LIBRARY COPYRIGHT NOTICE

www.huc.edu/libraries

Regulated Warning

See Code of Federal Regulations, Title 37, Volume 1, Section 201.14:

The copyright law of the United States (title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material.

Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specific conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be “used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research.” If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of “fair use,” that user may be liable for copyright infringement.

This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of copyright law.

INSTRUCTIONS FROM AUTHOR TO LIBRARY FOR THESES AND PRIZE ESSAYS

AUTHOR Louis Lander

TITLE Toward a Rogerian Based Reform Jewish Educational Model: A systematic Analysis of Carl Rogers' Philosophy of Education and Its Parallels in the Thought of Martin Buber and Janusz Korczak.

TYPE OF THESIS: Ph.D. [ ] D.H.L. [ ] Rabbinic [✓

Master's [ ] Prize Essay [ ]

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

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

Feb 20/86
Date

Louis Lander.
Signature of Author

Library Record

Microfilmed 11/6/86
Date

Emilie Sachs
Signature of Library Staff Member

TOWARD A ROGERIAN BASED REFORM JEWISH EDUCATIONAL MODEL: A SYSTEMATIC ANALYSIS OF CARL ROGERS' PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION AND ITS PARALLELS IN THE THOUGHT OF MARTIN BUBER AND JANUSZ KORCZAK

LOUIS LANDER

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for Ordination

Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion

1986

Referee, Prof. Samuel Joseph

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DIGEST

The educational philosophy of the renowned psychologist Carl Rogers is dedicated to the freedom, dignity and worth of each individual human being. These concerns, in the broadest sense, are identical to the concerns of what may be known as the humanistic trends within Reform Jewish education.

It is possible to more fully evaluate the Rogerian educational philosophy. Specific attention is paid to its educational worth as well as to its compatibility with the thought of prominent Jewish educators of past generations who are identified with humanistic educational philosophy. These factors help determine the applicability as well as the feasibility of the Rogerian approach to the Reform Jewish community.

In Part One of this thesis I determine the educational philosophies of Carl Rogers and his two Jewish counterparts-Martin Buber and Janusz Korczak. I aim to collect the scattered statements of each of these pedagogues and to assemble them into coherent statements on education. The educational philosophy of Carl Rogers, including a critique by educational scholars, is explored in Chapter One. In Chapter Two I analyze the educational philosophy of Polish educator Janusz Korczak. Chapter Three is a description of the educational philosophy of Martin Buber.

In Chapter Four I propose that there are some crucial points of agreement among the educatonal philosophies of the three personalities; these include a common stress on education as preparation for life and a de-emphasis on learning as an accumulation of facts. These educational philosophies come to a consensus on the importance of growthful teacher/student relationships as well. The chapter concludes with the proposition that if the Reform Jewish community wishes to implement the Rogerian approach, that it can rightly claim for it significant links with Jewish pedagogues.

Part Two includes the notion that, although important in several respects, the totality of the Rogerian approach does not resonate with the values or needs of the majority of Reform constituents. Furthermore, any implementation of a total Rogerian approach would face significant structural and attitudinal barriers from both Reform parents and teachers.

In Chaper Five I demonstrate that the new UAHC-CCAR Joint Commission on Education curriculum will not meet the Rogerian requirements for Reform humanistic education. I suggest that parents and teachers will especially have difficulties implementing Rogers' radical political and social agenda. A comparison with humanistic Confluent Education stresses that the Rogerian approach is much less structured and so would meet even greater opposition than does the Confluent approach.

Chapter Six is a summary which offers my impressions of the strengths and weaknesses of the Rogerian philosophy. It aims to

answer the question "what aspects of the Rogerian philosophy are valuable for contemporary Reform education?" Given these positive aspects, a Rogerian curriculum is proposed.

Finally, Chapter Seven is a Rogerian model curriculum for Bar/Bat Mitzvah training. In this chapter I stress the Rogerian compatibility with the developmental needs of adolescents. The chapter concludes with the thought that a Rogerian emphasis on relationships, communication and teacher facilitation is beneficial to the well rounded development of Reform Jewish adolescents.

To My Parents

Ralph and Marjorie

Whose Love and Warmth

Started Me On the Path to Ordination

AND

To MY Wife

Susan

Whose Support and Determination

Has Guided Me On That Path

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

With gratitude I acknowledge the kind assistance of my teacher Rabbi Samuel K. Joseph. His enthusiasm, resourcefulness and curiosity has inspired my work.

I am indebted to Susan Lander for her careful editing, and for always being there to listen.

RATIONALE

In recent years the Reform movement appears to tailor its educational efforts along humanistic lines. Within Reform circles, whenever a discussion of humanistic education arises, there is usually some mention of the pioneering work of psychologist Carl Rogers. In fact, one Reform educator characterizes Rogers as "the builder of the modern study of humanistic education."(1)

For many Reform Jewish educators and rabbis it is the work of Carl Rogers which is considered the definitive expression of humanistic education. If during their Rabbinical studies Reform rabbis are exposed to any humanistic educator, it is Carl Rogers with whom they are familiarized.

Given the centrality of Rogers' ideas to Reform education, it is surprising that no attempt has been made to systematize and evaluate Rogers' educational thought from a Reform Jewish perspective. Upon investigation it might well turn out that Rogers' work is even more applicable to Reform education than has hitherto been recognized and that an exclusively Rogerian model should inform the Reform religious school of the future. Alternately, it might be found that Rogers' approach really has very little relevance for today's Reform Jewish education.

Part of what makes Rogers' approach legitimate for Reform Jewish education is the degree to which his values and methods correspond to the values and methods prevailing in the Reform

Jewish religious community. Another guage of Rogers affinity with Jewish education is the extent to which his approach is similar to the approach of recognized Jewish humanistic educators of generations past. It is in this regard that the works of theologian Martin Buber and child advocate Janusz Korczak will be discussed.

One further critical consideration is the educational soundness of the Rogerian approach. Key considerations in this regard are whether Rogers' approach is sufficiently realistic and clear as to merit adoption by Reform Jewish schools. To facilitate this discussion a presentation of the comparative educational worth of Rogers vis-a-vis Buber and Korczak will be presented. To further clarify Rogers' approach, a sample curriculum for a Reform Jewish Bar/Bat Mitzvah course will be presented.

CHAPTER ONE

TOWARDS AN UNDERSTANDING OF CARL ROGERS

While Carl Rogers is well known among Americans, there is no doubt that the philosophy of education which he advocates is still little understood. Misconceptions abound as to the nature of the philosophy which he called "student centered" learning. Some persons perceive it to be a weird and outdated innovation of the Sixties that promotes student anarchy and sexual permissiveness. Still others are sure that its advocates are communists determined to foment social and economic revolution.

These misconceptions, while exaggerated, are grounded in a realistic fear. Rogers considers the world to be fraught with economic and racial tensions.(1) His prescription for change consists of radical social and interpersonal changes which will heal the rifts in society. Rogers envisions a new way of education that will pave the way to this new society. It is no doubt that a radical prescription like Rogers will alarm the average American. At the heart of Rogers' critique is the claim that Americans no longer know how to communicate with one another in an honest and tolerant way. Only a quiet revolution in education can stem the tide of separation. Unless a Rogerian mode of education stressing interrelationships is instituted, then the world is destined for bloodshed such as never before experienced.

Individuals feel powerless to deal with the social tensions. In the past they relied on the values associated with religious traditions to give them a sense of direction. Rogers contends that for most these religious values have lost their force.(2) Tragically then most persons are currently adrift, not knowing what values to hold in order to better cope with the difficult times. These same people are so estranged from their own values preferences and so unaccustomed to making decisions for themselves, they are unable to replace the outworn values with newer ones. Confusion is added to despair as they are mercilessly barraged by the conflicting value claims of organizations each vying for their passive loyalties.

Several responses arise in the face of this crisis. Many persons solve social problems by identifying "problem individuals" and manipulating them according to their own vision of propriety. In his most recent book, titled Freedom to Learn in the Eighties, Rogers suggests that the greatest threat to human dignity comes from these self-appointed and self-righteous "repairmen."(3) In this decade these persons clothe themselves in the garb of religious fundamentalists. They intrude into the nation's educational, judicial and communications institutions in order to mold Americans into their vision of propriety. By so intruding they violate the individual's fundamental right to determine his/her own lifestyle.

An equally maladaptive response to the crisis has been to ignore it altogether. Once persons disassociate their

intellectual perceptions from their feelings they can walk around numbed to the rifts which plague society.

According to Rogers, both the public and private schools systems have done nothing to alleviate the crisis of "separation" that exists between different classes, generations and races. Instead, they fuel the crisis by educating their charges according to the maladaptive responses outlined above. They do so primarily by discouraging students from thinking and feeling for themselves about relevant concerns. Nor do they teach them how to interact with each other in a harmonious manner. In short, they leave students passive and cerebral;ill equipped to live in a complex and fragmented world.(4)

The maladaptive responses are not confined to the United States. Rogers colleagues in West Germany posit a direct correlation between "noncritical" learning and the successful rise of the Nazi regime.(5) According to them, German students who had long ago become passive learners simply swallowed whole those prejudices which their teachers had presented to them.(6)

In his most recent book, titled Freedom to Learn in the Eighties, Rogers maintains his condemnation of the traditional school. He asserts that it has become only more passive and impersonal during the last two decades. In his defence he presents research proving that most teachers function below the minimal levels of effectiveness for both empathy and eye contact. These same studies also prove that students are mostly silent in the classroom. Eighty percent of the time it is the

teacher and not the student who is talking in the classroom.(7)

Rogers contends that there is widespread student malcontentment with this maladaptive but yet traditional mode of educating. He paints a picture of endemic boredom and frustration. In the upper grades where dropping out of school is an option, a large majority are so doing. Where this is not possible students act unruly.(8) Rogers suggests that if learning content is made more relevant to student's lives education will proceed much more smoothly. He ventures that today's learning pace could automatically proceed at five to eight times its current rate if it dealt with relevant concerns and paid attention to the personal meanings and feelings evoked by the subject matter.

The situation is only worsened when the educational system removes the locus of evaluation from the student and places it in the hand of the teacher. The student not only loses confidence in his/her own judgements but also suffers under the constant threat of harsh external evaluation. In as much as the final grade is left up to the often unpredictable and biased judgement of the teacher, external evaluation also encourages learned helplessness.

During his forty year career as psychologist and professor, Rogers called for a complete restructuring of the traditional educational system. Only in the last decade has he found this expectation to be too ambitious. The "new" Rogers now tolerates some modification of his learning principles. He now asks

teachers to initiate as much of his orientation as they deem comfortable.(9) Regardless of the new tolerance, Rogers remains consistent and clear to his ideals. He hopes for the day when all learning is experiential, student initiated and attentive to personal meanings. In as much as these dynamics are the stuff of Rogers message, they will be explained later on in this chapter.

The revolutionary core of Rogers' message is that the best of the educational process will develop a person identical to what the best of psychotherapy produces.(10) The self discovering person who emerges from both processes will be known as the "fully functioning" individual. This person is acutely sensitive to his/her own personality and experiences; welcoming the constant change that results from an existential interface between the two.(11)

The "fully functioning" person is the ideal product of any educational effort. Rogers borrows from Kierkegaard in describing this ideal product as "the self that is true to his own being."(12) It is only this "fully functioning" individual who is equipped to live in the fast paced and unpredictable world in which persons of the Eighties find themselves. Rogers more fully describes the transition to "full functioning" as follows:

"The individual explores what is behind the masks he presents to the world, and even behind the masks with which he has been deceiving himself. Deeply and often vividly, he

experiences the various elements of himself which have been hidden within...not a facade of conformity to others, not a cynical denial of all feeling, nor a front of intellectual rationality, but a living, breathing, feeling, fluctuating process...(13) As persons become more self aware they become more self confident and realistic. In turn they become more accepting of others and socialize with them in more satisfying ways."(14)

THE NATURE OF HUMANKIND

Carl Rogers spent the years 1924 and 1925 studying in a Protestant seminary. Since that time he has challenged the Protestant Christian tradition that a person is basically sinful and that only by something approaching a miracle can this sinful nature be corrected.

