jewish school except the only one branch [sic] of your religion, history and Hebrew language.[3]

The day school question occupied leaders of the Reform movement as early as 1850 and was a matter of intense debate up until the mid 1870's. During this formative period of Reform Jewish history a pro-public school ideology slowly emerged as the official Reform policy. Isaac M. Wise was the first Reform Rabbi to enter the day school debate. While serving in Albany he gave advice similar to Bush's: "Send your children to public schools. Do not allow your children to miss one day." Wise saw the public school as part of the foundation of freedom in America and a deterent against bigotry and religious coercion

> ...for there is no sect which has the power legally to control its studies...Our schools should be gathering places of republican youth, where, by the restricted nature of the studies, the last echoes of prejudice and superstition should expire.[4]

Wise admitted that some public schools suffered from the disadvantages to which Leeser had drawn attention. But Wise insisted:

> If the common schools are not good enough, as in the case in Albany and certainly in many other places, then it is our duty as citizens and fathers to reform them; we must exercise our influence in favor of improvement.
>
> If anything like sectarian Religion is taught in the public schools, the Israelites should complain and the school board is bound in duty to hear and to redress the wrong.[5]

Wise proposed that Jews have separate religious schools, presumedly to meet on Sundays or after school hours, to teach Hebrew language, Bible and Catechism.

Wise lost his enthusiasm for the public school and came out in favor of day schools after moving to Cincinnati where he became Rabbi of Bene Yeshurun and Superintendent of a day school, the Talmid Yelodim Institute. Wise was appalled by the level of anti-Jewish prejudice he discovered in the Cincinnati public schools. Writing in the Israelite he lashed out against the school's hiring practices and defended the right of Jews to operate their own schools.

> ...(Jews) contribute their share to the school funds; but they never asked a cent of it in return. They are willing to help others to a thorough education even if they themselves prefer to have their children educated in institutions standing under their own control, and not under that of a board who make religion the test of a good teacher.[6]

But Wise's support of separate schools was not based entirely on negative arguments. As Director of the Talmid

Yelodim Institute, or Lodge Street School, he argued that his private school provided a superior education to the local public school.

> Can the trustees of the public school show us pupils of twelve years of age, who can read and write grammatically in three languages, and are acquainted with all branches of primary education? In the Lodge Street School they can find plenty of them.[7]

Wise's support of separate education was also motivated by his life-long concern to train American Rabbis. He saw the Institute as the first step in an educational structure that prepared American Jews for the Rabbinate. As early as 1853, he wrote:

> I entertain the hope that the Talmid Yelodim Institute will in a few years realize my fervant wishes for a Hebrew College in which our national literature may flourish...[8]

Wise attempted to make a distinction between what he considered his responsible criticism of the public schools and those who he regarded as enemies of public education in general. Wise pointed out that he was no ally of Archbishop Hughes, a Catholic critic of public schools.

> The writer of these lines, when a resident of Albany, New York was the first man who wrote an article aganist Arch-Bishop Hughes, of New York, on the question of free schools.[9]

Thus Wise was careful to support the idea of public schools although he objected to the actual shape they took in Cincinnati. This distinction was critical to Wise's attitude toward public education. He objected to the Cincinnati

public schools because they did not live up to his standards not because he was philosophically opposed to public school education in principle.

Wise's pro-day school stand did not prevent him from providing a forum for Bush to voice an opposing point of view in the Israelite. Bush wrote a series entitled "Schools for Israelites in the United States," detailing his opposition to Jewish day schools. Having observed a Jewish day school in St. Louis, Bush concluded "that common schools for Israelites in the United States cannot and will not prosper, nor will they be efficient"[10] Sizing up the new meaning of education for Jews in the United States he wrote:

> Nay the education of our children is more appreciated now than ever before, and in this country more than anywhere else, for while knowledge was once our solace and support in misfortune and solitude, it is now our pride and ornament in society; while it only strengthened us in our sufferings, it now secures us enjoyment and prosperity...[11]

Focusing on the issue of Jewish schools Bush maintained that they were inevitably inferior to the common schools which merited Jewish support. Bush contrasted between public "school houses that are models of architecture, built for this purpose with all possible regard for the health and comfort of their children", and "narrow, badly ventilated rooms" in which Jewish schools held sessions.[5] Bush also argued that Jewish children lived too widely scattered in large cities to attend a Jewish school, while there were too few Jews in smaller cities to support separate schooling.

He argued that religious instruction in a day school had little value since "in mixing up the teaching of sacred truth, of the holy Bible and the prayers, with the hurry, bustle, and often roguish merriment of a day school, it will mess the solemnity and seriousness with which it should be approached."[13] But Bush's most convincing argument took a more philosophicical tack.

> Should our children be educated as Jews only or even as foreigners in language and spirit, or shall they b educated as Americans, as citizens of the same free country, to be with them one harmonious people; or should we ourselves foster that unfortunate prejudice that pressed so many bitter, burning tears from most of us, and from our fathers in the old country? Answer yourselves which system will do the one and which must result in the other.[14]

Bush explained the danger of self segregation. Concentrating Jewish residences around a Jewish school might bring on disastrous success, "by the aid of sectarian schools, and by separating ourselves and our children systematically from the rest of society - in getting, as once before in Europe, deprived of the liberty to settle where we choose and restricted to 'Ghettoes,' which we hope will never happen..."[15] Separate schooling would hinder Jewish efforts to be fully accepted by fellow Americans since Jewish self-separation fostered anti-Jewish feeling among Gentiles. Bush proposed a system of Sabbath schools, evening classes, adult education programs and a theological seminary as an alternative to day schools.[16]

Emanuel Brandeis, a museum lecturer, and journalist responded favorably enough to Bush's articles to write a supportive letter to the editor of the Israelite.

> Hebrew common schools are an unsuccessful and impolitic undertaking. They are superfluous and wrongful, tending to separatism, when we ought to be glad and proud that the public schools of this free country are open alike to all creeds, that no difference is made on account of religion... knowing no diversity between man and man as citizens of this happy country, (we should) foster our religious interests alone between ourselves and our God.[17]

But Wise was not persuaded by Bush or Brandeis. With the active cooperation of the Talmid Yelodim Institute's Board of Directors, he considerably expanded his school. In 1855, it registered 160 pupils for an all time high. Soon thereafter a new building was errected for the Institute, made possible by a private grants totalling $11,000, and a bequest of $5,000 left in the will of Judah Touro of New Orleans for the school. This building was one of the first specially created school houses in the city, and even contained the necessary laboratory equipment for courses in science, a major innovation at the time.[18]

Meanwhile the Hayoth Institute day school under the direction of Dr. Max Lilienthal, Rabbi of Congregation Bene Israel, in Cincinnati rose as an alternative to Wise's school. Lilienthal had previously conducted a large and successful Jewish boarding school in New York City. Like Dr. Wise, Lilienthal considered his school to be a model for the public schools. He proudly informed readers of the

Israelite that "the principal teacher of penmanship of the Public Intermediate School, visited Hayoth for information as to the method used in our Institute for imparting such rapid improvement in spelling and the correct style of penmanship."[19] Even the president and superintendent of the Cincinnati Board of Education testified to the superiority of his day school writing "that it surpassed the instruction given in the public schools of the city."[20]

Both Wise and Lilienthal had the opportunity to publicize their success at the first conference of American Rabbis held in Cleveland in October of 1855. The conference included a spirited discussion of Jewish education. Unfortunately there are no records of Wise or Lilienthal's contributions in this discussion. Available records do point, however, to a split within the Reform camp at the conference over the issue of day school education. According to an article in the Israelite two Reformers, Rabbi Isador Kalisch of Cleveland and the Reverend B.H. Gotthelf of Louisville locked horns over the day school question. Kalisch according to the article "was decidedly in favor of public schools with supplementary Jewish schools only." He argued that competition with the public schools was futile and also that "it was in the interest of the rising generation to become thoroughly acquainted with their fellow citizens..."[21] Gotthelf's opinion was outlined as follows:

> Willingly and gratefully acknowledging the advantage and excellencies of the public schools, he was afraid of the sectarian and missionary spirit, that governed the teachers and was manifested in the schoolbooks. He considered it therefore almost a religious duty to establish entirely separate schools.[12]

Wise returned from the Conference unconvinced by the opponents of Jewish day schools. Picking up on a now familiar theme, he argued that his school employed a superior educational methodology in which children received individualized instruction. He explained that "In all public schools, classes are instructed; in Talmid Yelodim Institute, children are instructed according to their individual capacities."[23] Wise also recommended his school because of its approach to religious studies.

> As regards religion we thoroughly educate independent minds. No catechism deprives them of freedom of thought. They receive a thorough knowledge of the Hebrew...read the Bible in the original tongue, are made acquainted with our history, and are fit to think for themselves, independent as it is due to the Israelite who should not depend for religion on the minister...[24]

The Talmid Yelodim Institute and Hayoth Institute were merged in February 1861 following a two year period when Hayoth functioned as a purely supplementary school. David Philipson later explained that Hayoth was having difficulty attracting students.[25] After the merger, Lilienthal increasingly devoted his attention to improving the quality of public school education. He co-authored an object lesson text book for use in the public schools and was elected to the Cincinnati School Board in 1862.[26] While on the board

Lilienthal battled to eliminate Christian influences in the schools.[27]

After the Civil War, the better-to-do element of the Jewish population moved to Cincinnati's West End, some distance from the Talmid Yelodim Institute building on Lodge Street. This prompted officials to sell the Lodge Street building in 1867. While in the midst of searching for a new location, Wise proposed to the Board of Trustees of the Institute that it be converted into a supplementary religious school.

This seemingly surprising change can be explained in various ways. Wise demonstrated a consistent indifference to the day-to-day operation of the school, suggesting that it was not a top priority for him. The minutes of the Institute's Board of Trustees repeatedly charged that Wise was neglecting his responsibilities as school superintendent in favor of other interests. Such complaints were first lodged against Wise at the Board's Annual Meeting in 1857.[29] They recurred over the years. An incident in 1863 illustrates the board's perception that Wise was giving the school too low a priority. In that year Wise received the Democratic Party's nomination for State Senator. In asking him to decline the nomination, the board emphasized that its opposition stemmed mainly from the fact that holding this office would be injurious to Wise's responsibilities as Rabbi and superintendent of the Institute.[30] There were probably other political motives involved, yet the board's

point of view is clear: Wise's attention was not sufficiently directed to the welfare of the school.

Complaints of Wise's neglect of duties reached a peak in 1865 when the Board instructed Wise to be present at all Board meetings so that proper liason could be established. Wise insisted that attendance at all meetings would be too great a burden. Finally, the Board compromised by requesting that he submit monthly reports and attend meetings on special occasions.[31]

Wise's attitude to the Institute may have been influenced by his conviction that Jewish education on the primary level was less important than more advanced study. As early as 1857 he presented a plan to the Board for consolidating the younger grades in order to save money and establish a new program for twelve to fifteen year-olds. Wise argued that these were the years of "greatest productivity" for Jewish education. But this plan was never successfully implemented.[32]

Wise demonstrated his preference for Jewish education on a more mature level in 1860 when he proposed the establishment of a Hebrew College with preparatory and collegiate departments. This institution was not intended to be a seminary. It was to include a Hebrew department, a classical department and a commercial department.[33] Wise reiterated his support for such a school four months before he proposed that the Talmid Yelodim Institute be converted to a religious school.[34] Thus Wise had not lost interest

in sponsoring an institution that would combine Jewish and secular studies. Rather he concerned himself with a joint program on a higher educational level. Undoubtedly this preference was related to his ultimate goal of establishing a Rabbinical seminary. Perhaps Wise considered his Hebrew College a more likely breeding ground for American Rabbis than his primary school.

Wise's conversion of the Institute can also be understood as more of a change of tactics than a change of policy. Wise's support for the Institute was largely based on his view that it protected Jewish youth from the twin evils of anti-Jewish prejudice and inferior instruction. Wise had not lost his misgivings over the Cincinnati Public schools in the 1860's, but he had changed his strategy for coping with this problem. Wise sought to raise public schools to his standards instead of isolating Jewish children from their negative influence.

Wise argued vigorously for the improvement of the public schools, advocating a new system of management and the introduction of natural sciences into the curriculum. He opposed formalistic methods of instruction and sought to eliminate Christian elements in the curriculum.[35] He was particularly incensed by Bible readings which he regarded as an illegal imposition of religious instruction in the public schools. In 1869 he wrote:

> As Jews we do not want anyone to teach our young ones the religion of our fathers. We do it all ourselves. From a general standpoint, however, we are opposed to

> Bible reading in the schools. The Public schools are institutions for the education of free, intelligent, and enlightened citizens...To this end we need good secular schools and nothing else. The state has no religion. Having no religion, it cannot impose any religious instruction on the citizen, adult or child. The Bible is a book of religion. All admit this. By what right is it imposed on the public schools.[36]

Finally Wise's conversion of the Institute into a supplementary school must be seen against a background of a subtle change in Wise's attitude toward the position of Jews in America. The rise of antisemitism during the Civil War led Wise to urge Jews to become more Americanized. He explained in 1862:

> We must be naturalized not only in the political sense of the word, but also in its social signification. Be no Germans, no Polanders, no Englishmen, no Frenchmen, be Jews in the synagogue and Americans everywhere outside thereof. The thanks you owe to the old country are paid in one day. Be Americanized in language, manners, habits, and appearances as well as in sentiments of freedom. Withdraw your sons from all Jewish, German, French, Polish, or any other exclusive clubs, societies, associations, which have not a directly religious or beneficent tendency; and let them associate with the community at large, in lodges, societies, associations, clubs, private circles, and their native genius will soon overcome all the obstacles placed in their way by prejudices super-annuated and ridiculous.[37]

In a similar vein Wise attacked efforts to preserve a German element within American Reform Judaism. Arguing against David Einhorn's German Olat Tamid, Wise protested efforts

> ...to write, introduce and establish German rituals, prayers, hymns, etc., to change the synagogue into a foreign establishment, foreign to this country, to the Israelites not hailing from Germany, and to the entire youth born in this land, also by German parents.[38]

Significantly, Wise connected his opposition to Germanizing influences and support for public school education in 1869.

> It is a regrettable evil that many children of German parents speak a poor English, so that they are at once recognized as foreigners by the choice and pronunciation of English words as well as by the employment of special phrases and locations. This is the case not only with the children of uneducated parents, but, above all, with those of educated parents, who are admonished in the parental home to speak a good German and to study German grammar...According to our view, the youth should be sent only to the state public school so that they should learn to speak the language of the country correctly and be sure to escape the danger of jargon.[39]

It would be very useful to co-relate Wise's change in policy with developments in the Cincinnati Public School system. Information on this subject, however, has not yet been brought to light.