Years after leaving Union Theological Seminary Rogers debated the Protestant theologian Niebuhr on the nature of humankind.(15) In his oration Niebuhr characterized people as beasts whose central problem was that they love themselves too much and give themselves too much power. Rogers responded most emphatically that people's chief disability is instead that they have insufficient regard for themselves. Contemporary humans suffer so much guilt about their natural needs that they come even to dislike themselves. All that is left for a humankind so beleaguered is to surrender what little power they have left to paternalistic organizations such as the Church. Niebuhr insultingly dismisses Rogers as having little appreciation of

either God or God's grace.(16)

Rogers holds a deep conviction that humankind is very good. At various times he describes humankind as "inherently socialized, forward moving, intelligent, realistic and self-balancing."(17) Rogers had not always maintained such a positive view. He admits how during the early part of his career he was persuaded by arguments to the contrary.(18) The Freudian school had convinced him that a human's basic nature is primarily made up of instincts which would, if permitted expression, result in uncontrollable acts of sexuality and aggression. Only after twenty years of working with individuals did he gradually change his views. In 1961 he writes, "only slowly has it become evident that those untamed feelings are neither the deepest nor strongest."(19)

Since that time Rogers consistently maintains his hard won view that people are essentially "tame". This said, he never denies that people have strong sexual and aggressive drives. Rather, he neutralizes those drives by alleging the existence of an acute internal balancing mechanism.(20) Rogers claims that when a person is heard, accepted and given freedom, that he/she will automatically move to balance his/her own temperment and behavior. The person so balanced will be characterized by an honest, nonabusive, dependable and non-materialistic nature.(21) When an individual has desperately few of his/her psychological needs met his/her internal mechanism will shut itself off. Only at this point does there exist within that person the potential

for "non-balanced" behavior.

When it functions, this balancing mechanism also balances the individual's need for absolute freedom with society's need for limitations on that personal freedom.(22) Rogers explains that persons of all ages can accept reasonable rules of behavior if they are given within the context of relative freedom.

Individuals will invariably rise to master any challenge if only they are given that critical requisite amount of freedom.(23) Given freedom there also emerges what Rogers coins an "exquisite rationality."(24) Rogers is convinced that people are inherently wise and universally equipped with the capability for subtle and complex thought. The more freedom given; the more these natural tendencies will automatically emerge.

Rogers view of humankind is totally positive. Its essence is best captured by Rogers himself when he exclaims that "people are wonderful, as wonderful as I let them be."(25) His conviction is that when engaged in a genuine, empathetic and freeing relationship any person will emerge as a well balanced, respectful, highly intelligent and motivated human being.(26)

Rogers only teaching experience has been in American universities. Based on his experience he concludes that Graduate Studies programs rest on the assumption counter to his, that individuals are insufficiently motivated to pursue learning for themselves. Students of all ages are thought motivated only by external motivators; chief among these being the threat of punishment. For many educators this notion translates itself

into the popular axiom that learning can only be effective when it is made difficult and painful. Rogers recognizes that this notion flies in the face of his belief that persons must be given a secure and affirming environment in order for learning to occur.(27)

Rogers also believes that American schools at all levels disregard his assumption that human beings have a deep and creative intelligence. He claims this as the reason why the traditional school system continues to plod along, pedantically accumulating "brick by brick" of knowledge according to a sequence which holds little surprise or ingenuity.(28) One result of such narrowness is that all divergent thinking is quashed. This is of benefit to many teachers. As Rogers suggests, the less students engage in critical thought the less chance there is that a teacher's competency is ever questioned .

Rogers submits that the modern educational machine is ignoring its students basic need for understanding relationships. What prevents such closeness from occuring is an "evaluation ethos" which states that a teacher cannot properly evaluate a students progress if he/she has any feelings for that student. The fear is that any degree of relationship precludes the existence of the objectivity necessary for external evaluation.(29)

Moreover, Rogers posits that the contemporary system denies the self regulating capabilities of students. As a result,

traditional schools see one of their main functions to be that of instilling a sense of order and discipline in students. In total contradiction, Rogers holds that "when students are in real contact with problems that are relevant to them, that they naturally move toward self discipline."(30) Despite what he admits to be the occassional display of "erratic classroom behavior", Rogers is unwilling to suggest that students are anything but essentially self regulating.

In his most recent book Rogers affirms that most U.S. schools continue to run in contradiction to his own assumptions about the nature of humankind. They instead operate very much according to what Niebuhr's view of mankind necessitates.

THE IDEAL TEACHER

The Rogerian philosophy rests on the notion that significant educational change is primarily emotional change. Such pervasive change is only facilitated through the experience of a certain type of relationship. A "growthful relationship" is one that is both safe and honest enough to nurture self-discovery of the emotional and, as it pertains to the emotional, the intellectual variety.(31) Rogers has such absolute faith in this prescription that he concludes after long and careful consideration that "growth would inevitably occur given the proper relational context."(32) [Note: While Buber did not believe that the most significant emotional change was emotional, he did however believe in the centrality of relationship as the vehicle for educational growth.]

The outstanding teacher is the individual who is expert in forming and maintaining growthful relationships. Rogers stressses that an excellent teacher need not have any formal training. He notes that any strictly cognitive training including the mastery of subject matter is especially irrelevant to effective teaching.

Rogers admitted that he had not always believed in the centrality of relationship.(33) In the earliest years of his therapeutic career he depended on his diagnostic skills in order to help distressed individuals. He gradually observed that people resisted his efforts to "repair" them if they sensed any judgementalness on his part. Further influenced by social worker Otto Rank, Rogers decided that clients would not accept his help unless he first entered into an accepting and mature relationship with them.(34) Rogers also learnt that he was more helpful to clients by entering into a relationship with them than by trying to diagnose and then "repair" their problems.

Soon he became totally disenchanted with the aim of "fixing" others. Noting just how passive the client remained during the entire process, he wondered just how effective his repair job remained once the client left his office for the freedom of his/her own home. Although his attempts had been based on the most modern knowledge and technique, he suspected that because his clients had not participated in their own change that any ensuing change would be both insignificant and and nonenduring. Too often, well intentioned plans for change

had been imposed on the client without his/her clear understanding or commitment. His self appointed busyness had also encouraged a dependency and passivity in clients that aggravated their overall functioning.(35)

Core Conditions

These seminal insights were to develop into a prescription for establishing facilitative, therapeutic and educational relationships. Rogers calls the absolutely essential characteristics of his prescription the "core conditions". He considers these conditions to be the prerequisites as well as the operative conditions of growthful relationships. Developed between I942 and I951, Rogers continues to stand solidly behind them in the Eighties.

a) Realness

The most essential of these "cores" is "realness" or "genuineness."(36) Realnesss is defined as the willingness to exist outside of a prescribed role and to expose ones true beliefs and feelings in a non-imposing manner.

Rogers believes that students will never know what is real in themselves or the world unless their teachers present themselves in an honest and direct way. It follows then, that teachers serve their students best when they share even painful feelings like anger and frustration with them.(37) In so sharing, a teacher allows the opportunity for very real emotions to be expressed within an an emotionally safe environment. Students who learn to identify and deal with their emotions will

be better able to heal a tension racked world.

Rogers calls this openness of self, "transparency." A teacher who is "transparent" must consistently evidence behaviors which correspond with his/her true inner feelings. A teacher who is so "balanced" is said to be "congruent." "Noncongruent" teachers confuse students, totally destroying their own attempts to communicate in an honest and forthright manner.(38)

Rogers guesses that teachers have as much difficulty exposing their warm feelings as they do their bristly ones. He identifies a pervasive fear amongst teachers that if they admit their caring feelings that they will either be rejected or taken advantage of.(39)

A further aspect of "realness" is the necessity of dealing in the present. According to the Rogerian scheme it is forbidden for persons to inquire into anyone's past. This is prohibited so that no one develop preconceived notions about persons based on their past actions.(40) This serves to eradicate stigma and like all aspects of "realness", applies equally to both teachers and students.

The final and most difficult aspect of being real is the readiness to admit mistakes and limitations. Rogers lauds the teacher who has the courage to admit "his fears, his lonliness and the attitudes which do not make him proud."(41)

b)Unconditional acceptance

This core condition voices the teacher's need to maintain a

warm regard for each student.(42) It is defined as a global liking and respect and is based on the teacher's abiding trust that the human is worthwhile .

Many have interpreted this "core" to have left no room for momentary expressions of anger and frustration. Many teachers wonder if according to the prescription they must remain accepting of a student even when he/she is abusive. Rogers answer is an emphatic but little publisized, no. He dictates that this "core" take a second seat to the "core" of realness. According to this priority a teacher is not only permitted, but is actually required to express his/her very real but nonaccepting feelings.(43)

The notion of unconditional acceptance bespeaks a deep trust that humans of all ages will become constructive and well balanced no matter how dysfunctional they appear at any given moment. It is within this context that Rogers principle of "freedom to fail" is best understood. A student must be given the freedom to attempt any endeavor even if it is apparent that the student will not succeed. Rogers takes his principle to the extreme suggesting that even when failure will result in physical trauma or death that a person must be trusted to determine his/her own course of action.(44) Rogers advocates that no one possesses the moral right to interfere in an attempted suicide. He so trusts people's decisions that he leaves even this fatal decision in their hands.

c)Empathy

Acceptance does not mean much until it involves understanding. The ability to empathize begins with the skill of feeling anothers reactions "from the inside out." It extends itself to understanding the emotional loadings of those reactions more clearly than the person who is experiencing them first hand. Empathy involves a great deal more that simply being able to repeat the remarks of another person. At its heart it involves the ability to clearly verbalize that content in a completely nonjudgemental manner.(45) This criterion is based on the Rogerian axiom that persons are incapable of empathizing while at the same time judging.

The singlemost important prerequisite for establishing these "core" conditions is teacher self awareness.(46) Teachers can share their feelings with students only once they themselves are aware of those feelings. Nor can attempts at nonjudgemental empathizing be successful until teachers are acutely aware of their own biases.

Most "helping professionals" are exposed to a brief synopsis of Rogers' three "core conditions" during their professional training. During that overview many are not taught that there exist other conditions which Rogers also considers indispensable to building growthful relationships.

Many of Rogers interpreters ignore his call for dependability and consistency.(47) Rogers emphasizes that no deeper condition of trust can ever exist if a helping professional does not keep appointments, respect

confidentiality, and act in a consistent manner from meeting to meeting.(48) He adds that being trustworthy does not demand rigid consistency. The priority demand for "realness" calls for the presence of some flexibility.(49)

Also largely ignored is Rogers call for "separateness" to be maintained between the professional and the client or student.(50) All parties keep their individuality intact by establishing sufficient emotional distance and no one feels trapped by the emotional or physical needs of the other.(51) A cardinal rule of the Rogerian relationship is that neither teacher nor student get so enmeshed that they lose sight of or even surrender their own needs, feelings or beliefs. Under no circumstances must an individual's capacity to determine his/her own life be interfered with.(52) A teacher may in no way overwhelm the student's autonomous decision making self. A teacher is dangerously non-separate when giving a student advise, persuading a student or when offering an overwhelming personal model.

One final condition is also overlooked. Rogers only alludes to it, so it is left up to the writer to formally label it. The condition of "appropriate participation" is based on Rogers' observation that a relationship is threatened if the professional either participates too much or too little. For example, in the beginning of a learning relationship it is the express responsibility of the teacher to actively initiate a facilitative learning climate. This includes eliciting and

clarifying purposes and needs as well as organizing any necessary resources.(53)

It is appropriate that only as students become more experienced and confident in guiding their own learning that they be called on to more actively participate and eventually guide that process.(54) Even at that point the teacher is prohibited from becoming totally uninvolved in the classroom. The teacher must continue to participate in classroom activities with the same degree of involvement and authority as any student.

Teachers who ignore this shifting continuum of participation do so for varied reasons. According to one such case a teacher almost immediately gave up any leadership role in his classroom. As a result the group floundered and lost all morale. Despite the desperateness of the situation the instructor remained uninvolved. This particular teacher's response was an overcompensatory reaction to the ambivalent feelings he felt toward the Rogerian approach. Unable to openly admit his problems with the Rogerian schema, he instead implemented it with an extremism with which it was never intended.(55)

A final condition for a growthful relationship is that of tolerance. Patience is called for in order to cope with what Rogers calls "the occasionally annoying, defiant and oddball qualities of the creative student."(56) Rogers admits that there is a strong temptaion to set these students "straight" and to

control their behavior. Rogers' comment leads us back full circle to the realization that above all, a successful teacher must be a "fully functioning" individual. Only persons who are open to their own creative possibilities are able to nurture the same in their students. Teachers so inclined will do so no matter what temporary behavioral difficulties arise.