Wise's proposal to convert the Institute into a religious school did not go unopposed. The President of the Board of Trustees of the Institute, H. Menderson considered Wise's plan a mistake. He called upon the Board not to let the Institute die as a day school. He cautioned Board members that the $12,000 held in trust for the day school was only to be used for supporting a full time educational institution. Moreover he told them:

> You will not only have the thanks of the poor whom you educate but the well wishes of every well thinking Israelite who takes an interest in the perpetuation of our religion.[40]

The Board of Trustees seemed to be of a similar mind in July of 1867 when they unanimously resolved against Wise's wishes that "the Board is opposed to any religious school only and firmly believes that our institution should be continued as a general institution as heretofore."[41] Yet a few months later Wise's point of view prevailed and the Board agreed on a temporary basis to Wise's proposal. Board records do not give the impression that a pro-public school ideology had anything to do with the Board's acquiescence to Wise. Instead they agreed to Wise's plan because proper quarters could not be found for the school.[42] Yet when the Institution re-opened as a religious school, the basement of Bene Yeshurun proved perfectly adequate. The problem of accommodations appears to have been a convenient excuse to save face for all parties involved.

The first official debate within the Reform movement over day schools was held at the Philadephia Conference in 1869. There is no evidence as to whether Wise participated in this discussion or not. It centered around two individuals, both from Chicago, Rabbis Isaac Low Chronik and Bernard Felsenthal. Chronik wished the Conference to go on record as opposed to day schools[43] while Felsenthal declared himself in favor of such schools.[44] Chronik advocated a sweeping assimilation of the dominant American culture which was incompatible with what he called parochial school education. He proposed the transfer of the Sabbath to Sunday and believed Hebrew had no place in the

service.[45] Felsenthal conceded the value of common schools in a democratic society but involved a higher value - Jewish learning. Despairing of the effectiveness of religious schools, Felsenthal wrote:

> We would be entirely against specifically Jewish schools, if the body of Jewish knowledge which we consider desirable for our children could easily be acquired in Sabbath schools. But there is too large an amount of subject matter to master...
>
> One must review daily the subject matter of Jewish education, if it is paralleled by deeper teaching.[46]

Felsenthal also felt that day schools would serve the important function of training students qualified to apply to Rabbinical seminaries.[47] It is worth noting that Felsenthal had a tendency to place a value on Jewish particularism which eventually led him into the Zionist camp. He identified with the ideology of David Einhorn at the Philadelpia Conference, who held similar views on the day school question.

In a sermon delivered in 1866, Einhorn called for the establishment of day schools in New York City. Employing a line of reasoning which had not been suggested up until this point, he complained about the polarization of Jewish and secular studies. If a child attended a secular institution then he had no opportunity for Jewish learning. On the other hand, if a child attended a school where only Jewish subjects were taught then he would not be equipped with the practical training which the child needed.

The solution to this problem, according to Einhorn, was a school that balanced Jewish and secular studies. In a challenge to the Jews of New York to create such an institution Einhorn said:

> Could not the unified congregations of this cosmopolitan city create an institution of learning which unites the achievement of the religious school with that of other (secular) schools and which completely and on a daily basis...(without atrophying the remaining [secular] branches of instruction) preserves for the religious cultivation a far greater domain than that of the Sabbath and Sunday School?[48]

Einhorn also suggested that such an institution would provide a foundation for a theological seminary to train American Rabbis.

Einhorn's support of day schools can be understood in the context of his overall view of the Jewish peoples' role in history. Jewish learning was to be the inspiration for a universal brotherhood of all people. He envisioned a messianic age which had as its goal "a unification [of all peoples] mediated by the teachings of Sinai, without priviledges for any people, without tribal sacredness, without separateness."[49] Thus Einhorn's support arose out of the value he placed on Jewish learning, not on Jewish separateness. He did not believe that religious schools were up to the task of transmitting the "teachings of Sinai" to future generations.

The conferees in Philadelphia did not pass any resolution on Jewish education. One can only speculate on a

reason. Perhaps the issue did not seem relevant to the broad theological issues that occupied center stage at this conference.

In any case a resolution was passed at the next Reform Rabbinical Conference held in Cleveland one year later. In their resolution the Cleveland conferees tied together the concepts of patriotism, obedience to lawful government and public school education.

> We love and revere this country as our home and fatherland for us and our children; and therefore consider it our paramount duty to sustain and support the government; to favor by all means the system of free education, leaving religious instruction to the care of the different denominations.[50]

Neither Felsenthal nor Einhorn attended this conference and therefore their dissenting voices were not heard.

Wise considered the debate within the Reform movement resolved in favor of public schools by 1875.

> As far as we can see, all of us and in all parts of this country are in favor of popular schools, secular schools, in which the future citizens of our country shall receive that education which is necessary for free men and women, in order to give them that degree of independence and self reliance and that feeling of solidarity, which forms the basis of liberty.[51]

Wise expressed the status of religious education versus secular education as follows:

> It is our settled opinion here that the education of the young is the business of the State, and the religious instruction, to which we add the Hebrew, is the duty of religious bodies. Neither ought to interfere with the other. The secular branches belong to the public schools, religion in the Sabbath schools respectively.[52]

Wise saw the religious school (or Sabbath school) as the chief vehicle for Jewish education answering those who argued that not enough can be accomplished in a once-a-week-school. Wise wrote concerning his own institution:

> This Sabbath school proves that very much can be accomplished in a short time by skilled teachers, under the protection of an earnest board of officers; and that all this can be done without the least interference with the public schools. It proves practically that those teachers and managers of Sabbath schools also maintain they can find no time to teach the Hebrew thoroughly, are in the wrong. There is no want of either time or talent, just give them the right sort of teachers who love the beautiful language of the Bible.[53]

Taken together Wise and the Cleveland Conferees clearly express the public school ideology as the official position of the Reform movement. They regarded the public schools as the unique setting where all American youth learned a love of America and her freedoms. The assumed that these schools would be religiously neutral and that religious education would be restricted to supplementary educational programs sponsored by sectarian groups.

All of the elements of this position can be found in the earliest writing of Wise and Bush on this subject. Thus the debate over day schools did not move far from its original notions about public schools. Nevertheless, the debate did serve an important function. It gave leaders of the Reform movement an opportunity to test the quality of this ideology in the laboratory of critical argumentation and an opportunity to publicly affirm commitments as they

developed. Thus the debate served as the means by which the pro-public school ideology was assimilated into American Reform Judaism.

# CHAPTER III

## EXPLORING NEW ALTERNATIVES: THE GARY PLAN

For several decades starting in the 1880's thousands of Eastern European Jews migrated annually to the United States. Eventually two million Jewish newcomers settled mostly in the large American cities. The Reform leaders, particularly in New York City, sought to reach out to these Jews through the Reform movement's Department of Synagog and School Extension. How to best educate the immigrants in the English language, American customs and liberal Judaism became an issue that agitated Reform Rabbis in New York and across the country. At the same time Reform Rabbis continued to be troubled by an old problem that affected newcomers and oldtimers alike. What could be done to protect Jews from Christian influence in the public school? For the most part Reform Rabbis supported a policy of religiously neutral public schools supplemented by Sabbath schools. They rejected day schools as unpatriotic and undemocratic.

Yet a group emerged within the Reform Rabbinate that was discontent with the Sabbath school option. Members of this group believed that Sabbath schools were inadequate vehicles for transmitting the Jewish heritage. They sought a middle ground between day schools and Sabbath schools which would maximize Jewish learning for children attending public schools. To achieve their goal this group seized

upon an educational program developed by secular educators known as the Gary Plan which released students from public schools for religious instruction. This chapter will examine Reform Jewish attitudes toward the Gary plan and try to explain them.

Proponents of the Gary plan recognized that by handing the education of Jewish children over to the public school, the Reform Movement had locked itself into a minimalist approach to Jewish education. It had little opportunity to achieve its own Jewish educational goals in the time that remained after public school hours. How could Reform leaders be content with this self restriction? Rabbis interested in a more maximalist approach embraced the Gary plan as a fair compromise between the virtues of public education and the value of a Jewish education without resorting to day schools. It preserved the religious neutrality of the public schools but unlocked the school week for religious instruction.

The Central Conference of American Rabbis (CCAR) Convention of 1892 heard the minimalist approach presented as Reform dogma by Rabbi Edward N. Calisch. He delivered a paper on "Judaism and the Public School System of America" which outlined what he considered the proper relation between the public school and Jewish educational institutions. In his view Judaism mandated support of the public school:

> In what light does the Jew ... does Judaism look upon the public school system of America; wherein are crystalized in their highest development, those two things so clearly cherished - education and government? There can be but one answer. Judaism most unequivocally encourages, most strongly supports it.[1]

Calisch admitted that the public schools were flawed by Christian influences.

> It is true that the Jewish child is compelled to listen to what is emphatically a Christian service at the opening of school; to hear its own parents and ancestors and itself doomed to eternal damnation.[2]

He saw this problem as an evil to be overcome by concerted effort of the Reform Movement. He advocated religiously neutral public schools.

> Judaism believes that religious instruction of any kind or character has no place in the public schools. Religious teaching shall have its way in the church, in the Sunday school, in the home, but not in the public schools.[3]

But all problems aside, Calisch saw the public schools as the source of America's greatness.

> Judaism earnestly upholds the public school system of America, because it believes that the strength and the glory of the country lie therein. The public schools are the cornerstone of the nation, on which and by means of which, she has reared the superstructure of her unparalleled achievements. They are the great beating heart of the land whence is pulsed forth year after year the throbbing life-current of character and knowledge, whose benign influence vivifies each minutest capillary of the tremendous body politic ... Europe may tremble beneath the tread of her weaponed warriors ... The "strength" of England may lie within the "wooden walls" of her navy. America has her public schools and needs no more.[4]

Finally Calisch turned his attention to the issue of parochial schools which he opposed. This opposition took on a special urgency in his mind in light of the needs of Jewish immigrants from Eastern Europe. The public school he believed was the best route for these newcomers to enter American society.

> The first care of the Jewish relief societies that receive the Russian children, is to teach the children and the grown ones the English language that they may enter the public schools and receive the touch and the influence of American culture and citizenship.[5]

In the public schools the immigrants would learn by example the value of democracy and equality. In such a school;

> the child of the hod carrier and the child of the millionaire may sit on the same bench ... Nowhere is the perfect equality the true democracy of our government so plainly shown.[6]

Furthermore Calisch ominously warned that separating Jewish pupils from their gentile neighbors would threaten Jewish equality.

> Sending a child to a private institution of learning creates a distinction that is bound to have its effect on the children both there and in the public schools. They will wonder why those children are sent to private schools. Are they finer or of coarser clay, that the public schools cannot contain them? The child cannot but note the difference, in its own instinctive way be impressed by it, and feel that after all, all of us are not alike, we are not all of us equal children of the state, and the flag of our country falls unevenly upon those beneath it.[7]

Four years later Rabbi David Philpson approached the problem from a more theological perspective. He argued:

> The present idea of having only religious schools under the auspices of the congregation, and having the children receive the secular instruction in the secular schools, together with all other children, is the correct one.[8]

Philipson based his opinion on his conception of Jewish identity.

> The Jews are such in religion only, and it is only in religious instruction that there is to be any differentiation in education.[9]

Calisch and Philipson battled against day schools on opposite fronts. Calisch argued that they were un-American. Philipson argued that they were un-Jewish. As long as these positions dominated Reform Judaism there was no room for support of Reform day schools.

Into this milieu a new alternative appeared during the 1890's - the release time plan known as the Gary system. Instituted by Dr. William Wirt, the superintendent of schools in Gary, Indiana, the plan rotated the schedule of children during the school-day so that at any given time some were in class, others in the library or on the playground, and still others released to attend religious classes. Attendance in religious classes was optional. Students who opted not to attend had a play period so that religious instruction did not cut into public school instruction time.

Intellectuals like Randolph Bourne wrote admiringly of the plan, and saw in it a partial fulfillment of John Dewey's educational ideas.[10]

Rabbi Henry Berkovitz, founder of the Jewish Chatauqua Society, saw the plan as preferrable to both day schools and the one day a week religious school. In 1893 he wrote:

> As a boy, I attended a Jewish parochial or day school ... When I entered the ministry I vowed that I would break up every school of that kind whenever possible, in the interests of children. I am happy to say that I have been instrumental in doing this in several places. The Gary system, now so much discussed, as I understand it, aims to loosen up the public school system in order to make it flexible in such a way as to include every activity of the child as part of his legitimate education ... If this plan can be worked out, the religious school may come into its rights, and we shall be able to secure some sort of legitimate opportunity for imparting to our pupils the knowledge which we desire them to have and the influence and impressions we desire to bring to bear upon them in their religious life.[11]

But it was not until 1915 that the Gary plan won a large circle of supporters with the Reform Movement particularly in New York City. This support developed when Mayor John Purroy Mitchell introduced the plan into the New York City schools. Mitchell a wealthy lawyer elected as an anti-Tammany reformer became intrigued with the plan as a means of saving money, not as a result of religious concerns. Because the Gary Plan made more efficient use of classroom space and teacher's time, it made possible the accommodation of nearly twice as many students in one school building as there were seats.

From the outset, the plan met with resistance within a broad cross-section of New York City's population. This resistance resulted, in part, because of ingrained fears of anything novel, in part because of a distaste for Mayor Mitchell, and in part because of suspicions that the plan would mean that children of the poor would linger on a vocational track rendering them unable to compete with children of the rich. Tammany Hall, on the lookout for an issue that would help it regain power, seized on these suspicions as an issue, playing on prejudices and fears of the lower classes.

John Hylan, the Tammany candidate in the 1917 election for Mayor pledged to "banish the imported Gary system which aims to make our public schools an annex to the mill and factory." Hylan likewise charged that "our boys and girls shall have an opportunity to become doctors, lawyers, clergymen, musicians, artists, orators, poets, or men of letters, not withstanding the views of the Rockefeller Board of Education."[12] Hylan won the election overwhelmingly. The Gary plan was scrapped although various released time plans were retained in New York City.

The debate over the Gary plan in the Reform Movement did not deal directly with these concerns although they undoubtedly lay somewhere below the surface. Reform leaders tended to focus on the religious implications of the plan and how it would effect the status of the Jewish community.

The merits of the Gary plan were formally debated at a joint meeting of the Religious School Union and Eastern Conference of Reform Rabbis in November of 1915. Dr. Ira S. Wile a member of the New York Board of Education was the main speaker against the plan. According to a summary of Wile's view that appeared in the Israelite he;

> denounced the religious feature of the system. He said it dragged religion into the school creating barriers and denominational differences between children and their teachers and between home. He claimed that the plan strangled liberty of conscience, undermined the principles of American citizenship and ought to be abolished, because, above all else, it was contrary to the law of the land.[13]

A lively discussion followed Wile's presentation. Bella Pevsner, one of the lay people at the meeting, offered a unique point of view. She insisted that religious education should take place primarily in the home not in the school. She said that the weak link in Jewish education was the Jewish mother who was either too Jewishly ignorant herself to teach her children or too involved in philanthropic endeavors to involve herself with religious education.[14] Rabbi Rudolph Grossman also spoke against the plan. He reasoned that Jews should speak in disfavor of the plan as Americans not Jews. "The system," he emphasized "is un-American and undemocratic."[15]

Grossman gave a more detailed exposition of his views in a sermon delivered at about the same time. He warned that the Gary plan "...strikes at the very root of our

American institutions." He feared that "the mere recognition by the public school of religion and religious differences introduces the baneful spirit of sectarianism..." He believed that this sectarianism would "foster that spirit of racial distinction and religious separateness which the public schools [were] primarily commissioned to overcome and uproot." Moreover he saw in the Gary plan an opportunity for Christian proselytism in the schools.[16]

Two rabbis spoke up in favor of the plan at the November meeting, Rabbi Maurice Harris saw a great opportunity in its adoption. "If the system," he observed, "gives us Jews an opportunity during school hours to give them [Jewish pupils] a Jewish education, it will result in a great deal of good for us, if we do it energetically and whole-heartedly."[17]

Dr. Clifton Harby Levy, of Tremont Temple, was also a strong advocate of the plan. According to the Israelite report

> He stated that it opened up the opportunity of converting Jewish children to Judaism. He urged the raising of a fund for the establishment of religious schools throughout the city.[18]

At approximately the same time the Israelite began an editorial campaign against the plan. Isadore M. Levy, a member of the New York City Board of Education wrote the first editorial in November of 1915. Levy believed that the plan would foster antisemitism.

> To revolutionize our system by the introduction of the religious feature would be to open the flood gates to a tide of possible bitterness and hatred. School children are pecularly susceptible to this, and their minds would at once be poisoned. Their religious belief and prejudice would be awakened and intensified. No longer would the children in our classrooms dwell together in peace and harmony.

Levy also saw the plan as a threat to the principle of separation between church and state.

> The school system has no right to call upon the church for religious instruction. To meet this burden which may be suddenly thrust upon them, they will be compelled to hire quarters near the schools and to engage teachers to give them instruction. This will cause many churches to undergo greater expenses than they can afford. If these churches would be rendering the city a service by such religious instruction, then such services should be paid for. This would at once create an opening and a wedge and sooner or later religious corporations would demand that they be reimbursed from the public treasury, the provisions of the Constitution notwithstanding.

Ultimately this threat could undermine American democracy in Levy's view. Should the plan go into effect;

> ...Our religious denominations would sooner or later make our schools a battlefield upon which would be fought their ancient enmities. We ought not to pave the way for their ultimate control of the school. It would be harmful to religion and harmful to us. Our school has long been regarded as the cradle of democracy. This has been one of its unique and most valuable features. Whatever menaces the school, then menaces democracy.[21]

One month later the Israelite published an editorial by Leo Wise against the Gary plan. Wise argued that the plan threatened the religious neutrality of the public schools.

> People should not allow themselves to be misled into consenting to the abrogation of the secularism of the Public Schools in the slightest degree.[22]

In the same issue Wise published a lengthy article against the Gary plan by Samson Benderly. Benderly, often called the architect of Jewish education in America, rejected this the plan for three reasons. First, he feared that program would subtly promote Christianity. He wrote:

> To this proposition there are grave objections. It is a dangerous procedure to permit the teaching of religion in the public schools, no matter how many safeguards we put around this plan. It is especially fraught with danger to us. We must not consider ourselves a denomination. We have a distinct religion, and opposed to us are all the Christian denominations which have the most important part of their religion in common. If such a course were pursued, the Christian spirit which would naturally be the predominant, would greatly influence our children.[23]

Benderley's second argument took a different tack. He speculated about the negative impact of teaching religion in a neutral environment if this could be achieved. He explained:

> But even if the schools could actually be made neutral, it would not prove useful. A neutral spirit in matters of sentiment has a chilling effect. Take away enthusiasm from the school and you have taken away its soul.[24]

Benderley's third argument was a practical one. As he put it:

> The most practical argument against such a course is that this method is in vogue in several European countries, and is not successful as far as the Jews are concerned.[25]

Rabbi Samuel Schulman, a former President of the Central Conference of American Rabbis with a pulpit in New York City came to the defense of the plan. Writing in the November issue of The Union Bulletin, Schulman acknowledged that there was a tension between the value of promoting religion and the need to deter sectarian influence in the public schools. Schulman therefore advocated the following strategy:

> Our purpose, therefore, as Jews should be to encourage the religious life of all churches and, at the same time, jealousy to be on our guard lest the spirit of sectarianism encroach upon government or the schools to the detriment of our rights as a minority.[26]

Schulman then turned to denying allegations made by Levy and Benderly and others concerning the plan:

> In the first place, it meets all objections of those who hold that it is not the business of the school, supported by the taxes of all children, to impart religious instruction. It does not emphasize religious differences amongst the children within the school building, as would be the case if the school were divided for religious instruction amongst various denominational teachers. The school remains secular. At the same time the school, representing the nation, gives its moral support to religious instruction, the sense that it considers the time spent on it well spent and necessary for the child's welfare. The imagination of the child will be impressed with the fact that religion is a serious matter, that it is as important for life as any other subject in the school and that three and four days in the week ought to be given to it. At present, the mere relegation of religious instruction to one day a week tends to make the child regard it as less important than arithmetic or geography or languages. And, indeed I hold that for effective instruction in religion it should have more time than what is given to it.[27]

Schulman summed up the reasons he favored the Gary plan as follows:

> The Gary system would make religious instruction an integral part of the education of the child, would give it dignity, because of its connection with the educational scheme, which it now lacks, would coordinate it more with national life, and at the same time would bring no pressure to bear on any child in the direction of sectarian instruction, would do nothing insidious and would not force the conscience of any parent who had strong convictions against religious instruction.[28]

> ...the feeling has been growing, and justly so, that even in a perfect Sunday School, the time is altogether too short (one and a half hours one day a week) for the proper ethical and religious instruction of the children, and that more time in the week should be devoted to it.[29]

Schulman may have used the same arguments at a meeting in New York of the Board of Supervisors of the Department of Synagog and School Extension of which he was a member. While several members of the Board were personally opposed to the Gary system, all members of the Board agreed "an effort should be made to meet the conditions thrust upon the Jewish people by the introduction of the Gary system."[30] The Board included such important figures as Stephen S. Wise and Abraham Cronbach.

Meanwhile, the Eastern Conference of Reform Rabbis gave the plan a less begrudging endorsement. Using arguments employed by Schulman they expressed their approval of the plan on the grounds that it raised religious instruction to the dignity of secular education.[31]

But the Reform Rabbis of New York City found themselves the only segment of the New York Jewish community supporting the Gary Plan. The Mizrachi Organization of America, the Union of Orthodox Rabbis and the Association of Hebrew Teachers openly campaigned against it. The strongest opposition to the plan in New York City came from leaders of the "Kehilla Movement," following the advice of Samson Benderly.[32]

The Gary Plan was elevated to the attention of the entire Reform movement in 1916 when the Central Conference of American Rabbis devoted a convention to discussing it and other released time plans. Rabbi Schulman delivered the keynote address at the Conference which was a restatement of his article in The Union Bulletin from the previous fall. This was followed by presentations concerning six different released time plans:

1. "The English System" by Rabbi Henry Barnstein
2. "The Continental System" by Rabbi Jonah B. Wise
3. "The Dakota Plan" by Rabbi Frederick Cohn
4. "The Colorado Plan" by Rabbi Louis Wolsey
5. "The Gary Plan of Instruction" by Rabbi Tobias Schanfarber
6. "The Birmingham Plan" by Rabbi Morris Newfield.[33]

The Gary plan was the only proposal seriously considered in the discussion that followed. As presented by Schanfarber the Gary plan had five main elements:

1) Religious instruction is in no way to be included in the public schools, nor is it to be given in the public school building.

2) The public school authorities do not in any way control, supervise, support, or patronize the church schools.

3) A pupil who is on his way to and from religious instruction is in the custody of his parents, not the public school.

4) The public school authorities will not enter into any agreement with any religious body; i.e., the parents may withdraw their child at a given hour for other purposes, such as taking music lessons or helping with housework.

5) No credit is given in the public schools for studies pursued in the church school.[34]

The discussion of the Gary plan as reported in the CCAR Yearbook was superficial. But it did serve to allow speakers to voice their general attitudes to the plan. Rabbi Alexander Lyons of Brooklyn, New York opened the discussion calling for approval of the Gary plan.[35] Rabbi Louis Wolsey of Cleveland seconded the motion but added a qualification. He urged the conference to appoint a commission to study the best way to implement the plan.[36] Rabbi David Philipson of Cincinnati opposed all time released plans, calling weekday instruction an inroad to formal religious instruction in the public schools. Rabbi Wolsey countered that the plan "can take care of the religious and moral education of the children without infringing upon our religious liberties."[37]

Dr. Julian Morgenstein of the Hebrew Union College argued that the proposal was premature. "Before we go

further," he said, "and approve the Gary plan, or any other plan, we ought to decide definitely just how far we are prepared to go in an endorsement of ethical instruction in the public schools."[38] Rabbi Samuel Cohon of Chicago replied that although the Gary plan was no panacea, "it offers a great many opportunities for religious instruction."[39] Rabbi Henry Barnstein of Houston added that despite fears to the contrary;

> ...in the Gary plan we have the very wedge to fight the union of church and state. We deplore the fact that we cannot give enough time to the religious instruction of our children. Then they will have to get some time during the school week, outside of their regular religious school, for religious instruction.[40]

Rabbi Philipson asked if the plan would stigmatize Jewish students and possibly raise the level of antisemitism.[41] Rabbi Wolsey replied that children who participated in the plan would not be stigmatized.[42]

The CCAR Yearbook does not indicate if the issue was called to a vote. The topic was to resurface at later CCAR Conventions but the Gary Plan was never again discussed as a formal option.

Even as the CCAR debated the plan, the Department of Synagog and School Extension moved rapidly ahead to implement it in New York. The Department set up a school in Temple Sinai in the Bronx capable of handling 1200 pupils. Parents in the area were surveyed as to whether they would be willing to pay for instruction. By November, 480

students were enrolled in a program operated by four full time teachers. By the beginning of the next school year enrollment had increased to 513. The school had 5 teachers: two full-time, one three-quarters time and two teachers half-time. When the mayoral election in 1917 brought an end to the Gary plan, the Department of Synagog and School Extension responded by adjusting its program to a more conventional supplementary school format.[43]

The main impetus for the Gary plan had always come from the secular authorities. As this support disappeared, the Gary plan lost its appeal in the Reform movement. Opponents of the Gary plan welcomed its demise. They regarded it as a threat to the separation of church and state. They feared it would stigmatize Jewish children and foster antisemitism. They regarded the public school as the quarantor of religious tolerance in American society. They rejected the Gary plan not because they disapproved of increased educational opportunities it provided, but because they believed it threatened the status of Jews in America.

Reform leaders who embraced the Gary plan did so because it maximized Jewish educational opportunities. They saw it as a legitimate means of increasing the hours devoted to Jewish study in a pupil's week without resorting to day schools.

The debate between supporters and opponents of the Gary plan in the Reform Movement served to bring into clearer focus the minimalist dilemma of Reform Jewish educational

programs. By committing itself to public education Reform Judaism left itself little opportunity to achieve its own educational goals. Supporters of the Gary Plan decried this situation, making explicit a tension in Reform Judaism between a commitment to public education and a concern for Jewish education.

# CHAPTER IV

## EMANUEL GAMORAN: MOVEMENT TOWARD ACCEPTANCE OF THE DAY SCHOOL IDEA

Emanuel Gamoran (1892-1962), Director of Education of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, was perhaps the single most influential individual in the history of Reform Jewish education in America. When Gamoran assumed his position with the Union, Reform Judaism lacked a single series of satisfactory text books or standardized curriculum. Reform religious schools were rarely staffed by qualified educators and teachers had little in the way of instructional materials other than textbooks. But from 1923 to 1958, Gamoran revolutionized Reform Jewish education. He served as the chief architect of Reform Judaism's textbook literature. He had a profound impact on methods of instruction and introduced the concept of Jewish values. He vigorously promoted the professionalization of teachers in religious schools and made a significant contribution to scholarly literature through numerous books and articles.

Gamoran's stature in the educational establishment of Reform Judaism by itself would warrant a review of his attitude toward day school education. But as it turns out Gamoran played a pivotal role in the debate over day school education. He was a key transitional figure in Reform Judaism's movement toward acceptance of the day school idea.

At the beginning of his career, Gamoran argued that the public school supplemented by religious schools provided the best setting for the education of the Jewish child. Both types of schools had a crucial role to play which could not be duplicated by a day school. Later, Gamoran came to the conclusion that the day school was a viable substitute and that Jewish survival required the intensive learning environment that only the day school could provide. Throughout his career Gamoran demonstrate a concern for achieving a proper balance between the value of Jewish identity against the value of assimilation into American society. This chapter will trace Gamoran's effort to balance these values in formulating a position on day schools relating his views to developments in the rest of the Reform movement.

Gamoran's view of Jewish identity was similar to that of Mordecai Kaplan. He believed the Jewish people were a cultural group sharing a common civilization with religion being one of its most powerful unifying bonds. Judaism in Gamoran's view embodied a distinctive way of life with common ideals, language, literature, art and music.[1] Gamoran cited Eastern European Jews as an example.

> Not belief, but action constituted the acid test of Jewishness. Jews who lived a Jewish life acted Jewishly. That included being a decent man, a good citizen, being honest in his dealings with his neighbors, as well as performing all the customs and ceremonies and observing the daily ritual. Jews never separated those aspects which had to do with other phases of their life from religion. People and religion were one.[2]

Gamoran advocated a view of Jewish identity that emphasized the peoplehood of Israel and its culture.

> That Jewish culture is known as Judaism and to live in accordance with that culture is to live in accordance with Jewishness.... The obverse of secular is, 'Jewish', not the adjective 'religious'. We lead a religious life by leading a Jewish one.[4]

Gamoran rejected the idea of some Reform Jews that Judaism was only a set of religious beliefs. He contended that the term "religion" was a non-Jewish category that did not neatly apply to the Jewish condition. He warned against confusing Jewish identity with the identity of Protestant religious groups.