ROGERIAN METHODS

Carl Rogers consistently underplays the methodological aspect of his orientation.(57) He considers methodology essentially superfluous to the educational process. At its heart, education is for Rogers the art of relationship building. The mastery of this art in no way depends on techniques. It is rather a teacher's accumulated life experiences, intuition and growth promoting attitudes which are the indispensable elements. As Millholen confirms, "for Rogers the attitudes were the most important tools."(58)

Techniques are not only nonessential but they are also opposed to the tenor or the Rogerian philosophy. Rogers considers the ideal "student centered" process to be totally spontaneous and fluid. In this regard he considers his to be a philosophy "to which there were no fixed points and goals of which he is only dimly aware."(59) Methods symbolize a commitment to a level of pre-planning which is not tolerated within the Rogerian framework. They channel much needed energy away from empathizing and toward planning and analysis. Rogers accuses any teacher who relies on such artificial and

ineffective means to be practising "methodolatry."

Nor is Rogers convinced that there has yet been developed techniques which can significantly help a person become more "fully functioning." In this spirit he writes, "when you come right down to it, there is very little in the way of technique that has been developed for helping persons achieve independence."(60)

It is apparent from his earliest writings that in the first half of his professional life Rogers was suspicious of, and even disliked conventional learning techniques.(61) Through the I940's and I950's he paid very little attention to them. At that stage of his career he had been satisfied walking into a classrrom and immediately giving students complete freedom to develop a course as they wished. Rogers then sat back until a request was made for his assistance. Most often his interventions were limited to supplying reading lists or facilitating encounter groups. If Rogers ever engaged in more than the minimum of methods, this has gone unrecorded.(62)

By the early sixties Rogers notions were undergoing a gradual change. He was becoming convinced that his near total laissez-faire approach was not facilitating "student-centered" learning.(63) His too premature removal of almost all structure and direction led only to widespread student anxiety.(64) Once he realized that he had to take a more active role in the classroom, he was forced to appropriate more methods. Although maintaining a general disregard for methods, he did succumb to

their practicality.

Before proceeding to a discussion of those methods, the philosophical characteristics of the "student-centered" approach is briefly summarized .

Rogerian learning is:

1)Experiential- The person's emotional and cognitive selves are involved in a learning event.(65)

2)Self initiated- even when the impetus or stimulus (for learning) comes from the outside, the learning is considered self initiated as long as the sense of discovery, of reaching out and of grasping and coprehending, comes from within the student.(66)

3)Pervasive-in that it makes a difference in the behavior, attitudes and perhaps even the personality of the learner.(67)

4)Self evaluated-meaning that the locus of evaluation is built into the whole learning experience.(68)

5)Meaningful- the element of personal meaning is built into the whole learning experience.(69)

6) Process centered - while the content (subject matter) is significant it is secondary to the mastery of the ability to think in a critical and coherent manner.(70)

By 1961 Rogers had outlined several techniques which he was satisfied were in consonance with the characteristics outlined above. He was however, not quite sure whether lectures should be considered among them. Although he felt that lectures were

inherently too passive and nonspontaneous, he was hesitant to do away with them completely. While maintaining them he drastically reduced their status. (71) He recommended that lectures become the least used instructional method.

In a further attempt to ensure their proper use he instituted basic ground rules to which lectures had to comply. The first of these being that an instructor could only lecture at the request of his/her students.(72) As well, he/she was permitted to continue lecturing only as long as he/she detected no boredom in his/her students. Furthermore, teachers could only discuss those topics which they were personally interested in.(73) If a teacher could not relate the subject matter to his/her personal daily life, then it was unacceptable for presentation. In order to be a valuable learning method, the lecture had foremost to retain its relevancy to the reality of current personal and social struggles.

Role plays are considered a totally legitimate method to expose students to real life issues. Rogers claims that students of all ages overwhelmingly prefer simulated role plays over conventional lectures.(74) Field trips and internship experiences in the larger community also come highly recommended for all ages. They are so highly regarded that Rogers informs his graduate students that "the opportunities within the larger community are as important as the opportunities within the university."(75)

Approaching the same problem from another angle, Rogers

suggests that students will get a better exposure to real life issues if subject matter is presented to them in a more wholistic manner. Material traditionally taught as discrete subjects should no longer be taught as independent units. As well, team teaching must ensure that different perspectives are brought to any given material.(76)

Rogers believes that programmed learning materials have a legitimate, although restricted place in exposing students to real life concerns. He lauds these materials for their immediate and positive reinforcement as well as for their stress on learning as an individually paced and coherent process. He cautions that programmed techniques never be used exclusively. He warns that they can easily become a substitute for thinking in larger patterns. As well, they can easily stifle creativity.(77)

The teacher who poses relevant issues and then creates a learning environment which is stimulating and reassuring is said to be enabling students in the "conduct of inquiry."(78) In order to facilitate this process the teacher must provide as broad an array of learning resources as possible. In a very real sense providing resources is considered a primary teaching method. Rogers advocates that teachers spend fully ninety per cent of their preparatory time organizing resources.(79) Typically these include organizing reading lists, audio-visual centers and resource carts.(80)

On the most basic level offering resources consists of

organization and compilation. On a higher level it means understanding the student perspective of the process of accessing resources. This is done with an eye to simplifying both the physical and psychological steps which students must go through to access resources.(81)

The students greatest resource is the person of the teacher. Teacher accessibility thus becomes an important "method" for fostering educational change. To maximize effectiveness the teacher must initiate contact with students at the very beginning of the course of study. At a formal meeting the teacher must clearly express his/her interests, competancies, biases and hours of availability.(82)

Throughout the entire course the teacher must be available several hours weekly to students. According to the Rogerian approach, the artificial distinction between "academic" and "personal" realms breaks down. Any subject of personal relevance is legitimate matter for discussion between student and teacher.

The more self disclosing a teacher, the better resource he/she is. Rogers raises teacher self disclosure to the status of a teaching method.(83) He suggests that meaningful learning will take place only if the teacher discloses personal puzzlements and asks the students help in clarifying and dealing with those issues.

The teacher's search for solutions will encompass new ways of understanding his/her self, of relating to others, and of

accumulating new information. Rogers stresses that his approach is not opposed to cognitive activity so long as all "informational pursuits" are integrated with affective learnings and are in the cause of better interpersonal relationships.(84)

In the Rogerian classroom the responsibility for evaluation remains with the student. This is based on the assumption that external evaluation is inherently irrelevant, potentially abusive and unfair to a student's unique talents and needs. Rogers discards all traditional evaluative methods which depend on external criteria. All examinations and assignments developed by teachers are therefore prohibited. Rogers also eliminates academic degrees in the belief that they are the ultimate symbols of success based on external evaluation.(85) He replaces these methods with self evaluative methods which allow students to discern their own strengths and weaknesses.

Despite his radical call to discard deeply entrenched evaluative methods, there remains some question as to whether Rogers is as consistently opposed to external evaluation as he makes his readers believe. On the one hand, he seems to advocate self evaluation to an extreme degree. In this regard he writes "that a student must embark on a course of study even if everybody else thinks that it is absurd."(86) Yet on the other hand, he demands that students in professional school submit to external evaluation in order to be licensed.(87) For some reason Rogers sees nothing inconsistent in expecting students to convince a licensing board that they are both "competant" and

"professional."(88) It is clear that Rogers is of varying minds on the legitimacy of self evaluation.

Just as students must learn to understand themselves, they must also learn to relate with others. Two different group experiences are recommended as methods to give students familiarity with life in a group. The first of these is an academically defined group called a "Facilitator Learning Group." Therein seven to ten students come together on the basis of a common learning interest. As this experiment in co-operative study unfolds, participants struggle with leadership and decision making issues integral to group life.(89)

In the second type of group, students are drawn together for the express purpose of emotional growth. These intense experiences are called "encounter groups" and can last anywhere from one half to four days. Participants are encouraged to express themselves in a clear, independent and honest manner. As well, emphasis is placed on receiving feedback from others in a nondefensive manner.(90) In short, these groups act as training grounds for the development of the "core conditions" as well as for self directed behavior.

The rationale for these groups is that nobody will dare initiate a proper learning climate within the classroom until they first experiment with it within the safety of the encounter group. Rogers encourages students as well as administrators and parents to participate in these learning labs.

Rogers recognizes that some students are always uncomfortable with the looseness of his approach.(91) It is for these individuals that Rogers offers learning contracts. These contracts are ideal in that with their activity suggestions and evaluation criteria they provide a necessary bridge to the even more unstructured amongst the Rogerian methods.

Rogers is particularly interested in the contractual model of Arthur Combs.(92). The salient feature of this so called "transitional" model is that students are allowed to predetermine the grade which they wish to work toward. This tool is based on the assumption that it is permissible for a student to choose to work for a grade below his/her perceived potential.

In theory at least, Rogers makes provision even for those students who will have nothing to do with his approach. Their need for teacher guidance and external evaluation is to be fully met within their own "Facilitative Learning Groups". Rogers affirms their rights writing, "if students are free, they should be free to learn passively as well as to initiate their own learnings."(93) Despite this gallant statement the writer is left with the nagging doubt that Rogers does not completely tolerate these persons. He seems rather to feel that teacher directed learning groups are like learning contracts;merely "stepping stones" to full participation in the "student centered" approach.

At the same time that Rogers began to tolerate the

incorporation of various methods into his hitherto laissez-faire approach, he also became more accepting of partial and modified applications of that approach in U.S. classrooms. By the 1960's he had only praise for those teachers who "brought the Rogerian spirit into the classroom" but had decided to maintain some methods of traditional education alongside it.(94).

Rogers begins Freedom to Learn with a commendation of an elementary teacher who does just this. This teacher modifies the "pure" Rogerian orientation to accomodate her students need for direction. She begins her Rogerian experimentation with an explanation of the rationale of "student centered" learning. Next she presents learning contracts of the transitional type described above.(95) As well, she remains constantly accessible for advice and clarification.(96)

This same teacher chooses the "programmed learning " method in order to give her students structured freedom.(97) Programmed texts allow students to move at their own pace while providing them with some order as well.

In a further attempt to keep some structure she maintains external evaluation. She modifies it to become the joint responsibility of both teacher and student.(98) As students become more confident in evaluating themselves, obligatory teacher consultations are changed from a daily to a weekly basis. It is unclear as to whether it is the student or the teacher who has the ultimate power to determine a final grade.

In keeping with her need to retain some structure this

elementary teacher elects to retain the state devised curriculum as it pertains to time scheduling and subject catagorization.(99) For example, the children can expect a definite time of the day devoted to math exploration. This teacher also unilaterally decides that the entire class will participate in music and physical education together. Despite her obviously only partial observance of the Rogerian methodology, she is applauded for her efforts by an increasingly tolerant Rogers.

A University French instructor makes her own ideosyncratic adaptations to Rogers paradigm. She elects to conduct the majority of her course time in "student centered" fashion. Yet, in the last two weeks of the year she asks her class to shift over to a traditional learning approach so that they will be best prepared to successfully complete a standardized final exam administered by the state.(100)

According to her own interpretation of Rogers, she institutes two major methodologies. Firstly, she decides to let pairs of students teach the course for a week at a time.(101) During their respective periods each pair is totally responsible for curricular planning and implementation. All evaluation is done on a peer basis. Her second innovation is to make her students personal issues the subject content of the French language skills seminar. In contradiction to a "pure" Rogerian approach this instructor made the unilateral decision that she will guide this seminar and that the subject content will be

personal in nature.(102)

A psychology professor offers one further example of what Rogers considers to be a legitimate modification of his paradigm. Rogers commends this professor's model despite that it diverges from Rogers' paradigm in some drastic ways.(103) For example, this professor elects to retain attendance credits. As well, he makes his preferences known as to what subject material he feels is worthwhile exploring. This professor also maintains external evaluation.(104)

While maintaining external evaluation, this professor is influenced by Rogers to give his students some options in this regard.(105) He gives them a choice as to whether they prefer standardized exams or whether they will want to design, in concert with their instructor, their own more wholistic evaluative tool. He also works to maintain student dignity by communicating to students both orally and in writing that evaluation will be of the work and not of the person. He further makes it clear that he does not believe that external evaluation in any way motivates students to learn but that this responsibility is primarity the students. Finally, he commits himself to honest evaluation even when it is a painful procedure.

In part this professor keeps external examination because the institution which employs him requests that he do so. All such institutional restraints to the implementation of a "pure" Rogerian approach are known as "institutional press." This

professor's opinion is that "institutional press" by itself does not hinder learning. Only when "institutional press" is combined with an authoritarian teaching style is learning inhibited.(106)

This same professor also chooses to rework Rogers typology of the three "core conditions." He prefers to list the following six conditions as indispensable to education.(107) 1)confronting a real problem 2) trust in the human being 3)realness 4) acceptance 5)empathy and 6)providing resources. Despite the obvious emendations and modifications, Rogers lauds this professor as a teacher who has remained committed to a Rogerian philosophy.

It is one thing to say that the "student centered" approach develops competant French speakers and another entirely to claim that it produces competant scientists. In order to prove the adaptability of his approach, Rogers presents a successful application of his approach in the study of neurophysiology.(108) In the case in point, all lectures excluding an introductory one are focused on topics that the students themselves suggest. All evaluation is done by peers and each student has the right to determine his own final grade.(109) As well, the professor encourages his students to lecture to the class as often as they desire. Finally, if the day's appointed lecturer decides that he/she has nothing worthwhile to present, then he/she has an obligation to cancel class for the day.

In an effort to produce a Rogerian learning climate another faculty member has chosen to implement lessons in relaxation techniques.(110) Although the methods used are behavioral, the offering still fits well into the Rogerian mode because it is based on free choice and a wholistic view of learning.

That same faculty member observes that persons who are in good physical condition have more energy with which to establish and maintain "core condition" responses.(111) As a result, he tests the fitness levels of students at intervals throughout the academic year and encourages increased activity as indicated.

It is difficult to know whether Rogers ever conceived of innovative methods such as fitness testing and the like. According to the example of the courses which he himself taught, it is apparent that Rogers disciples have built upon his own rather unimaginative methodologies. Rogers seems to have relied almost exclusively on encounter groups and book lists as methods for educational growth.

Rogers also diverges from his followers in the amount of teacher direction that he gave. For example, he is never quite comfortable giving his own students the ultimate power to determine their final grades. He stands in contrast to the neurophysiology professor in the preceding case who gives his students full and clear authority to determine their own grades.

In conclusion, a fair presentation of Rogers methodology is more complex than first anticipated. His attitude to methods

became more favorable as his career progressed. Still, he always deemphasizes methods if only not to divert attention away from his overall message. By keeping it relatively "mechanics free" he attempts to preserve a mystique around the approach. Indeed, his own teaching even into this decade depends on only a very few methods.

ROGERS AND RESEARCH

Throughout his career Carl Rogers has consistently looked to science to corroberate the intuitive satisfaaction he himself felt toward his educational approach. Just as consistently, he has believed that scientific investigation has totally vindicated that approach. So sure has he become, that he recently wrote "that the evidence has accumulated to the point where it (his orientation) seems irrefutable.(112) At no point does Rogers ever do systematic research of his own. His conclusions are based on the small research base of colleagues. These conclusions are doubly suspect due to his own inconsistent reporting of those same research findings.

The most extensive and best documented experiments implementing the Rogerian approach have been conducted in the U.S. in Los Angeles and Louisville, Kentucky. In the first case, Rogers and his personal staff implemented that approach in a Roman Catholic school system named the Immaculate Heart system.(113) That system had within its jurisdiction several elementary and high schools as well as a college. This experiment was conducted through 1965 and 1966. Its salient

feature included encounter groups for students of high school age and up, as well as for teachers and administrators.(114)

In Louisville, Rogers was an active observer. The project was implemented in that center's inner city elementary and high schools. The salient features of this project included encounter groups, team teaching, open classrooms and parent hiring of teachers.(115) As is apparent, the Louisville project incorporated many more facets of a "student centered" approach than did the Los Angeles project.

Rogers conclusions regarding the effectiveness of the L.A. project have been contradictory over the years. They range from undeterminable to negative through to the positive.

Rogers first evaluation of the project is found in Freedom to Learn. He admits therein that it is too early to clearly ascertain whether his approach did or did not facilitate learning.(116) He regards the bits of evidence in his possession as "straws in the wind."(117) Chief among the criticisms which he does acknowledge is that the Rogerian facilitators were perceived as "pushy." Rogers admits that his staff had imposed their own goals on the encounter groups and had also prematurely striped participants of the ways in which they traditionally saw themselves.(118) Elsewhere Rogers calls these facilitators "zealots" and condemns their efforts to convert persons who did not agree with the Rogerian philosophy."(119)

In a later article on this same project, Rogers' conclusions about the program's effectiveness are both more

definitive and more negative. He cites the above criticism, but adds that the project's biggest fault is that it does not provide followup. In no way are encounter group participants supported in re-entering their work environments which do not operate along Rogerian lines.(120) The other major difficulty being that from its inception the project had engendered extreme opinions both for and against it. The college community had become so polarized that classroom progress was effected. Rogers writes that "the polarization was so severe that the entire community was looking forward with great relief that the year was coming to a close."(121)

In that same article Rogers is left to conclude that while some of the teachers involved feel that the Rogerian experience has improved classroom communication, most feel that it has not.(122) Six months after the encounter groups ended, faculty and administration perceived an emotional distancing between their respective groups caused by the Rogerian experimentation.(123)

In his most recent report, Rogers ignores much of the criticisms that he had earlier reported. Those which he does report he dismisses as an "adolescent like reaction" of a community who has reaped the rewards of the experiment but is now impatient to followup on these successes on their own. Inherent in Rogers claim is a hearty self evaluation of the project. In this same victorious spirit he admits that there had been an initial period of "superficial criticism" of the project

but that this had soon given way to a full acceptance of Rogerian philosophy and method.(124) His earlier article had reported no such acceptance.

Rogers conclusions regarding the Louisville project appear questionable from yet another angle. In this case he is not contradicting himself; he leaves that job for another researcher. Rogers reports that the project failed because of a "tragic set of circumstances having nothing to do with the innovative policies of his approach."(125) He cites the merger of two antithetical systems and personal and cultural animosities as the "extenuating" circumstances which buried the experiment. In other words, he is unwilling to take any responsibility whatsoever for the wholesale failure of the project.

In her dissertation on the same project, Griggs outlines very different reasons for the failure of the project. She places the blame not on "extenuating circumstances" but instead on the theoretical impracticality as well as the clumsy implementation of the Rogerian model.(126)

In addition to the above case studies, Rogers relies on empirical studies to document the success of his system. In Freedom to Learn he cites three studies which indicate the successful application of his approach to the field of education. The first is a pilot study by Bills which is based on a sample of only eight teachers.(127) This study concludes that the teachers who the administration perceives as the most

effective are the same teachers who are perceived by students as being the most real, accepting and empathetic. This study points to a positive correlation between the Rogerian core conditions and teacher "effectiveness." However there is no indication as to whether the correlation is statistically significant.

MacDonald and Zaret studied the interactions of nine teachers with their own students.(128) They found that when teachers were clarifying, stimulating and accepting that student responses tended to be more discovering, experimenting, synthesizing and exploring of implications. In other words, the Rogerian approach fosters higher levels of cognitive activity than does the "traditional" method of education. While encouraging to Rogers, both studies are invalid because they do not follow random sampling and other methods of good research.

Approaching the issue from another angle, Schmuck shows that there is a more diffuse liking pattern between students who have a teacher who is understanding.(129) Instead of there being a few students who are both strongly liked and disliked, affection is more evenly distributed throughout the classroom. These same children also exhibit a more positive attitude toward themselves and the school experience.

In later studies Aspy confirms these same positive attitudes. Students who are exposed to the Rogerian approach show more creativity and independent behavior than those who are not. As well, they are more self disciplined.(130) As encouraging as these findings are, for many the big question

remains. Does the Rogerian approach foster academic progress?

Rogers cites more studies by Aspy to confirm that a higher degree of core conditions in a class results in "significantly higher gains" in student reading ability.(131) Rogers generalizes from these very specific results to conclude that his approach improves academic progress in all fields of study. His conclusion is doubly suspect in that he does not take into consideration that the sample population for this study was exposed to a Rogerian approach only after many years of being taught according to a traditional approach. At best, this study can only conclude that a combination of the two approaches facilitates progress in one of many academic skills.

In his most recent book Rogers cites an experiment with "educationally handicapped" students also designed to prove overall academic performance. Once again Rogers falls prey to sloppy generalizations.(132)

Later on in the same book Rogers cites the work of Horowitz who finds that there is no significant difference in academic achievement between students taught traditionally and students taught by the "student centered"approach.(133) Also cited is Good who concludes that the "mastery of basic skills" is reduced when children are taught in the Rogerian manner.(134)

It is critical to note that Aspy as well as MacDonald and Zaret only concern themselves with the correlation between effective learning and the presence of the three core conditions.(135) None of Aspy's work for example, tests the

relationship between effective learning and the existence of student directed learning. This is despite the fact that this is an integral part of the total Rogerian philosophy.

West German studies must be cited in order to make any further conclusions about Rogers approach. These studies conclude that the presence of both core conditions and student directed activities prove to "significantly facilitate the quality of the pupil's intellectual contributions during lessons."(136) Their conclusion in this regard is rather vague as it does not discriminate between academic progress which is due to the core conditions and that which is due to student self determination.

In summary, it appears that the research which exists to date shows with some certainty that the presence of core conditions facilitates personal growth within the classroom. It is undeterminable at this point whether the Rogerian approach effects academic growth in a positive fashion. Nor can any definite conclusions be made about the relationship between self direction and academic achievement. Finally, it is clear from the case studies that while the Rogerian theory has some favorable results when properly implemented that it is very difficult to so implement.

ROGERIAN CURRICULUM

The central theme of the Rogerian philosophy is that power is given to students and it is never taken away. Translated into curricular terms, this means that students are offered the power

to plan and implement their entire curriculum and that they can never lose that right. If students accept the challenge then the teacher, administrator and parents may only take on a consultative role in curricular concerns. Further, they may do so only at the specific request of the student group.

In the ideal Rogerain classroom the teacher enters the first class of any course without any personal agenda.(137) He/she procedes to elicit from students what issues are of concern to them.(138) At that point the teacher assists the students in setting up a tentative curriculum which focuses only on those topics of interest to students.(139) As the course progresses the teacher takes less and less of a consultative role until the students eventually have total control over what is being presented in class. Just as there is no teacher determined curriculum, so also is there no teacher developed student learning objectives. Rogers is unclear as to whether or not students must develop these for themselves. Given his aversion to pre-planning it is ventured that he does not call for student learning objectives.

If the most important classroom dynamic is student self determination, it follows that whatever students do in the classroom is legitimate as long as it is they who chose to do it. On the surface Rogers reinforces this view. He certainly never lists any criteria other than self determination that also must be met in order for learning to be considered legitimate.

From what has preceded there is no reason to believe that a

Rogerian curriculum must be anything else but free. In truth however, Rogers holds several notions about what constitutes the aims and content of a good curriculum. In advocating these notions Rogers contradicts his own overarching principle of student self determination. Since he hides his definitive views very well, very few people actually detect the contradiction.

According to his first criterion Rogers insists that a legitimate Rogerian curriculum cannot be a purely emotional experience.(140) This is the case even if that is what the participants favor. Rogers insists that a legitimate curriculum should have "a great deal of intellectual content." For him this means thinking and researching rather than the passive conveyance of subject matter. Still, it is clear that to be legitimate the curriculum must pay attention to ideas and concepts.

Nor does it appear, despite Rogers rhetoric to the contrary, that students are free to study whatever subjects they choose. In actuality they are "set free" in order that they "choose" to study the current and highly politicized social issues which Rogers deems important. Rogers makes it clear that if students do not successfully initiate the study of these social issues that it is the teacher's responsibility to "confront" them with those issues.(141)

Rogers identifies at least six current world problems which he is concerned that his students be exposed to. These include the following: 1)pollution 2)excessive drug usage 3) government

participation in national health care 4)social security and the elderly 5)nuclear power and 6)the ethics of the space program.(142) He is also particularly interested in the future of marriage and the nuclear family.(143) Rogers discusses marriage with an eye to debunking many traditional notions. Among his many strong opinions is that "a partner relationship has little to do with marriage as a ceremony or as a legal step."(144) As well, he questions just how safe the typical American family is for the emotional and physical well being of children.(145)

What emerges is a highly particular orientation for the Rogerian curriculum. It is obvious that Rogers is not as laissez-faire about what his students learn as some of his more blanket comments have it? In a little known book by Evans, Rogers is most clear about his avowed intention that the classroom produce a certain type of student. That student will be known as the "emerging person" and will be characterized as follows: 1)indifferent to material comforts 2)communal 3)distrusting of all external authority 4)close to nature 5)committed to situational ethics and 6)agnostic.(146)

Rogers has a very definite idea about the appropriate religiosity of the "emerging person." That person will be aware of his or her "smallness as against the enourmous universe" and will remain on a continued search for purpose in the universe.(147) Rogers hopes that despite "spiritually oriented" efforts this person will never find absolute answers to the

spiritual search. Although dreams and meditations may be used as tools, the searcher will remain forever uncertain about the "ultimate questions." As Rogers describes it, "the person will be forever uncertain as to whether there is a purpose in the universe or only the purpose which (the person) creates."(148)

In this spirit of openness, the "emerging person" must accept no orthodox religious dogmas. He/she must trust only that faith which has been borne out by his/her own experience and intuition. This individual is encouraged to study ancient philosophy and religion but is cautioned to keep at enough of a distance from it so as not to be coerced by its "free floating" religiosity.(149) As well, he/she must maintain a distance from the instituttions of organized religion. Rogers' attitude became most apparent when he responded to a question on the worth of the Church, saying that "I am too religious to be religious."(150) In other words, that his spiritual needs can be met just fine outside of organized religious institutions.