> ....it is wrong to think of Judaism as a denomination, in terms of Protestantism... There is a very important difference between the term 'religion' as used by Protestants and the same term as accepted (there is no Hebrew equivalent for the word) by Jews. Religion to the Jew was always closely identified with life in this world. ...Giving meaning to the God idea in terms of the strivings of modern men to bring about a reign of justice and righteousness on earth, does not give sanction to the divorce of such aspirations from the tradition and culture of the Jewish group, nor does it result in the meaningless extension of the term 'religion.' That is how religion functions.[5]

Gamoran saw Zionism as growing logically out of his notion of Jewish peoplehood. His approach was similar to Ahad Ha-Am's Cultural Zionism which promoted Jewish nationalism in Palestine without negating the diaspora. Gamoran believed that Zionist work in Palestine could only enrich the life of Jews in the diaspora and was therefore a positive value.

> Palestine offers a possibility of developing new culture and new values. It offers the Jewish people a favorable environment for creative activity, and such creative activity is the means by which a people makes its contributions to mankind, resulting in the development of cultural, aesthetic or religious values of universal significance.[6]

Gamoran was quick to answer the accusation that American Zionists had dual political loyalties. America could only be enriched through its Zionists.

> The Jews in America will live in America and will give their undivided political allegiance to America. Together with other American citizens they will no doubt participate in what is worth while in American life. In addition, they will bring to American life their experiences as a people with a rich past. If Jewish life in Palestine develops new cultural values -- and the Jew in the Diaspora lands can but give a helping hand in such development -- the influence of the Jewish center in Palestine will make the cultural contributions of the Jews in America richer.[7]

But despite this particularistic conception of Jewish identity Gamoran insisted that Jews become reconciled to America through assimilation of a modern world view and American democracy. Gamoran shared with John Dewey the notion that democracy implied an educational responsibility for society.[8] The goal of democracy was in their view a movement of society toward something better. This in turn depended on continuous personal growth or individual self realization. Society had no higher goal. It could not therefore compromise the individuality of its members.

> The idea that the self-effacement of the individual is to be sought is inconsistent with a conception of the worth of individuality.

> Individuals who are self-effaced lose their individuality. Similarly, a society composed of such individuals is a poor society.[9]

Gamoran argued that instead of demanding the self-effacement of the individual, democratic society sought to help the individual grow to his fullest potential. It was in the interest of a democratic society that individual differences be encouraged for without them progress was impossible. Progress depended on the contribution of each individual to the welfare of humankind in accord with his/her unique abilities.[10]

Gamoran believed however that the individual achieved the most growth in an environment that was varied. A varied environment provided a powerful stimulus to an individual to develop varied responses. The development of varied responses in his view was the essence of growth. Gamoran believed an individual needed society to provide the stimulation that leads to growth.

> It is this that makes Professor Dewey's thought -- that growth takes place best in a social medium -- so significant. This idea that growth takes place in a social medium implies both our aim of education and its methods ... the aim of education in a democratic society may be best expressed in the term "continuous and progressive socialization."[11]

By "progressive" Gamoran meant that education should lead the individual to "something better." Gamoran defined socialization with E.W. Burgess as "the participation of the individual in the spirit and purpose, knowledge and methods, decision and action of the group."[12] Thus Gamoran made a

crucial translation of self realization of the individual into socialization of the individual into society for the purpose of moving toward something better.

Gamoran distinguished between positive and negative socialization. The exclusion of Jews from the mainstream of life in Tsarist Russia was a powerful stimulus for negative socialization into the Jewish community. It resulted from of a lack of choice. Positive socialization took place in a democracy because the democracy aimed to socialize the individual by a process that freed the individual to make choices.[13]

Gamoran was particularly concerned with the situation of Jewish immigrants in the process of positive socialization. He argued that the Jewish immigrant must adjust to America but must not be required to give up his individuality. In Gamoran's view there was no "American type" that the immigrant must approach.[14] Positive socialization did not produce uniformity rather it created a like mindedness to serve as a basis for solidarity. At the same time positive socialization left room for preservation of distinct group values as long as they were not anti-social.

> If America means anything as a new experiment in social life, it is the attempt to work out a democratic society in which individuals and groups alike can, unless they be anti-social, develop freely as cultural entities and help create an America of the future. All that can be asked of the members of the group is that they evaluate their own conduct from an ethical point of view and see to it that it has no harmful effect upon other people.[15]

Gamoran was able to harmonize his views about democracy and Jewish identity through what he called along with Berkson a "community theory of Americanization."[16] He believed that every group should develop itself culturally and thereby contribute its share to American life. With this in mind he argued that "Jewish education is not only necessary from the point of view of the ethnic group but also from the point of view of a democratic society interested in the enrichment of life."[17]

One of the fundamental assumptions underlying this theory of Americanization was that "simple groups must first command the loyalties of the individual before he can become an efficient member of a complex group."[18] Thus as Gamoran saw it, a Jewish child first became part of the life the Jewish family, later became part of the Jewish people, and still later through the process of positive socialization became a citizen of the United States and even the world.

> The ultimate aim will be the progressive socialization of the individual into the highest conceivable community -- the world. There is sufficient reason in the history of America to justify the thought that an ever-growing, ever-developing concept of Americanism will welcome such an aim and will serve as an example of the fulfillment of this aim.[18]

Thus Jewish education served as a critical stage in the socialization of the child into the larger environment.

> 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.[19]

Gamoran used the term adjustment to refer to this process of retaining ones own identity while moving up the scale of socialization. Gamoran admitted that adjustment changed an individual.

> Adjustment may require the rejection of some unessentials and surely requires the reinterpretation of essentials from age to age and the realization of these values through the particular avenues of approach suitable to the new environment.[20]

But Gamoran also explained that "the adjustment of the immigrant must not be self effacement. For then individuality would disappear."[21] Gamoran called the so- called "assimilated" Jew maladjusted because he had lost his own values and ideals and too often did not substitute anything in its place. He was therefore unable to continue up the scale of socialization.[22]

Gamoran's notion of adjustment had a great bearing on what he considered the proper content of a school's curriculum. He argued a curriculum should aim to adjust a child to his environment. In order to do this it must be "synonymous with life", that is, it should reflect the real environment of the student. Failure to accurately reflect life would lead a child to maladjustment.[23]

To those who feared that society might use "adjustment" as an excuse for suppression of ethnic or religious differences, Gamoran explained that a democratic society had no authority to suppress any group unless it was anti-social. The Jewish group identity as Gamoran understood it was clearly not anti-social. The civilization that held the Jewish people together endorsed the brotherhood of all peoples under God, making it compatible with other groups and amenable to progressive socialization.[25]

This view of Jewish identity and assimilation provided the context from Gamoran's initial opposition to day schools. In his Changing Conceptions of Jewish Education, Gamoran's opposition appeared in a discussion of the need to "adjust" the curriculum of the Eastern European Jewish school to America. To "adjust" the school in Gamoran's system meant to adapt it to a new environment without giving up its individual identity. This implied that the curriculum of the Eastern Europe Yeshivah could not be transferred in toto to America. For, as Gamoran asked, "how could a course of study suitable to one environment be effective in an environment totally different?"[26] The problem with the old curriculum was that it did not reflect the American environment and therefore would not serve to adjust Jews to American life.[27]

Gamoran then explained that under ideal conditions "the Jewish school should reflect Jewish life wholly."[28] But there was only one place where these ideal conditions could exist -- in a Jewish state.

> It is possible to embody such a conception [of reflecting Jewish life wholly] only in a country where the Jews will live as a majority people having a free opportunity to develop and foster Jewish culture, and where the peculiar abilities of the Jewish peole will find expression without being hampered by an environment that acts as a centrifugal force upon Jewish life.[29]

The purpose of a Jewish state was to underwrite a Jewish culture through public Jewish schools. In the diaspora, however, Jewish life was circumscribed by a non-Jewish environment. This minority status lead Gamoran to the first of his two reasons for opposition to day schools in America. He argued that the proper conditions for an all day Jewish school (which would reflect life wholly) did not exist in America.

> Since the life reflected is not primarily Jewish, the school that can best perform the function of a reflector is the American public school.[30]

Gamoran acknowledged that theoretically a Jewish school could be created for the purpose of reflecting all of life in America. But Gamoran considered such a school to be severely handicapped when compared to the public school in attempting to achieve this purpose. Gamoran feared that the Jewish curriculum maker in America would conceive of his task in terms of transmitting the Jewish tradition regardless of its relevance to the childs need to adjust to an American environment. The curriculum maker would

> set up subject matter as something of value just by itself, apart from its function in promoting the realization of the meanings implied in the present experience of the immature.[31]

The curriculum would ignore the "present experience" of the child in favor of Jewish subject matter thereby frustrating adjustment and resulting in maladjustment. The curriculum would in Gamoran's words "become a source of error instead of a source of truth."[32]

Gamoran's second reason for opposition to day schools builds on the first. He believed that the public school's pluralistic environment (including many ethnic and religious groups) served the individual student and democracy in a way that the day school was unable to do.

> Taking the attitude that the democratic society must provide for the continuous growth of the individual and the group, the curriculum in our [public] schools [would not] hinder the possibility of coming into contact with other groups. On the contrary, it should be a concrete expression of the consciousness that the individual and the group can realize themselves best only in social relationships. It should make it possible for the individual to react to the many varied stimuli of modern life and develop within him the recognition of the value of interests of society. It should permit continuous adjustments, so necessary to conditions of freedom and interaction between peoples. In doing so it will pass the criterion of democracy.[33]

Gamoran concluded from this analysis that supplementary schools should serve as the vehicles for the positive socialization of Jewish youth

> which permit the Jewish child to attend the public school, to mix freely with other children of various nationalities, and yet provide his Jewish education after school hours.[34]

By means of this line of argumentation Gamoran supported public school education and yet retained a strong enough commitment to Jewish identity to be a cultural Zionist. But his position trapped him into the same problem Samuel Schulman faced 10 years earlier. How could Jewish education be maximized if one was committed to public school education? Gamoran's dilemma was perhaps more intense since the Jewish identity which he adopted was more particularistic than that of other Reform Jews. Consequently he sought to maximize opportunities for asserting Jewish identity in an educational setting. His solution to this dilemma was to expand the typical Sunday school into a longer program, one that included weekday sessions.

From the very beginning of his tenure as Director of the Commission on Jewish Education, Gamoran conducted a campaign to introduce a weekday class into the educational program of Reform Religious Schools. In 1928 he wrote a pamphlet called "Week-Day Jewish Instruction" which outlined how to gradually introduce a weekday class. The rationale for this move presented in the pamphlet was that "any effort to integrate the child into the life of a group possessing such a rich past (which consists of history, language, literature, customs, folk- ways, music, etc.) must be intensive and systematic and must continue for many years."[35]

In order to add "institutional" backing to his goal, Gamoran included the following recommendation of the

Commission on Jewish Education on the cover page of the pamphlet:

> Resolved; That this Commission in planning a detailed curriculum for the Jewish religious school of comprehensive scope, is unanimous ... that a weekday session will have to be added to the present Sunday session in building up a system of religious education that will be adequate to our needs...[36]

But this proposal did not gain wide acceptance within the movement. The proceedings of the 1929 CCAR and UAHC conferences make no mention of a vote on this proposal. The report of the Commission on Jewish Education included only the following line: "other plans include stimulation along the lines of increasing hours of instruction in religious schools."[37]

Insight into Gamoran's attitude toward those who opposed weekday instruction comes from a letter Gamoran wrote to Rabbi Joshua Liebman of Boston in 1941. Liebman prepared a statement for the CCAR on the "State of Jewish Education in America."[38] Dr. Gamoran was allowed to read the statement before its presentation to the Conference. He was shocked to find in Liebman's report the suggestion that Gamoran's curriculum for afternoon schools perpetuated doctrines and traditions which were no longer part of the Reform child's family life. Gamoran replied that this type of statement could only be seen as a "reflection of the opinion of a group of Jews who strayed away from Judaism and kept themselves aloof from their people."[39] Gamoran was deeply

disturbed by this tendency toward "minimalism" in the Reform movement.

At about the same time, released time plans re-appeared in several different cities. This inspired the CCAR to re-think its position on this format. Unlike earlier supporters of released time who saw it as a means of escaping from the minimalist situtation of Reform education, Gamoran vigorously opposed such plans. Speaking at the 1941 CCAR Convention, he presented three arguments to back-up his opposition.

First he saw it as a threat to the separation of church and state. He cited a study which showed that

> many of the classes engaged in religious education which were originally supposed to have nothing to do with the public school, not only were definitely related to the school, but met in public school buildings.
> ...In some cases the course of study for religious education was approved by the public school authorities.
> ...The public school superintendent in one case supervised the weekday religious instruction in order to avoid denominational rivalry.[40]

Gamoran also feared that released time would increase opportunities for proselytism of Jews.

> In an informal conversation with a woman who is in charge of weekday religious education for the Protestant church in one of our larger cities, I learned that some Jewish children attend the Protestant weekday religious school. How can a fact like that be explained if not because this released time was introduced...?[41]

Finally Gamoran offered the argument which was closest to his heart. In his view released time was a threat to weekday Jewish instruction for which he had labored for over twenty years.

> One of the very serious dangers it seems to me is the thought that parents and leaders of our congregations, as well as of other congregations, may become satisfied with the idea of religious education one hour a week.[42]

Gamoran then offered an alternative proposal called "dismissal time" to the CCAR. Gamoran explained the difference between the two systems as follows.

> Released time means that at any time of the day children are released to go to the church or synagog classes, while other children whose parents do not ask for such release remain in the public school. Dismissal time means that the school closes at 1:30 or 2 o'clock; all the children are dismissed, no children remain in the public school and the public school authorities have no concern with what happens to the children after they are dismissed.[43]

Thus Gamoran called for a fundamental re-apportionment of the student's time in which religious schools could claim a greater share. Such a proposal matched Gamoran's plan to expand weekday religious school instruction to the maximum extent. But dismissal time never became a popular idea and weekday instructional programs in the Reform movement remained the exception rather than the rule throughout the 40's.

Gamoran's frustration over failures to entensify Jewish education and his animosity toward Jewish minimalists is

revealed in an article written in 1947 called "The Role of Jewish Education in Developing a Creative Jewish Center in America." Gamoran saw the minimalist camp growing as a result of the Holocaust. He explained that antisemitism made Jews overly sensitive to gentile opinion.