Rogers also looks to the classroom to produce a student who is distrusting of all external authority. In theory at least, the Rogerian classroom is a place of discovery, part of which includes clarifying one's values. It is at school that each of us must strive to distinguish between those values which we feel comfortable with and those with which we do not. Rogers contends that as young children we indiscriminantly adopt the values of others in order to win approval.(151) As a result, adults are left maintaining loyalties to values that run counter to their

healthy existence. As they experience the safety of the core conditions adults are able to become aware of harmful values and discard them.(152)

According to Rogers' rhetoric all values must be free to change according to the situation . As such all values are open to constant re-evaluation. This approach is known as situational ethics. What however is the fate of those values which Rogers contends must be the end products of the educational process? Must these values also be submitted to the same gruelling interrogation that all other values are subject to? And what if after honest and thorough re-evaluation, a person decides that he/she prefers a value which Rogers does not prescribe to? Is the individual free to make a decision that is contrary to that which Rogers sees as the ideal? Rogers never directly speaks to this issue.

In order to be communal, it is important to know how to communicate. Rogers proposes that a significant amount of class time be devoted to the teaching of communication skills. For this he relies exclusively on the encounter group format. At no time does he broaden his horizon to include the formal communication drills which his disciple Carkhuff developed.(153)

It is Rogers' vision that the encounter group serve as the ground where oppressed segments of the population come to terms with their oppressors.(154) In this vein he suggests that wealthy and poor, black and white and children and parents come

together for encounter. Through discussion they will become aware of each other as people having the same needs and feelings. Rogers feels satisfied that these encounter sessions will automatically lead to positive social changes for all.

In summary then, the Rogerian curriculum depends mostly on group discussion and very little on books. While it appears that the curriculum is free, it is in fact not free. It is free only for its own purpose of developing existential, socially aware persons who shun tradition. If students do not naturally develop along these lines then the Rogerian teacher is given a clear mandate to spend class time inculcating them with such concerns.

A ROGERIAN CRITIQUE

Psychologist Carl Rogers broadened his interests beyond psychotherapy with the publication in 1951 of his book Client Centered Therapy. In this work Rogers devoted attention to the educational application of his theory of therapy. Evidence of his growing involvement in education are his articles published in the Harvard Educational Review and in Young Children in the years 1962 and 1966 respectively. During those same years he was invited to address prominent educational gatherings including the Conference on Educational Foundations and the National Conference of the Association for Supervision and Curriculur Development.(1)

During the Sixties educators listened to Rogers because he was one of the few people at that time focusing on the

interpersonal aspect of learning. Since that time his educational notions have come under pointed attack. Today many educationalists consider his views narrow and romantic and therefore irrelevant to education in this decade.(2)

Rogers has a great faith in the innate goodness and intelligence of humankind. Left to their own devices, people are able to learn all they want and value that, and only that, which enhances their quality of life. People are so capable that when the school dictates to them what they should learn or value, it only interferes with their intrinsic abilities to do the same. All that an individual needs from others in order to learn is a free and understanding environment within which to uncover his/her inherent learnings and values.

Self discovery, with the concomitant openness to experience, becomes the primary aim of Rogerian education. The traditional aim, that of learning how to live within a given society, becomes an extremely peripheral if not an illegitimate aim of education. Within Rogers' system the welfare of society, per se, does not matter. As long as the forward moving potential of individuals is left free then the buillding of society will supposedly take care of itself.

As the center of existence the individual is the sole possessor of truth. There is then, no "objective" truth but only truth as the individual perceives it to be. For "objective" truth to exist there would have to be an authoritative source outside of the individual who judges truths to be the truth.

According to Rogers no such external authority exists; whether it be other people, science or God.

Rogers envisions two kinds of knowledge operating simultaneously in each individual. On the one level there is "intuitive knowing", the kind that allows for deep self-discovery. This type of knowledge is always trustworthy. On the other level exists the "conscious" which receives and decipheres socially informed attitudes and information. This type of knowing is not considered trustworthy and more often than not serves as an interference to the deeper "intuitive knowing." The two types of learning are mutually exclusive and do not compliment one another. Rogers submits that all of the learning encouraged by the traditional school system is of conscious type.

The writer considers Rogers romantic view about the goodness of man to be a major deficiency in his approach. As early as 1957 Shirk lambasted Rogers for his naive view of the learner. She writes,"Rogers' emphasis on an innate drive toward knowledge springs from an improper adaptation of the findings of many psychologists."(3)

Frank suggests that Rogers' view of man is "sentimental oversimplification."(4) To test out his own view he studied an American school run according to the Rogerian orientation. He concludes that "left to their own, students simply develop neither the interest in problems relevent to our world nor the skills needed to master them."(5)

Dettering attacks Rogers belief that left to his own devices, an individual naturally unfolds into a wise and good person. He writes, "Rogers is too far into idealism. The concept of self discovery which Rogers stressed employs methods akin to the epistomology of traditional mysticism".(6) Rogers seems to have no concrete evidence upon which to base his fanciful claims about human nature.

As romantic as is Rogers view, so is it vague. He never clearly describes how or why his model of human nature works the way it does. He also never explains how the "natural ability to know" works or how it became superior to conscious knowing.(7) Indeed, as Jamison concludes, "his assertions required a great deal of blind faith in order to be believed."(8)

It is unfortunate that on the basis of no evidence and only piece-meal explanation that Rogers has created a rift between the individual and his/her society. According to his theory an individual can acquire no worthwhile knowledge from the external culture. Shirk finds this dualism a rather "curious piece of fantasy."(9)

Jamison suggests that it is this adversarial separation which has more than anything else "taken Rogers philosophy out of the context of American schooling."(10) By ignoring the current socialization function of Americal schools, Rogers makes himself unrealistic and thus irrelevant. Certainly there always exists a tension between the needs of the individual and those of the society. If this is the real issue, it does no good for

Rogers to solve the tension by simply disregarding one of the parties. By having little appreciation for society's needs he makes both the society and the individual losers. At the same time he alienates a large percentage of America's teachers.

Rogers came to a black and white distinction between the individual and society. Evans identifies a tendency in Rogers to see all things in extremes.(11) He wonders aloud what possesses such an intelligent man to take such extreme views of the human experience.(12)

Rogers also applies his "black and white" approach to the issue of core conditions. According to the manner in which he reasons Rogers sees only two alternatives. Either there is no need for a core condition or there is infinite need for it. Rogers cannot understand the adage that "there can indeed be too much of a good thing."(13) Evans writes that "Rogers would have you believe that the more congruent, the more empathic, the better. It sounds good, but as is the case with most linear thinking, it fails in the extreme and that is exactly where both Rogers and his students have taken it."(14) Rogers believes that all human problems from marriage to international negotiation should yeild to the application of his principles of communication.

Rogers tries to apply his theory of therapy to every sphere of human life. When he appies it to education he does so in a wholesale and indiscriminate manner. The writer considers it inappropriate of him to transpose the exact goals and aims of

psychotherapy to the endeavor of education.(15) For example, it is wrong of him to make the acquisition of information a peripheral classroom concern just because it is so in the therapy room.(16) Rogers will have to come up with a more careful rationale than this for his radical moves. Unfortunately he never offers such a rationale.

What Rogers cannot transpose whole into the educational framework he simply does not bother discussing. That is why his curricular theory and actual curricula are non-existant.(17)

It is also clear that Rogers is contradictory in some of his positions. On the one hand Rogers says that truth is the perception of the individual. On the other hand, he speaks of himself as a scientist in search of "truth as it exists out there." He in fact writes as if there is a "hard reality" in nature which exists apart from human perception.(18)

The ramifications of Rogers inconsistencies are important. The writer suggests that once Rogers admits to the possible existence of "objective" truth he is then free to formulate his own vision for people and consider it to have the authority of "objective" truth.

This is exactly what has occured. His vision of the "fully functioning" person took on for him more status than it would have if he had simply considered it to be his own personal "subjective" truth. The scientist in him encouraged him to talk about objective truth. The therapist in him however, could not in good conscience allow him to set his own views above the

views of others. Hence the strong double message that "I do not have the right to interfere in other peoples lives but I must because I know how best they need be educated." This strong double message pulses through all of Rogers writings.(19)

In his search for extremes Rogers becomes the victim of his own philosophy. Blinded by his own passion he ignores many pertinent issues which are as central to the educational process today as they were during his most active years. Today's teachers can no more look to Rogers for direction on the issues of accountability, planning or competancy than could teachers of the Fifties.

It is true that during the Seventies and Eighties Rogers backtracks somewhat from his extreme views on the individual vis-a-vis society. Still, he has not yet treated the subject with the depth and clarity that it deserves. His views on the nature of humankind continue to lose him much credibility. If he had not first done so himself, his critics would surely suggest that he spend some time teaching in the nations grade schools before he makes any more contributions to the nation's educational theory.

CHAPTER TWO

TOWARDS AN UNDERSTANDING OF JANUSZ KORCZAK

Janusz Korczak was born in Poland. Trained as a physician, he is best known for accompanying the orphan children of the Warsaw ghetto to their deaths at the hands of the Nazis. Korczak belonged to no political party or religious movement. He never joined a synagogue or sat on any committee for Jewish philanthropy. Although in many ways he stood alone in his fight for humanity, he is today remembered by many around the world for his wisdom and heroism. Over five hundred schools and scout troops in Poland carry his name. In 1978 UNESCO declared an international celebration dedicated to the pediatrician known with affection as "Mistor Doctor." The International Korczak Association awards the Korczak Literary prize each year so that the spirit of the man is kept alive.

Janusz Korczak was a compelling caregiver, a respectful Jew and a dynamic educator. For the past thirty years he has been recognized throughout Europe as a champion of the rights of children, both in and out of the classroom. Americans are just now becoming familiar with his message. Hanna-Mortkowicz suggests that his pedogogical contributions are so masterful that his rightful place is amongst Dewey, Montessori and Piaget.(1) Longtime student of Korczak and professor at George Washington University is Ed Kuleweic. He concludes that "Korczak

has much to inspire and motivate education today."(2)

Throughout his forty year career the one love of Korczak's life was the poor and orphaned children of Warsaw. These children were mostly between the ages of seven and fourteen and had been neglected and otherwise abused by their parents.(3)

During the first seven years of his career Korczak treated these "broken" children as a surgeon at an inner city hospital. He gradually came to feel that mending their broken bones was not enough. In his own words, "somehow the doctor had saved many children from the grips of death, but it would be the teacher's assignment to let them live, to win for them the right to be children."(4) Uninterrupted by war and army duty, his frustration led him to turn his thoughts and efforts toward child care. It was during this early period in his career that he wrote his first books devoted to raising children. He soon became famous and was asked to administer two Warsaw orphanages, one for Jewish and one for non-Jewish children. For thirty years, up until the day that he went to the concentration camp, he remained singularly devoted to his orphanages.(5)

Despite his intensive involvement with children, it is clear that Korczak did not consider himself a "teacher" in the professional sense that most use it today.(6) He never considers his primary sphere of influence to be the classroom nor his care of children to end at the close of the school day. In contrast, he considers himself to be an "educator" and even a "parent substitute."(7) Although his experience is more as a "parent

substitute" than as a teacher, he does consider his message to be applicable to classroom teachers. His earliest essay, entitled "Educational Factors", is a clear testament to that fact.

What Korczak cared about most, that which he worked towards his whole life, was that children would no longer be oppressed. In their suffering he likens children to the Negro race, to women and to peasants around the world.(8) They are victims of an adult world wherein an overemphasis on physical strength and monetary independence gives adults all the power and children none.(9)

Korczak believes that regardless of whether orphan or not, all children suffer to the same abhorent degree. Simply because they are small, adults consider children to be "blank slates" and forget that they have inherent abilities to think, to evaluate and to feel all the emotions that adults do.(10) As well, adults negate the past experience of the child. They see a small child and forget that the child responds according to a large and legitimate inventory of thoughts and feelings. Korczak writes "the child has a future but also a past consisting of events, memories and long hours of highly significant solitary reflections."(11)

While some adults consider children to be blank slates, others see them as chaotic.(12) Korczak considers these myths and procedes to debunk them with typical sarcasm: "Researchers have asserted that an adult is guided by motives, a child by

urges; an adult is logical and a child reckless in its illusory imagination; an adult has character, a definite moral make-up, a child is enmeshed in a chaos of instincts and desires. They examine the child not as a different psychological structure but as a weaker and poorer one. Adults of course, are all saintly professors."(13)

Still other parents consider their children to be a burden. These parents feel a constant resentment toward their children for restricting their lifestyle.

Korczak posits that whatever their particular bent, all adults handle their children in the same way. They proceed to mold them into the type of child that they prefer to cope with. They advise, critique, train, suppress and direct. They do so wherever and whenever they feel it necessary.(14) All the while they insist that it is for the good of the child. Yet the children of these parents grow up having no right to their own feelings or choices.

Parents who mold their children also tend to overprotect them. Korczak laments how the child is so often denied any possibility of developing into an active, confident and independent adult.(15) Once children have sensed their powerlessness, it is their nature as young children to comply with the framework provided them.(16) According to Korczak, it is only in the teen years that any rebellion against the oppression surfaces.

The conventional school system perpetuates that

oppression.(17) Korczak maintains that it is in the school where "the vigilance of the home and its abusive nature is doubled."(18) He considers school to be a crime against the human soul and body. He wonders aloud how anyone could expect a vivacious child to sit for up to four hours at a time in an uncomfortable seat. If children resist this passive role then they are blamed for their disinterest.(19) Korczak reports that the interest of children to learn is "lacerated" as early as kindergarten. This is accomplished by unfeeling teachers who do not bother to understand the student's discomfort but only make fun of their apparent inability to learn.(20) This insensitivity causes the student's initial discomfort to turn into anger and fear of the teacher.

At the slightest sign of student anger the teacher disciplines.(21) Maintaining control soon becomes the teacher's main concern. Korczak characterizes the typical school to be the four walls of a prison where there exists "more trickery than helpful hands, more indifference than smiles."(22)

The alternative proposed by Korczak is for teachers to better understand their student's needs and feelings. If teachers will care enough to know their students then the impersonality of the classroom will disappear. Armed with a knowledge of student backgrounds teachers will tailor curriculum to personal needs. In this way they will build success into the learning experience. Korczak laments that "teachers are unfortunately too lazy to undertake this effort."(23) Instead,

they prefer to relate to their students as one giant adversarial monolith. The most unyielding student in this monolith is singled out as "delinquent."(24)

It is with poetic justice that Korczak exercises his perogative to label teachers, "artless". He hates their indifference and their heavyhandedness. Yet he feels as sorry for them as he feels for their students. He writes, "closed in that classroom with the children the schoolmistress not only constrains but is herself constrained; wearying others she is herself wearied."(25)

On the one hand he blames teachers for not choosing a profession to which they are better suited.(26) On the other hand, he recognizes that they simply have not been trained "in the art of talking that puts both students and teachers at ease." Informal conversation allows for trust and warmth and thus is the key to constructive education.(27) Korczak admits that no book can ever teach teachers how to become effective communicators. They must learn by experience how to facilitate good relations.

Korczak does not place the entire burden for good relations upon the teacher's shoulders. Students have an equal responsibility for fostering warm relationships in the classroom. This said, Korczak is clear that it is the teacher's and not the student's responsibility to initiate such relations.

Korczak always remained skeptical that parents and teachers

had the ability to strip themselves of their biases and relate to children in a humane and affectionate manner. For too long parents and teachers have refused to look at their own feelings because they have been so preoccupied with interfering in the lives of children. Before adults can properly relate to children, they must get back in touch with their own selves. Self awareness is the single most important prerequisite to establishing rapport with children. As Korczak writes, "We cannot liberate the child as long as we (adults) remain in chains ourselves."(28)

No one who writes about Korczak discusses his blanket condemnation of adults. Nor do they concern themselves with his reverse prejudice in favor of children. It is partly because of this reverse prejudice that Korczak gives children so much credit. Except for their size he considers children the equals and sometimes even the betters of adults.

Korczak describes how children are more capable at interrelating and are keener observers than are adults.(29). So also are they more willing than adults to make amends when they have done wrong.(30) Furthermore, children are willing to live according to reasonable amounts of rules which are imposed upon them.(31) Finally, unlike adults they consider a challenge to be their greatest joy.(32)

Kurzweil suggests that Korczak's tendency to compare children and adults as the same entity is a result of his psychological training which prescribed to the Russian view of

human development. This view denied the existence of a discernable developmental period called adolescence.(33) In his day Russian psychologists considered adolescence to be a capitalistic invention of convenience and not a true developmental stage. Without adolescence existing as a buffer, Korczak completely blurrs the emotional and cognitive differences between children and adults until that point where he equates the two.

Korczak recognizes that although capable, children need some direction and help in order to fulfill their potential.(34) He develops three educational goals according to which his teaching efforts will be guided. They are 1)to assist students in obtaining a knowledge of self 2)to improve student self esteem and 3)to assist students in mastering harmonious relations.(35) In addition, Korczak gave special attention to two lesser goals which straddle the major goals. They are, 1)to instruct students as to which social compromises are essential in life and which can be avoided at all costs and 2)to demonstrate to students at which point hypocracy stops being a matter of propriety and becomes an offence.(36)

Korczak also has very definite notions about the type of learning climate that facilitates goal attainment. This writer identifies them as Korczak's four "core conditions", each one indispensable to good education. They are 1)physical comfort and stimulation 2)emotional security 3)discipline and purpose and 4)partial student self determination.

1)Physical comfort

On the most basic level a classroom must be built for mobility and be well ventilated. For maximal effectiveness Korczak stipulated that it had to be variously colored and contemporarily furnished.(37) As well, the class should be safe, but not so safe that nothing remains to be explored or experimented with.

Korczak derides teachers for being flippant about their student's symptoms of physical discomfort.(38) He writes, "what a cough is for a physicain, a smile, a tear or a blush should be for an educator. Not a single symptom should be overlooked."(39)

2)Emotional security

Equally important is that a classroom be emotionally safe. The hallmark of such a class is what Korczak calls "subjective empathy." This primarily means that an adult must constantly visualize the difficulties that are inherent for children in learning. Korczak writes of the difficulty of the task, "we fluent reading acrobats, cannot visualize the difficulties a child has to cope with nor the artifices he uses to make things easier for himself."(40) In part, empathy prohibits asking a child to do what an adult would not him/herself do. So for example, Korczak calls for the end of the practise of asking children to confide in front of their classmates.(41) Finally, empathy dictates that a teacher realize that a single word has different meanings and that he/she listen carefully to each

student for variations in meaning.(42)

The expression of affection is also part of a safe environment. Korczak writes the following on the power of a kiss. "A kiss, within sensible limits, is a valuable educational factor, a kiss smoothes pain, alleviates harsh words, awakes repentance and rewards effort."(43) At the same time Korczak cautions that affection must never be given on the condition that a student conform. As well, it should never be used to disguise a selfish attempt to overprotect a child.(44) Nor should affection be distributed unequally.(45) There must be no favorites and no despised in the Korczak inspired classroom.

Honesty is another characteristic of an emotionally safe environment.(46) Adults often attempt to hide the less pleasant aspects of life by lieing to children and covering up their own doubts.(47) Children are able to detect these lies at an early age and feel cheated. Nor do these lies serve them well in the future. When they are actually confronted with the pain in the world they are left confused and directionless. At times adults are, according to "Mistor Doctor", simply too lazy to make the proper explanations to children. They prefer to explain questions away with more lies. Each time that a child is lied to because he is a burden, his self respect plummets.(48)

Korczak uses humour with his students to help make the learning of life's lessons a bit easier. Negerly lauds Korczak's sense of humour and Kulaweic calls him a jocular man.(49)

Finally, a teacher makes a classroom emotionally safe by

not constantly interrupting a student in order to correct his/her mistakes. Korczak suggests that there is enough time at the end of a presentation to inform the student of necessary corrections.(50)

Korczak wants the teaching environment to be a kind one. He writes, "years of work made it increasingly obvious to me that children deserve respect, confidence and kindness, that good is derived from them in a cheerful atmosphere of mild sensations and merry laughter."(51)

3)Discipline and purpose

Part of being kind to students is providing them with rules. Korczak's conviction is that students cannot develop self control until they are first in possession of rules that can direct them towards it. Without imposed rules no child can begin to understand the consequences of his/her actions.

Korczak believes that at the beginning of the education process children temporarily resist understanding the consequences of their behavior and so cannot by themselves regulate it.(52) For this reason the teacher is called on to "use a definite though tempered coersive effort" to impose these necessary but unwelcome rules.(53) Moreover, the make-up of children causes them to be angry at the teacher if not given the security of these imposed regulations.(54) As the students internalize more self control they gain more freedom to live according to rules they themselves create.

The teacher is called on to walk a "fine line" when using

discipline. Korczak cautions teachers that neither too much nor too little discipline is appropriate. He writes, "beware that by kindness you do not understand laxity, ineffeciency and clumsy stupidity. We find among teachers not only crafty brutes and misanthropes but also rejects from every possible kind of work, incapable of sustaining any responsible action."(55)

Korczak's position on discipline is unusual because it is directed without being vindictive. Korczak writes, "A child's behavior was noted and meted out but there was no abuse or insult to the child."(56)

In enforcing rules Korczak never solicited religious guilt by making reference to sin.(57) Most of the children in the Jewish orphanage did not have a particularly strong Jewish identity. It was therefore impractical for him to appeal to students on this basis. As his co-worker affirms, "Korczak exchanged the outworn and discredited morals (of the religious) and substituted in its place that which was relevant."(58)

Korczak only concerns himself with rules governing relations between students. For example, a student will not receive any punishment for dawdling until it adversely effects another student.

Korczak suggests that "children should be admonished wholesale though only on rare occasions."(59) When applied, discipline must take the form of a "friendly chat." He writes the following on what he feels is the faulty rationale behind harsh discipline: "We adults fear, as a rule, that the child

will forget but it is not so, (the child) remembers everything very well-it is we who are rather apt to forget and thus we prefer to settle the matter there and then-in other words, at the wrong time and brutally."(60)

4)Partial self determination

Korczak's hope is that all children will become able to freely decide for themselves without the threat of adult interference.(61) In describing his ideal he poetically likens the human mind to a forest: "the child's mind is a forest in which the tops of trees gently sway, the branches mingle, and the shivering trees touch. Sometimes a tree contacts its neighbour with a delicate touch and through that neighbour receives the vibration of a hundred or a thousand trees-of the whole forest. Whenever anyone of us says "right-wrong, pay attention-do it again, that is like a gust of wind which plays havoc with the child."(62) It is Korczak's intention that such interference continue for as short a period as possible.

Until that time of self liberation adults must be cautious not to overly interfere in the lives of their children and thus overprotect them. To overprotect them is to invariably make them "self centered and stupified."(63) Korczak pleads with adults to let go of the apron strings as early as possible. He asks them to cast aside the typical attitude which says "let (the children) seek, provided they do not stray, let them climb, provided they do not fall, let them clear virgin land, provided that their hands are not bleeding, let them struggle, but be

careful."(64)

Korczak's discussion of the limits of self determination are only figurative. There is no way to know to what extent he actually advocates a free hand. The following description of one of his students antics will shed some light on the matter. Regarding that student he so matter of factly writes, "He lied. Unseen, he took a cherry out of the wedding cake. He lifted a girl's skirt. He threw stones at a frog, laughed at a hunchback, broke a statuette and put the pieces back together so that it should not be found out. He was smoking a cigarrete. Annoyed,he silently swore at his father."(65) Korczak feels that this behavior, at least, is within the bounds of permissibility.

It is clear from Korczak's writing that a teacher must even accept lieing and anger as legitimate childhood experimentation. So understood, the teacher does not feel compelled to punish such behaviors every time they occur. The teacher is called on to "hold out with his rules and influence until the very last moment when the child is beginning to lose all balance. It must be a teacher's hope that "the child will emerge from the struggle triumphant before he must intercede."(66)

Korczak has only a vague vision of what sort of person his teaching efforts must produce. He wants his students to become compassionate, self controlled, fraternal and hard working.(67) He held no expectations beyond these broad parameters. As Negerly confirms "Korczak does not want to mold the child according to this or that pattern or program in the interest of

the state, the church or some particular social class."(68)

None of Korczak's educational philosophy can be considered original. Even before his birth there had taken place in Europe and America pedagogical experiments which moved in the direction he was later to follow. In Wickersdorf and Odenfeld, Germany there had existed "free school communities" which had tried to replace compulsion with agreement and to make students more active and responsible for their own lives.(69)

Korczak's unique contribution was his ability to transform his ideals into methodology. Chief among his innovations being the student parliament, in which students were given responsibility for planning and implementing community rules. This body also provided imput into teacher evaluations.(70) Korczak's only role in the parliament was to give tacit approval to its decisions. By so limiting his own influence he gave credence to his deep felt belief that "the expert is the child and without the participation of the expert we shall never succeed."(71)

The student run newspaper was a similar innovation. Additionally, Korczak provided students with registers wherein they could keep a constant record of their behavior and the consequences of such.(72)

In an effort to expose his students to the wide world outside of the orphanage walls, he made available to them a resource shelf which contained material on travel, literature, social problems and personal hygiene.(73) To compliment this he

frequently invited special guests from the community to talk about the fields in which they had been successful. He also took advantage of the expertise found within the home. For example, he often invited the orphanage maid to discuss hygiene with the students.