In this article Gamoran indicated for the first time that his position on day school education had altered. Without endorsing day schools he revealed his distaste for minimalist opponents of day schools. Moreover he argued that "parochial schools" are completely compatible with democracy.

> There can...be no doubt that a democratic philosophy of education permits the establishment both of private and parochial schools. Yet many American Jews violently resent any such effort. This resentment seems to be a reflection of panic...
> ...The problem of Judaism in America today is still the problem of emancipation. When Jewry lived within the ghetto walls, it constituted a distinct community whose life was largely unaffected by the surrounding people who generally reflected a lower level of culture. Under these circumstances, Judaism flowered and functioned in the life of the people continuously. Once emancipation came, Jews were confronted with two tendencies: the desire for survival as a distinct entity; and fear of separatism, which at times developed into panic under the force of severe persecution.[44]

But although Gamoran demonstrated an increased openess to the idea of day schools this idea was still very unpopular among members of the CCAR. A rapid growth of parochial schools following World War II inspired the CCAR Committee on church and state to make a recommendation that the CCAR officially oppose day schools.[45] The discussion of this recommendation revealed a new wrinkle in attitudes

toward day schools: One faction argued that day schools deserved an evaluation from the perspective of its Jewish educational value as opposed to its bearing on the separation of church and state. Rabbi Barnett Brickner who had written a scholarly work on Wise's Talmid Yelodim Institute argued:

> I think the question of parochial schools should be a subject of study and report by the Committee on Religious Education. I do not think it comes within the scope of the Committee on Church and State. There is a sort of insinuation involved in such a study by this [church and state] committee ... that the establishment of Jewish parochial schools involves a conflict between Church and State.[46]

But a resolution calling for consideration and programming on the question of Jewish day schools by the Commission on Jewish Education was defeated in the Committee on Resolutions. This defeat angered Rabbi Philip Bookstaber. He asked for an explanation.

> It [parochial schools] is a problem in many communities. There is a national movement for Jewish parochial schools, and I would like to know why the committee did not approve.[47]

Rabbi Jerome Mack, Chairman of the CCAR meeting replied:

> Your Committee felt that the Conference would not be particularly interested in a discussion of the subject of Jewish parochial schools.[48]

Not only did the opponents of day schools stifle discussion of this issue in this way but they filed a report of the discussion under the heading "Committee on Church and State"

insinuating as Brickner had argued that day schools involved a church-state conflict.

Two years later, however, the Executive Board of the CCAR called for the Commission on Jewish Education to submit a recommendation on Jewish day schools to the CCAR.[49] This invitation lead Gamoran to make his first public endorsement of day schools at the 1950 CCAR Convention as part of a debate in which Rabbi Victor Reinhart presented a paper opposing day schools.

In his presentation Gamoran conceded that Reform Jews had some "very good reasons [to be] committed to the public school system." He explained that the most important of these reasons was "that the thought of separating our children or, as the opponents of the day school would say, segregating them from the rest of the population during the public school years is distasteful to them...[50] In fact Gamoran expressed this opinion himself during the 20's.

Gamoran then went on the explain the arguments which apparently convinced him to change his views. He began by suggesting that segregation was not necessarily a bad thing:

> A certain amount of social activity on the part of members of an ethnic, religious or cultural group is very natural on the basis of what Professor Gidding used to call "consciousness of kind" which he formulated as a basic sociological law, namely, that people like to be together with others of their own kind.[51]

Gamoran argued that since some type of segregation was inevitable there are better and worse lines along which such

segregation could take place. He wrote: "Segregation on the basis of the social economic grouping is less justified than on the basis of cultural and religious interests.[52] Socio-economic segregation was motivated by snobbish anti-democratic tendencies. Religious segregation on the other hand was motivated by positive "spiritual cultural and educational," objectives.[53] But what of Gamoran's concern that Jews learn how to live in a democratic American environment? He suggested:

> the day school can and does teach Americanism and the essentials of a democratic philosophy of life. In fact, from the point of view of a democratic philosophy of life, much can be said to the effect that one of the best protections against a totalitarian state is to be found in the existence of the private secular as well as religious day schools under non-state auspices.[54]

Thus while Gamoran feared in the 20's that the Jewish community would flounder in American society because Jews were not exposed to the best in American society, he feared in the 50's that American society might overwhelm the minority Jewish culture. He especially pointed out how day schools could protect Jewish youth from antisemitism.

> while we cannot insulate our children against such reactions, much may perhaps be gained by postponing their occurence to the later years. From this point of view an even stronger case can be made out for the so called Foundation School which takes the child out of nursery school age and keeps him until he is eight years old, so that during the early years, when he is very sensitive and needs what Professor Gidding calls the "consciousness of kind" and protection from anti-attitudes, he is with fellow Jews who convey to him the feeling that he belongs instead of, as so often happens, the feeling that he does not belong.[55]

Gamoran suggested several other reasons for supporting day schools. He argued that day schools promoted intellectual integration.

> Jews have always sought a unification and integration of life rather than a dualism (religion and secularism). Unity is the first essential of Jewishness.[56]

He also claimed that day school would help to fill the need for Jewishly educated Reform leaders in the future.

> there is a need for the training of Jewish leadership of which Hebriac education is a basis. We have no such basis now in the ranks of Reform Judaism. Without it we shall be largely dependent on Orthodox and Conservative Jews to supply us with children who have sufficient Hebriac background to go into Jewish work, into the rabbinate. I submit that this is not a wholesome position for our liberal Jewish movement in America.[57]

Indeed, Gamoran saw the Reform day school as aimed at a small elite group. The small number of students involved in such schools convinced Gamoran that these schools posed no threat to the future of good public education for all other Americans.

Finally, Gamoran noted the acceptability of private schools as reasons enough for some of "Reform's finest families" to send their children to such schools. "So" he asked, "why not have Reform Jewish Private Schools which would be able to hold their own with the best private day schools in the country..."[58]

The change in Gamoran's position on day schools can be explained in various ways. First of all Gamoran was clearly

frustrated in his attempt to intensify Jewish education through weekday instruction. As the most intensive form of Jewish education, the day school must have appeared to Gamoran as a way to solve the problem of intensifying Jewish education in one fell swoop. Furthermore, Gamoran's support for day schools can be seen as a logical outgrowth of his concern with adjustment. Gamoran recognized that maladjustment could occur by a failure to socialize the Jewish child into the Jewish people. Gamoran explained this position succinctly in 1931.

> The normal growth of an individual must take into account such important facts as that of a distinctive ... religious and ethnic group. The failure to develop an intelligent understanding of one's attitude to such ... religion or ethnos accounts for the stunted growth of many individuals and even for serious mental adjustments.[59]

Gamoran feared that Jewish identity for some Reform Jews had become so "attenuated" due to antisemitism and a lack of Jewish education that they were maladjusted and required an intensive Jewish educational experience as a result. The day school was the cure for this "disease."

But despite some continuity in Gamoran's thought, his endorsement of day school education represented a significant change in his point of view. He recognized that the Jewish curriculum maker was not any less qualified than the non-Jew in making a curriculum that reflected America. By 1950 he acknowledged that Jewish educators could create a

curriculum that would serve as a positive socialization for Jews into American society.

Gamoran's support of day school education should also be seen as part of larger trends in Jewish life in America. Several factors following World War II contributed to a heightened Jewish consciousness. Awareness of the Holocaust in Europe, the significance of the establishment of the State of Israel linked with a resurgence of religion among Americans in general intensified Jewish identity in America. This lead to an increased interest among Jews in all forms of Jewish education including day schools.[60] Alexander Duskhin argued that the new concern for Jewish education resulted from a maturation of attitudes within the American Jewish community as it lost its "immigrant -first general" character.[61] Moreover, day schools gained "respectiblity" within a broad segment of the Jewish educational establishment when they received the endorsement of such figures as Duskhin and Judah Pilch. This "respectability" was reenforced by the rapid growth of Catholic parochial schools and Protestant day school schools during this period.

Thus Gamoran's movement toward support of day schools should be seen against a background of greater interest in Jewish education and a rise of support for day schools among non-Reform educators. These factors allied with the internal developments in Gamorans thinking make sense of

Gamoran's decision to support day schools after his initial opposition.

Reichert's refutation of Gamoran's arguments began with a prophetic stance:

> The Jewish All-day School, like Jonah's gourd, has come up in the night of despair. It will wither in the broad daylight of renewed faith in freedom and the democratic process...[62]

Reichert saw the day school as a "withdrawal into the shell of separation." Such a withdrawal posed great dangers to the Jewish child.

> ...The inculcation of intense and narrow Jewish loyalty, purchased at the price of voluntary withdrawl and segregated sectarian study, came too high. Like any private system of education that withdrawls children from the public schools in their most pliable and impressionable years when they should be experiencing the free association, the friendship and the fight of democratic way of life and not merely learning to speak the phrase - the scar of a certain snobbish, warped and narrow mental outlook is fairly sure to result. ..It is my contention that any project, however nobly motivated, that subtracts any American child from the wholesome give and take of the public school, in some measure dwarfs the child's outlook by depriving him of the vigorous experience and exciting adventure in democratic group living.[63]

Thus unlike Gamoran who saw public and private schools as equally legitimate options, Reichert opposed all private schools as anti-democratic. Any value that might be obtained from intensive Jewish education in a day school was less important than the value of participation in the public educational system.

Following the delivery of Gamoran and Reichert's papers, delegates at the CCAR Convention offered a series of comments which according to the National Jewish Post and Opinion "amounted to a severe beating for the day school movement."[64] Rabbi Bookstaber asked for the Reform movement to go on record in opposition to day schools. He said that while he did not think that day schools were un-American he did feel that they were not "American-minded." Instead they were "European- minded" reflecting a ghetto mentality.[65] Rabbi Hersch Levin of Lawrence Massachusetts, argued that day schools threatened the survival of public schools. He explained that parochial schools in Boston had made the public schools so weak that they were in chaotic conditions.[66] Rabbis Leon Fram and Samuel Thurman expressed similar views.[67]

Two lone Rabbis spoke up in support of Dr. Gamoran. Rabbi William Rosenbloom of New York City said that a switch in the Reform position to support day schools would speed the growth of the Reform movement.[68] Rabbi William Braude, of Providence, Rhode Island, who sent his own children to a day school, explained that day schools provided children with a thorough grounding for Jewish living.[69]

Despite the hostile reception to Gamoran's views, his position as Director of the Commission on Jewish Education made support of day schools a legitimate minority position

in the Reform movement. Moreover, his switch from opposition to support of day schools signaled that the old consensus in the Reform movement had disappeared. A new period of debate had begun.

# CHAPTER V

## ACCEPTANCE OF THE DAY SCHOOL IDEA

In the winter of 1961, 52 Rabbinic students and faculty members at the New York campus of the Hebrew Union College - Jewish Institute of Religion signed a petition calling on the UAHC Commission on Jewish Education to consider the establishment of "liberal-Jewish day schools."[1] This petition was the opening shot in a ten year battle between proponents and opponents of day schools over whether the Reform movement should officially endorse the day school idea. At the end of this decade the movement agreed to a compromise endorsement and witnessed the birth of two new Reform Day Schools. This chapter will trace the history of this debate ending in the 1971 landmark endorsement.

Rabbi Maurice Eisendrath, President of the UAHC got the debate underway on a national level by raising the day school question in his report to the Board of Trustees of the UAHC four months after the petition at HUC-JIR. Eisendrath presented a maximilist approach to the problem of Reform Jewish education. He suggested that if the Jewish community was to disprove the words of David Ben Gurion, that Judaism was no longer viable in the diaspora and hence her eventual disappearance outside of Israel was certain, "we must make certain that there be far-reaching improvement in our still desultory attempts to pass on to future generations outside of Israel the knowledge of our Hebrew tongue."[2] He continued:

> We will, likewise, have at least to discuss the question of the Jewish Day School. There is increasing dissatisfaction with the few hours of instruction presently afforded in our congregational schools and, while the majority within our own movement may resist, for still a long time, any temptation to yield to the growing clamor for the day school, the trend to the parochial school is already making great inroads in Conservative movement.[3]

It is worth noting the impact of the Conservative movement's endorsement of day schools on Eisendrath's thinking: Its interest in day schools made a Reform examination of the question necessary.

Eisendrath also recognized that this issue was often seen in terms of a church/state conflict. He therefore concluded by saying:

> In speaking of the Day School ... we shall most definitely continue our unequivocal stand against any form of federal aid to such religious or parochial schools...[4]

Two weeks later the Ad Hoc Committee on Full-Time Jewish Education was established by the Commission on Jewish Education to study the day school question.[5]

But momentum behind the day school idea was slowed five months later at the 1961 Biennial Assembly of the UAHC. UAHC delegates focused on the issue of federal aid to parochial schools. They passed an ambiguous resolution which sought to criticize such federal aid without implying "any lack of respect for religiously sponsored institutions." The resolution went on to state:

> We respect tha right of any religious denomination to establish and administer its own educational

> institutions. We applaud their contributions to the cultural and spiritual diversity of our nation.[6]

But the UAHC stopped short of recommending that the Reform movement attempt to make such a "contribution" itself.

A few months later the Executive Committee of the National Association of Temple Educators (NATE) the organization of Reform educators, threw its weight behind day schools in an unequivocal way. It declared that it looked upon the development of Reform day school as a part of the normal program of Reform Jewish education. It promised that NATE would lend all aid and support to such projects.[7] In order to educate its members about the day school issue, NATE sponsored a debate at its 1962 convention along the lines of the Gamoran/Reichert debate. Rabbi Samuel Glasner, Director of the Baltimore Board of Jewish Education, presented the case for day schools while Rabbi Samuel Rosenkrantz, St. Louis, Missouri, presented the case against day schools. Glasner summarized his position this way.

> A Jewish day school under Reform auspices would be Jewishly meaningful. It would somewhat minimize in the education of some few Jewish children unhealthy conflicts between Jewish and Christian culture. It would help produce an elite group of Reform Jewish intellectual and cultural leaders. To all of us who are committed to the highest standards of Jewish education this should constitute a challenge, a provocative opportunity, an inspiring goal.[8]

Emanuel Gamoran suggested all of these arguments 12 years before. But while Gamoran offered a sociological

justification for separating Jewish children from their Christian peers, Glasner offers a religious justification. He argued:

> With all of our liberal talk of "Judeo-Christian" tradition, we forget that Judaism and Christianity are very different in many important areas of religion and even ethics ... the Jewish child in the public school is inevitably being taught Christian values and concepts both in what is stated and in what is omitted by even the friendliest teacher, administrator, and textbook authors ... some children are more sensitive than others to such influences and can less readily tolerate the intellectual conflicts which are thus engendered in all of us. Furthermore, the American Jewish community will always have need of some potential leaders, who are relatively less 'contaminated' by the Christian environment, or to put it more positively, are more intensively steeped in the Jewish tradition. For these, the Jewish day school provides the ideal answer.[9]

Rosenkranz like Victor Reichert before him was opposed to all non-public schools in principle.

> I am opposed to <u>all private</u> schools. I am opposed to <u>all</u> parochial schools. In a democratic society, I believe <u>all</u> children should attend <u>public</u> schools.[10]

But while Reichert expressed a concern about the impact of day school education on the individual child, Rosenkranz wrote about its negative impact on society as a whole. Rosenkranz argued that the day school question cannot be viewed in isolation from the larger issue of church and state relations.

> Let us remember ... that we are faced with more than the problem of the day school system because we cannot separate it from the freedom of the public school system and from the problem of separation of church and state; that the Orthodox day school movement shows us

> that we cannot establish a successful Reform day school without risking the pressures that could force it to expand and multiply; that such expansion becomes indeed a threat to general public education in the United States and to our liberties; that a sectarian day school is a parochial school which is religiously devisive force that has no place in a democracy...[11]

Thus Rosenkranz proposed a domino theory which began with Reform day schools and ended with the destruction of public education and individual liberties. Rosenkranz feared the results of removing Jewish children from the public school, while Glasner feared the results of letting them remain in such a "contaminating" environment.

Following the endorsement of the day school idea by the New England Reform Rabbinate,[12] the 1963 Biennial Assembly of the UAHC took up the day school question again. The leadership of the UAHC came out strongly in favor of day schools. Rabbi Jay Kaufman, Vice President of the UAHC, and Rabbi Alexander Schindler, then the Director of the Union's Division of Religious Education, expressed their support in an interview given during the Biennial. According the a New York Times report, Rabbis Kaufman and Schindler believed that the graduates of the Jewish day schools were moving into ranking positions in the Jewish community including the Reform Rabbinate. The Rabbis voiced the conviction that the program of Jewish religious education, including the all-day Jewish schools, was the "concern of the total Jewish community, meriting its material support." Schindler expressed the hope that a "number of private individuals would sponsor

such an all-day school and give it a Jewish religious program that is Reform rather than Orthodox in its approach." Schindler rejected the idea that day schools constituted a threat to the public school system or a violation of the principle of separation of church and state.[13]

Although several proposals pro and con were made at the '63 Biennial, none of them were brought to a vote. Instead the delegates adopted a compromise resolution which called for the Union to take no action "until a report on the subject had been received from the Commission on Jewish Education."[14]

Rabbi Kaufman carried his campaign in favor of day schools into the pages of the CCAR Journal in the spring of 1964. Rabbi Sylvan Schwartzman, Professor of Education at HUC-JIR, Cincinnati School, argued against his position. Unlike his predecessors who had argued that day schools were anti-democratic and un-American, Schwartzman claimed that day schools were "un-Reform Jewish". He insisted that Reform Judaism and day schools were uncompatible. Asserting that he wrote in the true spirit of Reform, Schwartzman explained:

> The truth is that up until very recently the Outline of the Curriculum for the Jewish Religious School issued by the Commission on Jewish Education stated: "It [the Reform Movement] stands firmly opposed ... to the promotion of a private system of religious education which will absorb the general education of the public." (1959 edition, p.v.). Though this statement has since been removed, it still represents Reform's legitimate position.[15]

Schwartzman went on to argue that this traditional position of the movement reflected the fundamental principles of Reform Judaism, namely the insistence on equality for Jews, absolute separation of church and state, the mission of Israel to all of humanity and support of the public schools as a vital force for democracy. Schwartzman insisted that day schools would require Reform Judaism to sacrifice these principles, vaguely hinting that day schools would impede American Jews from fulfilling their civic responsibilities.[16]

Rabbi Kaufman's companion article treated Rabbi Schwartzman's claim that Reform Judaism and day schools were incompatible with distain. He wrote:

> If I had not seen it in print I would not believe mature Jews in positions of responsibility even capable of such statements.[17]

He also attacked the position that segregation of Jewish youth will have a negative impact on Jewish youth. Kaufman assured his readers.

> My own extensive observation and that of careful students of the subject has failed to disclose any difference in the Americanization or sophistication of the children who attend Jewish day schools and the children in <u>their own neighborhood</u> who attend the public schools the children would be attending.[18]

Kaufman explained that socialization outside of the classroom caused this similarity.

> The children play together after school and weekends, watch the same television, go to the same movies, read the same comic books, belong to the same boy scout troop, attend the same summer camps and are absorbed in the same fads and hero-worship.[19]

But Kaufman did note a significant difference between those who attended day schools and those who did not which convinced him of the merit of day schools.

> day school students have an infinitely profounder knowledge of Judaism, care much more and demonstrate a greater seriousness in their approach to their studies both Jewish and general.[20]

Kaufman like other day school proponents before him allowed that only a small percentage of Jewish youth would attend such schools. He therefore conceded that the Reform movement will have to continue to improve supplementary school education for the majority of Jewish youth. Nevertheless, he asserted that an elite core of future leaders for Reform Judaism could be trained in such day schools greatly enriching the Reform movement.[21]

The Kaufman/Schwartzman articles elicited a spirited response. Alfred Russel writing in Issues, the publication of the Council for American Judaism contributed the only new element to the debate. Russel took both Schwartzman and Kaufman to task for failing to admit the extent to which Zionist organizations stood behind the pro-day school movement. In Russels words "The Zionist movement is the driving force behind the day school program in Reform Judasim."[22]

It is certainly true that various Zionist organizations endorsed the day school idea.[23] Moreover, the leading proponents of day schools within the Reform movement, Gamoran, Eisendrath, Glasner, Kaufman and Schindler were all Zionists of various type. But there is no evidence to

suggest that there is a causal relationship between Zionist endorsements and Reform support. Instead there was a natural resonance between the "maximalist" Jewish educational approach of the day school proponents and the particularism implied by the Zionist idea. Both were intensive forms of Jewish identification and it is not surprising therefore to discover that day school supporters were also Zionists. Furthermore, none of the Reform day school supporters resorted to "Zionist" arguments to justify their position. Rather they defended Reform day schools in terms of the needs of Jews in the diaspora and within the context of Reform ideology.

Just as the Schwartzman/Kaufman debate came out in the CCAR Journal, the annual Assembly of Delegates of the New York Federation of Reform Synogogues took up the issue. Rabbi Alvan Rubin of Roslyn Heights, called upon the Reform movement to "bring fresh energy and renewed vitality for a positive Jewish community" by establishing a chain of Reform day schools.[24] Taking issue with Rubin's proposal were Rabbis Paul M. Steinberg, Executive Dean of HUC-JIR, New York School, and Alan Bennett of Great Neck, President of NATE, who contended that day schools would "undermine the integrity and quality of public education".[25] By a narrow vote the delegates passed a resolution calling on the UAHC to study the feasability of establishing a chain of six Reform Jewish day schools.[26] But this call went unanswered by the UAHC Biennial Assembly in 1965. The 1967 Assembly,

however, passed a resolution calling for further study of the issue. It instructed the Commission on Jewish Education to conduct "during the next two-year period a thorough and objective exploration of this matter".[27]

One of the most emotional and pointed presentations on the subject of day schools made during the two year period of study was given at the Hebrew Union College Founder's Day ceremonies in 1968 by Rabbi Stanley Chyet. Chyet's sermon, Tomorrow, contended that by the year 2000, eighty percent of the college educated Jews of America would be "letting go of their Jewish identities," or, as Chyet quoted from Philip Roth's book Letting Go: "It's not an issue in my life" said Gabe Wallach.[28] Chyet desparately wanted to make Judaism an issue in the lives of the "Gabe Wallachs" of the world. He wanted these "Gabe Wallachs" to have a profound Jewish experience. But he warned:

> If Judaism is a way of life and of looking at the world, it is a way which cannot be experienced on weekend mornings.
>
> It cannot be experienced even on Monday and Wednesday afternoons, or in the finest summer camps.
>
> It can be experienced only within the confines of a daily ongoing exposure to Jewish concerns - and there is but one institution able to offer such an exposure.
>
> I mean, of course, a Reform Jewish Day School.
>
> Only when that instrumentality is created, only then can we hope to counter the Jewish marginality of the laymen who dominate our congregations and our communal institutions.
>
> It is only within such a framework that the young would-be (and otherwise, I fear, will-be) Gabe Wallachs can begin to discover the possibility that Judaism is an issue in their lives.[29]

In May, 1968, the Commission on Education dispensed with further study and adopted a resolution favoring day school education by a vote of 17-3. The resolution stated:

> The Commission on Jewish Education recommends to the Central Conference of American Rabbis and the Union of American Hebrew Congregations that they encourage the establishment of schools, which would provide for the liberal Jew, on a full-time basis, an integrated program of Jewish and general studies.[30]

Following the Commission's decision, Dimensions magazine served as the forum for another in the series of head to head confrontations over the issue. This contest matched Rabbi Samuel Glasner in favor of day schools with Rabbi Elliot Rosenstock, a professor at the University of Notre Dame, arguing against day schools.

Glasner toned down his approach considerably from his earlier effort. Gone are all references to the "contaminating effects" of Christian culture. Instead he introduced to the debate an idea not heard since I.M. Wise's early editorials in favor of day schools. Glasner argued that day schools were needed because of the poor quality of public school education. Glasner recognized with deep concern that increasing numbers of Jews attended private schools organized by specific Protestant denominations. Frequently these schools listed among their stated goals "the inculcation of Christian attitudes", and the "building of Christian character". Private Reform day schools should be created as a Jewish alternative for the private school student.[31]

Rosenstock dismissed Glasner's argument out of hand.

> the argument that many children who come from Reform homes already attend private day and boarding schools is not convincing. For this is not a significant percentage. And even if it were, it does not mean that we should establish competing schools. Better that we build better homes and public schools that would alleviate the necessity of thes children absenting themselves from our religious schools.[32]

Both Glasner and Rosenstock admitted that the racial integration of the public schools was a factor behind the growth of the private school population. Both deplored racism. Glasner argued that even if "some parents are in part motivated in this direction by the reprehensive considerations of racial prejudice...this does not invalidate the positive motivation of the majority."[33] Rosenstock on the other hand pleaded with his readers not to abandon the public school, in spite of its troubles:

> We should be in the forefront of the battle to preserve the public school. The day school is a failure of nerve. Let us have the nerve to fail rather than to succumb to failure.[34]

Day school supporters scored a major victory in June of 1969 at the annual CCAR Conventions. Participants voted to authorize the UAHC Department of Education "to encourage the establishment of pilot programs and experimental projects in full-time Reform Jewish education."[35] The Commission on Jewish Education explained in its report that such schools should aim to provide "a more intensive study of Judaism than the part-time school can possibly provide". The

report conceeded:

> The great majority of our children and youth will obviously continue to receive their Jewish education in the religious school and camp. But we must also be concerned about the minority who desire and seek more intensive Jewish education in the full-time school.

The report went on to say:

> The Commission [on Jewish Education] considers this proposal to be wholly compatible with the principles of American democracy. The private school is an accepted institution, legally provided for by every state constitution.

The Commission report ended by calling on all CCAR members to urge delegates to the UAHC Biennial Assembly of 1969 to support this recommendation.[36] The Assembly's support was critical since both the CCAR and the UAHC Biennial Assembly was required to ratify a proposal before a UAHC department could institute a new program.

A survey conducted in 1969 by the Commission on Education of the attitudes of Reform Rabbis to a Reform Jewish preparatory school provides some background information on the success of day school supporters in 1969. Of 354 Rabbis responding to the survey, 251 responded in favor and 85 opposed; the remainder were "not certain". The most frequently stated reasons stated by the supporters of such a school were:

1) There is a need for full-time Jewish education
2) There will be support for such a program once started

The most frequently given "negative" response given was:

> There is no need for full-time Jewish education in my area

The survey also indicated a high level of personal commitment among day school supporters. 53 Rabbis said they would send their children to such a day school.[37] One can conclude that this highly committed core provided the main support for the day school idea in the CCAR.

Miami Beach was the scene of the 1969 Biennial Convention of the UAHC where delegates considered the 1968 recommendation of the Commission on Education, in favor of day schools, and its ratification by the CCAR. According to The New York Times, opponents of the proposal led by Alexander Ross, a member of the Social Action Commission of the UAHC described day schools as a threat to the public school system and a violation of the principle of the separation of church and state. Ross argued that such schools would not be built in the small towns but would be:

> ...started in the big metropolitan cities. It is here that democracy faces its crisis with the school system as a focal point of conflict. It is here that black and Jews and other Americans must learn to live not only side-by-side but together, to build a society worthy of this nation.[38]

According to The New York Times report day school proponents countered that financial support for Reform day schools would come from synagogues or the Jewish community and not from public funds. This they said would not involve a violation of church-state relations.[39]

Rabbi Alexander Schindler, elevated to the position of Vice President of the Union, said that American democracy had not been built:

> on a monolithic system of state education. It allows for private schools. It might be noted, marginally, that some of the most fervent opponents of the day school idea for Reform Judaism send their children to private schools often sponsored by non-Jewish denominational groups.[40]

In support of this argument, Rabbi Jack Spiro, National Director of Education, made a charge that undoubtedly offended lay persons at the convention. He remarked that it was not "a secret that many Jewish leaders are Jewishly ignorant...They qualify for leadership positions because of monitary rather than cultural reasons."[41] After five hours of animated discussion delegates defeated the proposal to establish Reform day schools.[42]

Rabbi Louis I. Newman of Temple Rodoph Sholom in Manhattan reacted with anger to this decision in a sermon entitled "Jewish Anti-Semites: Jewish Belittlement of Jewish Causes." According to a report in the Jewish Post and Opinion he charged the convention with being guilty of hypocrisy and bigotry in opposing education under liberal Jewish auspices.[43]

Newman had reason to be sensitive on this subject. He was at that time in the process of establishing a Reform day school in his congregation. Newman was an early supporter of day school education in the Reform movement, seeing it as the best method of educating young Jews. In a 1961 sermon called "The Jewish Day School: Why I Favor It," Newman stated that:

> it [the Reform day school] would aid us in overcoming the abysmal ignorance among Jewish children regarding

> Jewish history, archaeology, literature and life, which we seek to overcome by the inadequate Sunday and mid-week school.[44]

Newman's support for day schools was part of a career long interest in establishing Jewish educational institutions. His book "A Jewish University in America?" published in 1922 provided an ideological foundation for what was to become Brandeis University a generation later. Newman was also one of the driving forces behind the establishment of the Jewish Institute of Religion.[45] Thus Newman's interest in establishing a day school was a logical extension of his earlier work. He conceived of his day school as "a service to the community, designed to develop character, values and ethical ideals, leading to responsible citizenship."[46] In the interest of democracy, his school was to be "open to all pupils, who can qualify for its academic requirements, regardless of faith".[47] But the school also was to offer its students "courses of Jewish content on a voluntary basis, taught from the historical and scientific viewpoint".[48]

Newman was sensitive to the problem of segregation and white flight from the integrating public schools. But he believed that his day school "would be helpful ... in persuading more families to remain in the metropolitan area, instead of migrating to the suburbs," thereby preserving a culturally and racially mixed community.[49]

Undoubtedly Newman felt obliged to make such a claim because he laid the foundations for his school during a period of public school integration. Just as Newman was seeking support for his school, Dr. Nathan Brown, acting superintendent of the New York City Schools, urged Jewish leaders to keep Jewish pupils in the city public schools. Brown feared that the alienation of the Jewish middle class from the public school system could result in a city of "ghettos surrounded by police protecting one group from another."[50] But while fear of integration undoubtedly played a role in motivating parents to send their children to the Rodoph Sholom School, Newman's long standing interest in Jewish education makes it clear that public integration was peripheral to his motives.