Vocational work was used as a major educational tool. Part of every day was spent in on-the-job training in carpentry or electronics. In addition to expertise, the experience was calculated to teach students co-operation as well as to bolster self confidence. The lessons were divided into small "effort units" that made any goal manageable and so ensured success.(74)

It is unclear what formal academic teaching Korczak did in the orphanage and therefore, on what basis his educational theories are legitimate. What is clear is that each of his students did receive a full time academic instruction at a nearby Polish Christian school. Korczak was fully cognizant that he played a supplementary role in the academic instruction of his charges.(75)

Despite his relative detachment from academic achievement, per se, Korczak at one time suggested that academic learning could be facilitated using material that had personal meaning for students. So it was that he experimented, using puzzles and comic books to stimulate and maintain his students interest in reading.(76) In the end he was of two minds about this creative approach. He noticed that his students were more interested in

reading. He also detected that the practise had distracted students from the acquisition of that academic skill.(77)

Korczak feels it imperative that adults make themselves available to students as character models. He writes,"a child has a right to adult models who demonstrate consideration for others, integrity in living, a desire to work out problems and offences, a sense of ethical values and, most especially, compassion and empathy.(78) Kohlberg emphasizes that for Korczak being a model meant more than just preaching about how one must live. Korczak's greatness is that he lived up to his preachments.(79) It is for this reason that Kohlberg places him at the highest stage in his own scale of moral development.(80)

It is curious that although Korczak believes in the educational efficacy of adult modeling, he never calls attention to himself as a model. Kohlberg suggests that for Korczak to have had done so would have made him unvirtuous and thus, by definition, a poor role model. As Kohlberg writes, "to think of ones role as exemplary is to risk hypocracy by an inconsistent display of virtue."(81)

Korczak insists that a proper adult model will teach children that there is a God. He feels that children need to believe in a transcendent figure. He writes, "How doomed to disappointment are parents (do not call this progressive) who, having told their children that there is no God, think that this will help them understand the surrounding world. If there is no God, how will they understand how everything got made, and what

will they think happens when they die."(82)

It is however illegitimate, according to Korczak, to raise children according to any particular set of religious traditions. He equates all organized religions with authority and a rigid obeyance of law and ritual.(83) To inculcate a child with such limitations is in his words, "to sentence (the child) to a life of constraint-a life of caution to the point of passivity."(84) It also meant sentencing them to a life of tunnel vision where children ignore all beauty and truth existing outside of their particular tradition.(85)

Korczak chose not to sentence his students to such a life. He was, therefore lax about maintaining Jewish observance and knowledge in the orphanage.(86) If children had entered the home with some level of observance he respected this and allowed them to maintain it. For example, he excused some children from attending school on the Jewish Sabbath. He did encourage all of his students to pray, although neither the form nor timing of the prayer was dictated by Jewish tradition.(87)

Perhaps Korczak's truest feelings for all religions emerged most honestly when, after being criticized for his religious leanings, he once responded: "Faith is necessary for the lonely and the sad. What will we give the children instead of prayers!?."(88) He clearly would not allow religiosity to divert his energies from making the temporal lives of his students successful. If religion had any merit it was as a tool of catharsis and consolation which he could use for his own

temporal ends.(89)

In conclusion, Korczak is extremely sensitive to the neglect and maltreatment of children. He tries to counter the powerlessness of children by elevating their status to the level of adults. His homiletical writing style allows him to champion this and other equally extreme statements without ever having to give a methodological accounting of his views.

Despite his unsystematic and zealous style, it is clear that Janusz Korczak was a great educator and child advocate. It is therefore appropriate that Kohlberg includes him in the company of such great personalities as Socrates and Martin Luther King.(90)

CHAPTER THREE

TOWARDS AN UNDERSTANDING OF MARTIN BUBER

There is an Indian parable in which people of different faiths are asked to describe the essence of an elephant. In order to do so they must first walk blindfolded into a room containing an elephant and grope at it. Each person touches only a small but very different part of the elephant's anatomy, but is sure that the part which he/she has touched is characteristic of the whole.

Martin Buber is a German born theologian famous for his "I-Thou" theology. Forced by the Holocaust to move from his homeland, he became a leading Zionist figure in his new home, Palestine.(1) Like the elephant, Buber's writings are massive and complex. As such it is very easy for students to grasp one part of the whole and mistakenly think that the piece they touch gives them a complete representation of Buber's thought. Goodblatt reports that Kiner, for example, ignores the key concept of the teacher as the "selective seive."(2) Still others ignore equally central themes, including that of the teacher as role model.

Some resist altogether any attempt to understand Buber in a complete and systematic manner. They prefer to allow the pseudo-mystical thoughts of the man to remain hovering above the universe somewhere in the supra-linguistic spheres. These same

interpreters insist that Buber "had no doctrine but that he was doctrine."(3) Others have similarly concluded that "his thought does not follow logically and that its succession is determined more biologically than theoretically."(4) In other words, Buber's notions are perceived as somehow springing naturally out of the "ground of being" and therefore transcending theoretical formulation.

Goodblatt suggests that Buber himself resists translating his observations, including those about education, into systematic theories.(5) Buber feels that his observations are so situation specific that any attempt at theorizing from them does an injustice to their existentially unique nature.(6) Wenger confirms that Buber resists any systematic analysis of education and for that reason refused a teaching position in the field of pedagogy at the Hebrew University.(7)

Despite the reluctance of some to find a systematic approach to Buber's work, it is clear that Buber's beliefs about education do in fact follow a definite direction which can be captured in a logical exposition. Etscovitz confirms this, adding that only a systematic and thorough interpretation can do justice to the intricasy of Buber's thought.(8)

THE NATURE OF HUMANKIND AND OTHER DEFINITIONS

Buber is as reluctant siding with Niebuhr in considering the human as a beast as he is uncomfortable in supporting Rogers' claim that humans are all good.(9) Instead, Buber provides a third alternative. People are neither radically good

nor evil, but a dynamic mix of the two. From birth to death the individual is a polarity of struggling and opposing forces.(10)

The struggle is further described by Buber to be whether an individual selects himself or God as the center of the universe. Choosing oneself means a life devoted to narcissistic individualism. Choosing God means a life devoted to deeply communicating with, and helping, other people. Buber considers the latter to be the only natural and good choice. A person who moves in the direction of God and true fellowship is said to be "moving in the direction of home."(11) Buber believes God and community to be the most eternal and legitimate of all Jewish values.(12) It is a "sinful shirking of the responsibility to God" to orient the Jewish soul in any other direction.(13)

This personal struggle is considered difficult but not impossible to overcome. Individuals are endowed with a "critical flame" which "tells" them throughout life what is right and what is wrong.(14) However, the "critical flame" is naturally dull and must itself struggle to shine confidently and clearly. According to Buber, bolstering the flame is the central task of education. Only the proper kind of education, broadly religious in scope, can support this flame.

Proper education is also directive. Schaeder suggests that once Buber evaluated the human as a struggler, and thus somewhat weak, he had no choice but to prescribe a tenor of education that was directing, protecting and persuading.(15)

People who select themselves as the center of the universe

must expend tremendous energy ignoring the instructions of their "critical flame" to act otherwise.(16) In order to counteract the "flame" they set up elaborate psychological mechanisms. So, for example, one becomes convinced that all lower class persons are ignorant. This psychological lie is a deliberate attempt at cushioning the instructions of the "critical flame" that one must interact with all people in an intimate and just manner.

Buber believes that by the time children are six years of age that they already begin to use these mechanisms to distance themselves from others.(17) He considers the tendency to be endemic among children and maintains that there is a "sickness in the relationships" of school aged youths.(18) Once established, this "sickness" will normally reside within them to poison their future relationships and destroy the part of them that is intrinsically altruistic.(19) Buber identifies all relationships so poisoned to be of the "I-It" variety. Where the "sickness" is not present, relationships are of the "I-Thou" type. "I-Thou" relationships are characterized by their unselfishness, honesty and spontaneity.

Political, religious and other organizations prevent the "critical flame" from properly working. These organizations exist to advance the material self-interest of their members. Buber considers them totally uninterested in fostering humane and just relationships of the "I-Thou" kind.(20)

The struggle in pursuit of God and true fellowship is also hampered by what Buber calls the "originator" instinct.(21) From

birth the individual is driven by a need to remain on his/her own and to create. If this instinct is left untampered with, people do not feel the desire to relate to anyone other than themselves and their creative talents.(22) This precludes the possibility of cooperative relationships existing in the world. It is the task of education to recognize this instinct and temper it.(23)

When the "critical flame" burns brightly in a person, the "originator" instinct is superceded by the "communion" instinct. The "communion" instinct pushes humankind to interrelate in an intense as well as "validating" manner.(24)

Buber has great faith in the ability of well adjusted people to communicate. In a mystical fashion he describes the process of communication as follows: "What appears here as the humanum, as the great superiority of man before all other living beings known to us, is his capacity of his own accord, hence not like the animals out of the compulsion of needs and wants, but out of the overflow of his existence to come into direct contact with everything that he bodily and spiritually meets-to address it with lips and heart and even with heart alone."(25) In other words, people are able to relate to others not out of self interest but out of an energy flow which simply leads them to validate all people.(26) Humankind reaches its height when people create spontaneous and deep fellowship both in and out of the familial home.(27)

Buber parts company with most philosophers who unlike he,

feel that the individual's central task is to think, reflect and understand.(28) Buber remains staunchly commited to the belief that the individual's greatest task is to relate with God, with nature and especially with other people. People are above all else, created for the sake of communion. Buber writes, "at the opposite pole of being compelled by destiny, nature, or men, there does not stand being free of destiny or nature or man but freedom for communion."(29) Freedom is given in the classroom not for its own sake but only for the cause of improving the student's relationship with God and others.(30)

The person who lives alone can never achieve a fully ethical life. Buber writes "though something of righteousness may be evident in the life of an individual, righteousness itself can only become wholly visible in the structure of the life of a people as they function in the social, political and economic spheres." He concludes that "the righteous state of man can be most fully accomplished in the rounded life of the community."(31) It is clear to Buber that the independent life can only be prized as a footbridge toward the fuller meaning found in a life of community."(32)

Buber believes that most persons never make it off that "footbridge" of narcissistic individualism. Most go through life "playfully" taking care of their own needs. Within Buber's system the action of "playing" has a technical meaning. "Play" is equated with the "undisciplined life force" present in all people. It is defined as the "measureless instincts rushing forth before being restrained."(33) Play has its proper place within the ethical life in that it allows humans to be spontaneous and present centered in their relations to others.(34)

The spontaneity of impulses known as play, has no meaning in its own right. Meaning needs to be purposefully injected into "playfullness." Due to their turbulent nature, people are unable to do this for themselves. The teacher is thus called on to guide students in their search for meaning.(35) Buber understands the current rejection of the Bible as a sign that

students have been unsatisfactorily assisted by teachers in their search for meaning.(36)

Buber recognizes that once speaking about "assisting others to learn", he has entered into the realm of "influence." The amount of influence that one person can legitimately hold over another is of paramount interest to Buber.(37) Before discussing his view of what is that legitimate degree of influence, Buber's assumptions regarding the dynamic of "influencing" must be outlined.

The first two assumptions are meant to protect the student from the undue influence of the teacher. The first assumption states that the unconscious mind is the student's true center of autonomy and that it can only be influenced to an "insignificant" degree by a teacher.(38) Furthermore, a student will invariably rebel against any person who threatens that autonomous center.(39) Buber's second assumption suggests that teachers can get to know their student's inner needs sufficiently well so that whatever little influence they can have is always in the student's best interest.(40)

The third assumption pertains to another angle of the issue. It states that people can only be influenced when they are umcomfortable.(41) People experience psychic pain every time they relate to another in a non-confirming way. Yet the discomfort which the pain naturally causes is prevented from reaching conscious awareness. Only the experience of an "I-Thou" relationship frees this pain and allows it expression. It is

precisely when the discomfort surfaces that the person is open to constructive influence on the part of another.(42) In other words, it is at this moment that education can begin.