By the time the UAHC Biennial met in Los Angeles in 1972, a second Reform school had opened in Miami[51] and the pro-day school forces had put together a winning compromise resolution. Delegates reaffirmed the Union's support for high quality public education but also recognized "the very real need for a high quality Jewish education and the challenge presented by the Reform movement of tomorrow." The resolution went on to propose the establishment of a "self-supporting academy, independent of the budget of the UAHC." The resolution also explained that the school would be open to applicants "without regard to race, religion or national origin."[52]

Lacking a financial base and a well defined pool of applicants, the program was doomed to failure from the start. Yet this resolution did mark the end of an era in the debate over day school education in the Reform movement. Through this resolution the Reform movement officially moved away from the concept that all children should attend public schools making room for the day school concept in the Reform community.

What factors ccntributed to this landmark endorsement? First a powerful coalition of groups emerged within the Reform movement that favored day schools. Officers of the UAHC, Jewish educators in NATE and the Commission of Education, and a core of highly committed day school proponents in the CCAR all began promoting the idea. Second, the growth of Conservative and Orthodox day schools contributed to a climate in which Reform day schools appeared more acceptable. Finally, the integration and perceived deterioration of public schools influenced parents to choose non-public school education for their children and thereby created a group willing to pay for education and eager for the kind of new alternatives which day schools represented.

# CHAPTER VI

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The debate over day school education moved through four major stages; a formative stage in which a pro-public school ideology emerged as official policy; a second stage in which educational "maximalists" struggled with the contradictions in this official policy and endorsed the Gary Plan as a new compromise; a transitional stage, in which Emanuel Gamoran moved from opposition to support of the day school idea in order to combat forces of assimilation; a fourth stage, in which the Reform movement officially abandoned the idea that all children should attend public schools, making room for the growth of Reform Jewish day schools. Different forces in every stage shaped the position of the debaters. But one theme does run through all of these stages: the Reform movement's attitude toward day schools was conditioned by a tension between assimilation and identity. On one side of the spectrum, Reform Jews desired to transmit the Jewish heritage to future generations. On the other side of the spectrum, Reform Jews sought to secure a place in American society. Each stage in the history of the day school represents a compromise between these two tendencies.

It would be interesting to speculate on socio-economic and cultural divisions between pro and anti-day school forces. But this study did not bring to light any strong predictor of attitudes. Day school supporters were young

and old. They came from all parts of the country, and from the "right", "center" and "left" of the Reform movement. Day school supporters tended to be Zionists. But not all Zionist were day school supporters. For example, Judah Magnes under the influence of Samson Benderly opposed day schools in New York City.[1]

Currently, the official Reform movement's policy, adopted in 1971, sanctions the day school idea but neither the UAHC or CCAR have put institutional force behind this position. Instead, in keeping with the Reform movement's traditional emphasis on congregational autonomy, a handful of Reform day schools have emerged on the local congregational level. These schools represent the culmination of a debate over 100 years old. But they have moved far beyond the debate over the propriety of a Reform day school. These institutions are now engaged in creating a curriculum for the Reform day school that integrates Liberal Judaism and secular studies. This integrated curriculum is emerging as:

> a series of educational experiences in which Jewish concerns are infused into areas of study which were previously considered 'secular.' At the same time, the teaching of basic skills and competencies is part and parcel of the tendency of Judaica.[2]

Reform day schools also face the problem of finding teachers "who are capable of teaching a liberal, 'integrated' curriculum."[3] Discussion of the merits of the day school idea in the Reform movement in the future will surely depend on the success of these efforts.

# ABBREVIATIONS USED IN FOOTNOTES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

| | |
|---|---|
| AJA | American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati, Ohio |
| CCARJ | Central Conference of American Rabbis Journal |
| CCARY | Central Conference of American Rabbis Yearbook |
| Isr. | American Israelite, Cincinnati, Ohio |
| NATE | National Association of Temple Educators |
| UAHC | Union of American Hebrew Congregations |

# Notes

CHAPTER I:

1. Frederick Robinson quoted in "Temple's of Liberty Unpolluted," by Lloyd Gartner, A Bicentennial Festschrift for Jacob Rader Marcus, (New York: KTAV, 1967), p. 158.

2. Ibid, p. 159.

3. Quoted in The Evolution of the Urban School System, by Carl F. Kaestle, (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1973), p. 112.

4. Horace Bushnell, quoted in "Temples of Liberty Unpolluted," by Lloyd Gartner, A Bicentennial Festschrift for Jacob Rader Marcus, (New York: KTAV, 1967), p. 159.

5. Ibid, p. 161.

6. Hyman B. Grinstein, "Studies in the History of Jewish Education in New York City (1728-1860)", The Jewish Review, (New York), Vol. II, 2 & 3, April and July/October, 1944, p. 41-58 and 187-201.

7. Alexander M. Dushkin, Jewish Education in New York City, (New York: The Bureau of Jewish Education, 1918), p. 42-43.

8. J.R. Rosenbloom, "And She Had Compassion: The Life and Times of Rebecca Gratz, (Rabbinic Thesis, Hebrew Union College, 1957).

9. Samson Benderly, "Jewish Education in America," The Jewish Exponent (January, 1908). Reprinted in Jewish Education, Vol. 3, 20 (Summer, 1949).

CHAPTER II:

1. Lloyd Gartner, "Temple of Liberties Unpolluted: American Jews and Public Schools, 1940-1875," A Bicentennial Festschrift for Jacob Rader Marcus (New York: KTAV, 1967), p. 167-68.

2. Isaac Lesser quoted in Lloyd Gartner, "Temple of Liberties Unpolluted: American Jews and Public Schools, 1940-1875," A Bicentennial Festschrift for Jacob Rader Marcus (New York: KTAV, 1967), p. 167.

3. Occident, IX, 9 (December, 1851), p. 476.

4. Asmonean (October 22, 1852), p. 272.

5. Ibid

6. Isr., I, 20 (December 8, 1854), p. 158.
I am assuming that unsigned editorials from 1854-1875 were written by Wise.

7. Ibid

8. Wise quoted in Max May, I.M. Wise. (New York: The Knickerbocker Press, 1916), p. 146.

9. Isr., I 20 (November 24, 1854), p. 158.

10. Isr., I, 22 (December 8, 1954), p. 174.

11. Ibid

12. Isr., I, 24 (December 22, 1854), p. 189.

13. Ibid

14. Ibid

15. Ibid

16. Isr., I, 25 (December 29, 1854), p. 197-98.

17. Isr., I, 27 (January 12, 1855), p. 214.

18. Barnett Brickner, "The Jewish Community of Cincinnati: Historical and Descriptive, 1817-1933," (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Cincinnati, 1933), p. 140-141.

19. Isr., III, 30 (January 20, 1857) p. 238.

20. Ibid

21. Isr., II, 18 (November 9, 1855), p. 148.

22. Ibid

23. Isr., IV, 32 (February 12, 1858), p. 254.

24. Isr., VII, 30 (January 25, 1861), p. 236.

25. David Philipson, The Oldest Jewish Congregation in the West (Cincinnati: C.J. Krechbeil and Co., 1894) p. 60.

26. Morton J. Merowitz, "Max Lilienthal - Jewish Educator in Nineteenth-Century America" YIVO Annual of Jewish Social Science, Vol. XV, (New York: YIVO Institute for Jewish Research, 1974), p. 53.

27. Die Deborah 1, 34 (February 22, 1861), p. 135.

28. Barnett Breckner, "The Jewish Community of Cincinnati: Historical and Descriptive, 1817-1933," (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Cincinnati, 1933), p. 146.

29. Minutes of the Board of Trustees, Talmid Yelodim Institute, Cincinnati, Ohio, Minute Book 1, October 31, 1857, AJA, Box 1630.

30. Ibid, September 7, 1863

31. Ibid, February 18, 1865

32. Ibid, April 18, 1857

33. Isr., VII, 18 (November 2, 1860), p. 140.

34. Isr., XII, 36 (March 2, 1866), p. 284.

35. Barnett Brickner, "The Jewish Community of Cincinnati: Historical and Descriptive, 1817-1933," (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Cincinnati, 1933), p. 345.

36. Isr., XVI, 14 (October 8, 1869), p. 8.

37. Isr., VIII (April 4, 1862), p. 316.

38. Isr., VIII (April 11, 1862), p. 324.

39. Die Deborah, XIV, (June 4, 1869), p. 190.

40. Minutes of the Board of Trustees, Talmid Yelodim Institute, Cincinnati, Ohio, Minute Book 1, October 20, 1867, AJA, Box 1630.

41. Ibid, July 18, 1867

42. Ibid, October 20, 1867

43. Sefton Temkin, The New World of Reform, (Bridgeport: Haitmore House, 1974) p. 90-99.

44. Ibid

45. Ibid, p. 12

46. Felsenthal quoted in Lloyd Gartner, ed. Jewish Education in the United States, (New York: Columbia University, 1972), p. 83-84.

47. Ibid

48. David Einhorn, Predigt, Gehalten am 31 August 1866. (New York: Thalmessinger & Cohn, 1866), p. 10-11.

49. Einhorn quoted in Benno Wallach, "Dr. David Einhorn's Sinai, 1856-1867," (Ph.D. dissertation, Hebrew Union College, 1950), p. 190.

50. The Jewish Times II, 22 (July 29, 1870), p. 342.

51. Isr., V, 2 (July 9, 1875), p. 4

52. Wise quoted in Lloyd P. Gartner, ed. Jewish Education in the United States, (New York: Columbia University, 1972), p. 86.

53. Isr., XXVII, 2 (July 11, 1873), p. 4.

CHAPTER III:

1. CCARY, Vol. I, II, III, (1892-93), Appendix "C", p. 125.
2. Ibid, p. 128.
3. Ibid, p. 126.
4. Ibid, p. 125.
5. Ibid, p. 129.
6. Ibid, p. 128.
7. Ibid
8. David Philipson, The Oldest Jewish Congregation in the West. (Cincinnati: C.I. Krechbrel and Co., 1894), p. 59.
9. Ibid
10. Irving Howe, World of Our Fathers, (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1976), p. 279.
11. Henry Berkowitz, Intimate Glimpses of the Rabbis Career. (Cincinnati: HUC Press, 1921), p. 70.
12. Irving Howe, World of Our Fathers, (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1976), p. 280.
13. Isr., Vol. 62, 21 (December 2, 1915), p. 1.
14. Ibid
15. Ibid
16. Isr., Vol. 62, 20 (November 11, 1915), p. 1.
17. Isr., Vol. 62, 21 (December 2, 1915), p. 1.
18. Ibid
19. Ibid
20. Ibid
21. Ibid
22. Isr., Vol. 62, 21 (December 2, 1915), p. 1.

23. Ibid, p. 1.

24. Ibid

25. Ibid

26. The Union Bulletin, Vol. 5, 9 (November, 1915), p. 4.

27. Ibid, p. 9.

28. Ibid

29. Ibid, p. 4.

30. The Union Bulletin, Vol. 5, 10 (December, 1915), p. 22.

31. The Jewish Teacher, Vol. 1, 1 (January, 1916), p. 63.

32. Ibid, pp. 62-63.

33. CCARY, Vol. XXVI (1916), pp. 399-419.

34. Ibid, p. 458-459.

35. Ibid, p. 479.

36. Ibid, p. 479.

37. Ibid, p. 479.

38. Ibid, p. 480.

39. Ibid, p. 481.

40. Ibid, p. 481.

41. Ibid, p. 481.

42. Ibid

43. Ibid

44. David Cohen, "American Reform Judaism and The Jewish Day School," (Master's Thesis, Hebrew University, 1974), pp. 23-26.

CHAPTER IV:

1. Emanuel Gamoran, Changing Conceptions in Jewish Education, Book I, (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1924), p. 105.

2. Emanuel Gamoran, "The Role of Jewish Education in Developing a Creative Jewish Center in America," Jewish Education, XIX, 1, (Fall, 1947), p. 25.

3. Ibid

4. Ibid

5. Emanuel Gamoran, The Jewish Teacher III, No. 1, (November, 1934), p. 24.

6. Emanuel Gamoran, Changing Conceptions in Jewish Education, Book II, (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1924), p. 124.

7. Ibid, p. 125.
Ibid, p. 27.

9. Ibid, p. 31.

10. Ibid, p. 32.

11. Ibid, p. 33.

12. Ibid, p. 34.

13. Ibid, p. 34-42.

14. Ibid, p. 44.

15. Ibid, p. 45-46.

16. Ibid, p. 46.

17. Ibid, p. 46.

18. Ibid, p. 47.

19. Ibid, p. 43.

20. Ibid, p. 52-53.

21. Ibid, p. 77-78.

22. Ibid, p. 76.

23. Ibid, p. 77.

24. Ibid, p. 62-63.

25. Ibid, p. 43.

26. Ibid, p. 61.

27. Ibid, p. 62.

28. Ibid, p. 62.

29. Ibid, p. 62.

30. Ibid, p. 63.

31. John Dewey, Democracy and Education, (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1929), p. 226-227. Gamoran indicated his support for this line of reasoning in Changing Conceptions in Jewish Education, Book II, p. 63.

32. Emanuel Gamoran, Changing Conceptions in Jewish Education, Book II, (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1924), p. 63.

33. Ibid, p. 89.

34. Ibid, p. 61.

35. Emanuel Gamoran, "Weekday Jewish Instruction" (Cincinnati: UAHC, 1928), p. 2.

36. Ibid, p. 10.

37. PUAHC, May 1929 (55th PUAHC), p. 116. Also CCARY, Vol. XXXIX, 1929, p. 450.

38. Emanuel Gamoran, July 2, 1942, AJA, Near Print File of Emanuel Gamoran.

39. Ibid

40. Emanuel Gamoran, "Religious Education and the Public School", The Jewish Teacher, XII, 4, (June, 1944), p. 13-14.

41. Ibid, p. 15.

42. Ibid, p. 14.

43. Ibid, p. 17.

44. Emanuel Gamoran, "The Role of Jewish Education in Developing A Creative Jewish Center in America", Jewish Education, XIX, I, (Fall, 1947), p. 24.

45. CCARY, Vol. LVI, 1946, p. 206.

46. Ibid, p. 154.

47. Ibid, p. 207.

48. Ibid, p. 207.

49. CCARY, Vol. LXII, 1948, p. 163.

50. Emanuel Gamoran, "Liberal Judaism and the Day School," The Jewish Teacher, XIX, 20 (January, 1951), p. 3.

51. Ibid, p. 4.

52. Ibid, p. 4.

53. Ibid, p. 4.

54. Ibid, p. 4-5.

55. Ibid, p. 5.

56. Ibid, p. 5.

57. Ibid, p. 7.

58. Ibid, p. 1.

59. Emanuel Gamoran, "Jewish Education Then and Now," The B'nai B'rith Magazine: The National Jewish Monthly, 45, 9 (June, 1931), p. 324.

60. Judah Pilch, "From the Early Fourties to the Mid-Sixties," in A History of Jewish Education in the United States, ed. Judah Pilch, (New York: American Association for Jewish Education, 1969), pp. 140-141.

61. Alexander Dushkin, Jewish Education in the United States, (New York: American Association for Jewish Education, 1959), p. 50.

62. Victor E. Reichert, "The Day School: Its Falla and Dangers", The Jewish Teacher, Vol. XIX, 2, cy (January, 1951), p. 7.

63. Ibid, p. 7.

64. The National Jewish Post and Opinion, Vol. 5, 42, June 16, 1950, p. 3.

65. Ibid

66. Ibid

67. Ibid

68. Ibid

69. Ibid

CHAPTER V:

1. "Recommending the Establishment of Liberal Day Schools" by the students and faculty of HUC-JIR, New York School, February 14, 1961, AJA, Schools, Jewish All-Day, Miscellaneous file.

2. Report of the President, Rabbi Maurice Eisendrath, to the Board of Trustees of the UAHC, June 4, 1961, Cincinnati, Ohio, p. 5.

3. Ibid

4. Ibid

5. Alvin I. Schiff, The Jewish Day School in America, (New York: The Jewish Education Committee of New York, 1966). p. 211.

6. UAHC Resolutions Passed by the 46th General Assembly, November 11-16, 1961, Washington, D.C., AJA, Near Print File.

7. NATE News, Vol. VII, 1, February, 1962, p. 34.

8. Samuel Glasner, "The Day School and Reform Jewish Education - A Case for a Reform Jewish Day School," The Jewish Teacher, Vol. 32, 4, April 1964, p. 18.

9. Ibid, p. 17.

10. Sam Rosenkranz, "The Day School and Reform Jewish Education," The Jewish Teacher, Vol. 32, 4, April 1964, p. 19.

11. Ibid, p. 21.

12. Alvin I. Schiff, The Jewish Day School in America, (New York: The Jewish Education Committee of New York, 1966), p. 214.

13. "Two Reform Rabbis Back Day Schools," The New York Times, November 17, 1963, AJA, Schools, All-Day, Nearpoint File - Special Topics.

14. PUAHC (1963), Resolution XXV-A, p. 95, quoted in David S. Cohen, "American Reform Judaism and the Day School, (Master's thesis, Hebrew University, 1974), p. 63.

15. Sylvan D. Schwartzman, "Who Wants Reform All Day Schools", CCARJ, Vol. 12, 1, April 1964, p. 6.

16. Ibid, p. 7.

17. Jay Kaufman, "Day Schools: Not Whether, But How," CCARJ, Vol. 12, 3, October 1964, p. 8.

18. Ibid, p. 5.

19. Ibid, p. 5.

20. Ibid, p. 5.

21. Ibid, pp. 6-7.

22. Alfred Russell, "The All Day School and Reform Judaism", Focus, Spring, 1965, p. 35.

23. Eugene Kohn, "The Zionist Interest in the Jewish Day School", Jewish Education, Vol. 20, 1, pp. 16-22.

24. "Reform Jewry Urged to Establish Network of Six Day Schools", Jewish Exponent, April 24, 1964, AJA, Schools, All-Day, Nearpoint File - Special Topics.

25. Ibid

26. Ibid

27. Jack D. Spiro, "Study and Discussion Kit on Full-time Jewish Education," New York: UAHC, 1968.

28. Stanley F. Chyet, "Tomorrow?" Dimensions, Winter, 1968-69, Vol. III, 2, p. 61.

29. Ibid, pp. 62-63.

30. Jack D. Spiro "Study and Discussion Kit on Full-time Jewish Education," New York: UAHC, 1968.

31. Samuel Glasner, "The Case For/Against a Reform Jewish Day School," Dimensions, Vol. III, 4 (Summer, 1969), pp. 36-38.

32. Elliot D. Rosenstock, "The Case For/Against a Reform Jewish Day School," Dimensions, Vol. III, 4 (Summer, 1969), p. 36.

33. Ibid, p. 36.

34. Ibid, p. 39.

35. CCARY, Vol. LXXIX, 1969, p. 90.

36. Ibid, p. 91.

37. Jack Spiro, "Study and Discussion Kit on Full-time Jewish Education," New York: UAHC, 1968.

38. "Jewish Unit Bars All-Day Schools," The New York Times, October 30, 1969, AJA, Schools, All-Day, Nearpoint File - Special Topics.

39. Ibid

40. Ibid

41. Ibid

42. Ibid

43. "Rabbi Newman Lashes Out Against Vorspan, Eisendrath," The Jewish Post and Opinion, November 28, 1969, AJA, Newman, Louis I., Nearpoint Box.

44. Quoted David S. Cohen, "American Reform Judaism and the Jewish Day School," (Master's thesis, Hebrew University, 1974), p. 66.

45. "Louis I. Newman Noted Rabbi, 78" The New York Times, March 10, 1972, AJA, Newman, Louis I., Nearpoint Box - Biographies.

46. Louis I. Newman, Rodoph Sholom Chronicle, May 26, 1969, AJA, Schools, All-Day, Nearpoint File - Special Topics.

47. Ibid

48. Ibid

49. Ibid

50. "Brown Urges Jewish Leaders to Keep Pupils in City Schools," The New York Times, December 7, 1969, AJA, Schools, All-Day, Nearpoint File - Special Topics.

51. David S. Cohen, "American Reform Judaism and the Jewish Day School," (Master's Thesis, Hebrew University, 1974), p. 79.

52. Ibid, p. 82.

CHAPTER VI:

1. Arthur Goren, New York Jews and the Quest for Community, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1970) p. 98.

2. Michael Zeldin, "Merging General and Jewish Studies in the Reform Jewish Day School," Compass, Vol. 4, 3, (Summer, 1981), p. 3.

3. Ibid, p. 18.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY


I. Primary Sources

A. From the American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati, Ohio

1. Near Print Files

Emanuel Gamoran
Louis I. Newman
Schools, Jewish All-Day
Union of American Hebrew Congregations

2. Minute Book of the Board of Trustees, Talmid Yelodim Institute, Cincinnati, Ohio, Box 1630

B. Manuscripts from the Klau Library, Hebrew Union College Jewish Instiute of Religion

Eisendrath, Maurice, "Report of the President to the Board of Trustees of the UAHC, June 4, 1961, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Gamoran, Emanuel, "Weekly Jewish Instruction," Cincinnati: UAHC, 1928.

Periodicals, Yearbooks, Newspapers:

The American Israelite
American Jewish Yearbook
The Asmonean
Central Conference of American Rabbis Journal
Central Conference of American Rabbis Yearbook
Compass: Directions in Jewish Education
Dimensions
The Jewish Times
NATE News
The National Jewish Post and Opinion
The Occident and Jewish Orient
Reform Judaism
Religious Education (Vol. LVII, 1962, January-February)
The Rodoph Shalom Chronicle (1968-1971)
The Synagogue School
The Union Bulletin (1911-1915)

II. Secondary Sources

A. Books

Berkowitz, Henry, Intimate Glimpses of the Rabbi's Career, Cincinnati: HUC Press, 1921.

Cremin, Lawrence A., The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education, New York: Vintage Books, 1964.

Cubberley, Ellwood P., Public Education in the United States, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1919.

Dewey, John, Democracy and Education, New York: Macmillan Company, 1929.

Dushkin, Alexander M., Jewish Education in New York City, New York: The Bureau of Jewish Education, 1918.

_____, and Engleman, Uriah Zvi, Jewish Education in the United States, Vol. I, New York: Association for Jewish Education, 1959.

Einhorn, David, Predigt, Gehatten am 31 August 1866, New York: Thalmessinger and Company, 1866.

Gamoran, Emanuel, Changing Conceptions in Jewish Education, New York: MacMillan Company, 1924.

Gartner, Lloyd P., ed., Jewish Education in the United States, New York: Columbia University, 1972.

Goren, Arthur, New York Jews and the Quest for Community, New York: Columbia University Press, 1970.

Howe, Irving, World of Our Fathers, New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1976.

Kaestle, Carl F., The Evolution of the Urban School System, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1973.

May, Max, I. M. Wise, New York: The Knickerbocker Press, 1916.

Pilch, Judah, ed., A History of Jewish Education in the United States, New York: American Association for Jewish Education, 1969.

Philipson, David, The Oldest Jewish Congregation in the West, Cincinnati: C.J. Krechbeil and Company, 1894.

Schiff, Alvin Irwin, The Jewish Day School in America, New York: Jewish Education Committee Press, 1966.

Temkin, Sefton, The New World of Reform, Bridgeport: Hartmore House, 1974.

B. Articles

Benderley, Samson, "Jewish Education in America," The Jewish Exponent, January, 1908. Re-printed in Jewish Education, Vol. 2, 3, Summer, 1949, pp. 80-85.

Brickman, William, "Public Aid to Jewish Day Schools," Tradition, Spring 1961, Vol. 3, pp. 151-190.

Chyet, Stanley F., "Tomorrow?", Dimensions, Winter 1968-69, Vol. III, 2, pp. 61-63.

Gamoran, Emanuel, "Liberal Judaism and the Day School," The Jewish Teacher, Vol. XIX, 2, January 1951, pp. 1-6.

_____, "Jewish Education Then and Now," The B'nai B'rith Magazine: The National Jewish Monthly, Vol. 45, 9, June, 1931, pp. 323-324.

_____, "Progress and Prospects in Jewish Education," The Jewish Teacher, Vol. XVIII, 3, March 1950, pp. 1-5.

_____, "Religion Education and the Public School," The Jewish Teacher, Vol. XII, 4, June, 1944, pp. 176-179.

_____, "The Role of Jewish Education in Developing a Creative Jewish Center in America," Jewish Education, XIX, 1, Fall, 1947, pp. 24-30.

Gartner, Lloyd P., "Temple of Liberties Unpolluted: American Jews and Public Schools, 1840-1875, "A Bicentennial Festschrift for Jacob Rader Marcus, New York: KTAV, 1969, pp. 25-31.

Glasner, Samuel, "The Case for a Reform Day School," Dimensions, Vol. III, 4, Summer 1969, pp. 36-38.

_____, "The Day School and Reform Jewish Education - A Case for a Reform Jewish Day School," The Jewish Teacher, Vol. 32, 4, April 1964, pp. 16-19.

Goodman, Saul, "The Future of the American Jewish Secular School," The Reconstructionist, Vol. 30, 8, May 29, 1964, pp. 7-13.

Grinstein, Hyman B., "The Minute Book of Lilienthal's Union of German Synagogues in New York," HUCA, Vol. 18, pp. 321-352.

Grossman, Louis, "Religious Education in Modern Judaism," HUCA, 1904, pp. 110-123.

Kaufmann, Jay, "Day Schools: Not Whether, But How," CCARJ, Vol. 12, 3, October, 1964, pp. 3-9.

Kohn, Eugene, "The Zionist Interest in the Jewish Day School," Jewish Education, Vol. 20, 1, Fall, 1948, pp. 16-22.

Merowitz, Morton J., "Max Lilienthal - Jewish Educator in Nineteenth-Century America," YIVO Annual of Jewish Social Science, Vol. XV, New York: YIVO Institute for Jewish Research, 1974.

Nardi, Noah, "The Growth of Jewish Day Schools in America," Jewish Education, Vol. 20, 1, November, 1948, pp. 22-32.

Oles, Arthur M., "Communications," CCARJ, Vol. XII, 3, October, 1964, p. 61.

Reichert, Victor E., "The Jewish Day School: Its Fallacy and Dangers," The Jewish Teacher, Vol. XIX, 2, January, 1951, pp. 7-9.

Rosenkranz, Sam, "The Day School and Reform Jewish Education," The Jewish Teacher, Vol. 32, 4, April, 1964, pp. 19-21.

Rosenstock, Elliot D., "The Case Against a Reform Jewish Day School," Dimensions, Vol. III, 4, Summer, 1967, pp. 37-39.

Russel, Alfred, "The All-Day School and Reform Judaism," Focus, Spring, 1965, pp. 31-39.

Schreiber, Mordecai, "The Agnon School of Cleveland: the Unlikely Birth of a Day School," CCARJ, Vol. 18, 2, 1970, pp. 66-79.

Schwartz, Bernard, "Religion in Education: A Legal Perspective," Teacher College Record, Vol. 64, 4, January, 1963, pp. 363-366.

Spiro, Jack D., "Jewish Education - Today and Tomorrow," CCARY, Vol. LXXVIII, 1968, pp. 200-211.

Zeldin, Michael, "Merging General and Jewish Studies in the Reform Jewish Day School," Compass, Vol. 3, 4, Summer. 1981, pp. 3, 4, 18.

C. Theses

Brickner, Barnett, "The Jewish Community of Cincinnati: Historical and Descriptive, 1817-1933." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Cincinnati, 1933.

Cohen, David, "American Reform Judaism and the Jewish Day School." Master's thesis, Hebrew University, 1974.

Wallach, Benno, "Dr. David Einhorn's Sinai, 1856-1867." Ph.D. dissertation, Hebrew Union College, 1950.