Regardless at what age it occurs, Buber identifies this disquietude and subsequent vulnerability as a person's "second youth."(43) He writes, "one is said to become educable only to the degree to which one who has hitherto seemed wholly crystalized has been stirred up and loosened; having again become soft earth."(44) Buber has complete faith that students have an inherent courage which enables them to deal with a recognition of their own psychic pain as well as that of others.(45) He calls on teachers to initiate this disquietude against the backdrop of the "I-Thou" relationship.

When a person is able to accept the influence of another, he/she is said to be "reawakened."(46) Buber identifies several prejudices common to both young and old. It is these biases which cause the battle for "reawakening" to be hard one.(47)

The first of these is the prejudice against change.(48) People are resistant to any new experience or thought which might endanger the choices which they have seized upon in the past.

The second prejudice is against history. According to Buber, young persons in particular like to think that the world began with them. Thus, they reject the importance of history and in turn the significance of tradition.(49)

Lack of faith in the "spiritual" is another prejudice

existing among people of all ages. Buber is particularly distressed by this bias although he understands the circumstances which have led up to it. With regret he points out that the "spiritual" is often used by political powers instead of itself being the standard setter. In other cases, the "spiritual" retires to its own corner and totally abrogates its social responsibility.(50)

Immediately upon the heels of this prejudice follows the prejudice against truth. Much to Buber's chagrin society has adopted the notion that there is no one definitive truth that guides all of mankind. In its stead there exists as many truths as there are people; each truth fashioned according to a person's unique circumstances.(51) Buber admits that there is an element of truth in this stance. He applauds the fact that persons are considered more than merely receptacles for an inherited and fixed truth. He encourages individuals to take part in making truth meaningful to themselves. Yet he firmly believes that there exists only one overarching truth according to which all Jews must live their lives.(52)

One aspect of this absolute truth is the expectation that peoples are responsible one to another.(53) In direct opposition to this expectation exists the contemporary prejudice against communal responsibility. Buber believes that people are mostly interested in self preservation and devote only peripheral attention to the concerns of others.(54) The anonymity provided by political and other collectives allow individuals to more

easily escape their responsibility to others.(55)

Buber is quick to indicate that it is not only in the collectives where the individual is threatened with a loss of self.(56) Due to the prejudice against personal warmth and spontaneity, people are also threatened within their personal relationships.(57) Buber believes that the prejudice is well founded. He suggests that it is a backlash against "the modern forms of the overestimation of the personal sphere of feeling and the sentimentalizing of life."(58) He nonetheless laments that a certain unreservedness between people has been lost. In its stead exists impersonality wherein even kindred spirits take on an attitude of assumed superiority one to the other. Holding back, calculating and criticizing become the new order of the day.(59)

Buber makes other observations about the nature of people that directly impact on his notions about education. Firstly, he claims that the average student wants to learn. He writes "Pupils for the most part want to learn something even if not over much."(60) He also suggests that it is possible for teachers and students to arrive at a tacit agreement allowing the teaching process to proceed.(61) Finally, Buber emphasizes that cognitive understanding is never enough to produce behavioral change.(62) He considers neither "facts, figures nor moral maxims" sufficient to effect pervasive change in students.

THE NATURE OF EDUCATION AND THE TEACHER-EDUCATION AND ITS PSYCHOTHERAPEUTIC PARALLELS

Although Buber has neither formal training nor experience in psychotherapy, he feels confident in comparing the educational to the therapeutic process. Most of his comparisons are highly critical in nature. He criticizes both endeavors, not so much for their inherent worthlessness as for having become "professionalized".

Historically societies did not depend on professionals to heal or educate their citizens.(63) Instead, there existed exceptionally committed persons who took these responsibilities upon themselves. They functioned informally and without pay. Having no interest in status, they depended less on sophisticated methodology and more on personal example in order to help people. Within Jewish society such a person was called a "Tzaddik". The Tzaddiks are no longer part of the Jewish educational scene. They have disappeared because this century is not one of spiritual growth.

Contemporary Jewry must instead settle for being taught and healed by "professional" people. According to Buber, these professionals are neither as devoted nor as adaptable as the Tzaddiks of old. Such professionals are called teachers and therapists respectively.

Buber does not consider it practical for Jewish society to turn back the clock and attempt to reinstitute the

"master-disciple" mode of learning characteristic of the Tzaddiks.(64) He does however, consider it practical to insist that teachers be able to imitate the attitudes and skills of those masters.(65) In order that this high standard be attained, he advocates that candidates for the teaching profession be drawn from among the elite of each university.(66)

Above all, professionalization causes the teaching task to become routinized. The once informal and honest Tzaddiks have given way to teachers who hide their real selves behind the professional role.(67) According to Buber, it is the anonymity and superiority accruing from the professional role which gives teachers the security they need to face a classroom of students.

At first, teachers adopt a professional demeanor in order to protect themselves from the complexity and force of their students reactions to them. Once in control, they maintain the role because of the economics of time which the profession dictates. Buber points out that the teacher simply does not have the time to relate in an existential manner. Moreover, the role lends a certain predictability to the job which the teacher is hesitant to surrender. As Buber writes, "to genuinely meet another would dangerously threaten the regulated nature of (the teacher's) practise."(68)

Buber proposes that in order to meet the student or client face to face, the professional shed as many roles as possible. No longer receiving legitimacy by virtue of "ascribed role" or

even "knowledge base", the professional's only remaining claim to legitimacy is that he/she has struggled and overcome the same struggles the student or client now faces.(69) Commonality of experience becomes the main rock that trust between the two is built upon. As Buber himself concludes, "the essential force in the education process is the person behind the title or degree."(70)

The analytical stance is one more characteristic of the professional. Whenever analysis dominates, the possibility for relationship is precluded. Analysis is by its very nature inward turning and therefore cuts the "analyst" off from experiencing the other person. As well, analysis only concerns itself with that part of the other which is rational and can be placed into a category. Analysis is totally ill-equipped to understand the dreams, hopes and emotions of persons.(71)

Buber underlines his conviction by the following analogy. A person only acquires a knowledge of the sea that is worth knowing when he/she dives into the sea and experiences the fullness thereof with all his/her senses. In the same way a person can only acquire a worthwhile understanding of another person through a stance in which there is no holding back of self.(72)

Buber makes a distinction between knowing by analysis and knowing by intuition. Buber defines intuition as "a clear knowledge which did not capture its meaning or arise through rational conviction but through a feeling and enjoying of the

object itself."(73) Intuition is the attentive spirit which opens itself to the full experiencing of another. It is a primary prerequisite for true relationship.

The most unfortunate result of the analytical stance is that it commonly causes professionals to enter relationships with preconceived aims and conclusions. So armed, they feel no need to come close and experience the student or client. They rather prefer to observe them, all the while fitting their neat observations into preconceived categories.(74) Of these persons Buber writes, "they disturb the experience of relating and stunt its growth."(75)

Analysis deflects much needed energy away from communication. Buber laments that analysis has become the "great sport between people."(76) Buber believes that teachers practice a great deal of analysis. Their tendendency to prefer jargon and labels over simple and direct talk predisposes them to the analytical stance.

For Buber, Socrates epitomized the analytical personality par excellence.(77) Like all analyzers, his conversations with other people were dominated by questions. Buber dislikes questions because they are too easy a form of communication. Those who depend on questions need never reveal any part of their personal self. This is especially the case where teachers ask only the questions to which they know the answers. While this artificiality hinders dialogue, it does ensure that teachers maintain an image of flawlessness.

Professionals suffer from yet another tendency which prevents communication. "Psychologism" is defined as the tendency to see the product of one's own mind as the whole of realiity.(78) A result of this self centeredness is that students take on reality for the teacher only as far as they come to think like their teacher.

Though not complimentary, the similarities between education and therapeutic professionals are clear. In fact, when asked to compare the two professionals Buber came up with only one essential difference between them. He feels that therapists hold "legitimate superiority" over their clients by virtue of the success they usually have with them. In contrast, Buber is more pessimistic about the inherent effectiveness of the professional teacher. He writes, "the therapist in the most favorable cases can heal, while no teacher can teach perfectly. The teacher is a rather tragic person because in most cases learning is fragmentary."(79)

Buber formalizes the relationship between the therapist and the teacher by incorporating both under the rubric of the "exposed intellectual professions."(80) The following excerpt describes the essential characteristics of this group: "The teacher, the Priest, no less the doctor of the body, each comes to feel as far as conscience genuinely infuses his vocation, what it means to be concerned with the needs and anxieties of men, and not merely, like the pursuer of a non-intellectual profession, with the satisfaction of their wants."(81)

It is Buber's hope that the teacher, doctor and therapist consider themselves to be members of a vocation rather than a profession. Websters dictionary defines vocation as a "strong inclination, often divinely summoned, to a particular state or course of action."(82) In common parlance "vocation" is used to connote an extremely strong commitment to a task, even to the extent where there is a blurring of the work and private selves.

Goodblatt believes that Buber's hope for a totally committed teacher is a direct throwback to his veneration of the Tzaddik.(83) Just as the Tzaddik was able to address any and all needs of his constituents , so should today's teacher be willing and able to do the same.

Buber reasons that if only today's teachers will consider their work to be a "vocation" then they too will be successful in dealing with the development of the whole student. This the case, there will be no need for specialist teachers. The same teacher will deal with a wide variety of spiritual, intellectual and physical concerns as they arise during the course of spontaneous interaction. There will be no sending a student to an "expert" for answers. Teachers who take their vocation seriously will be ready and able to handle all concerns.(84)

Buber feels that teaching is as serious a job as it is complex. His rationale being that in contrast to the "non-intellectual professions", teachers deal with people's needs rather than their wants. Since they deal with the

essential rather than the non-essential, teachers cannot afford to wait for their constituents to take the lead. It is only those who deal in the "non-essential" realm of wants who can afford to wait to be directed by those who contract their services. In sharp contrast, teachers must take the lead so that students are given what they need to survive.

It is because Buber takes the role of the teacher so seriously that he contradicts his own educational principles. On the one hand, he decrees that students must be free to determine their own values and meanings.(85) On the other hand, he gives teachers much more influence in the classroom than he gives students. He even gives teachers permission to predetermine the subject matter that their students wil be exposed to. It is in this capacity that Buber identifies the teacher as the "selective seive."(86) As "selective seives" teachers are even to persuade their students to the Buberian point of view on the material. Given this strong teacher mandate, students have little room within which to make the kind of autonomous decisons which Buber pays great lip service to.

Goodblatt confirms the immense contradiction in Buber's position.(87) He reports that other commentators choose to ignore the "directive" kernel of Buber's scheme. For example, Schaeder's interpretation of Buber is that he advocates a purely laissez-faire style. Accordingly the teacher acts only as a mirror to help clarify the student's emerging thoughts and values.(88) Wenger also understands Buber to be against imposing

beliefs upon students.(89) Moreover, Kohanski denies that Buber ever permits a teacher to compel a student toward his own belief.(90) It is clear to Goodblatt that in reality Buber is willing to sanction forceful teacher influence so that as many Jewish students as possible are persuaded to choose the values which he considers important.(91)

It is also clear from Buber's writings that he tries very hard to rationalize his directive stance. He does so by distinguishing between different degrees of influence which he considers variously legitimate. The subtle, benevolent and humble kind of influence which he advocates he calls "penetration."(92) The use of "penetration" is not only permissible but is considered necessary in the classroom.(93) Only influence which is motivated by power and implemented clumsily is considered non-permissible.

Buber never had an emotional investment in the therapeutic process and did not have enough experience in therapy to have formed preconceptions about how it should proceed. It is because of his emotional distance from the therapeutic process that he is able to refrain from making the same contradiction in that field that he makes regarding the educational process.

Despite the discrepancy, Buber's contribution to the worlds of therapy and education remains singular. He calls for a type of communication that goes beyond questions, and explains how difficult true listening is when professional obligations channel energy away from the difficult task.(94)

In addition, he emphasizes that the ability to communicate in no way depends on a person's educational status or intellectual ability. The life of dialogue, he writes, "is no priviledge of intellectual ability...it does not begin in the upper story of humanity. It begins no higher than where humanity begins. There are no gifted and ungifted here, only those who give of themselves."(95)

Buber considers a person's most important decision to be whether or not they will live a life of dialogue. In so doing he elevates communication to the status of a religious sacrament. If people relate to each other in an "I-Thou" manner, they are in turn validating God's existence.(96) They do so whether or not they are aware of God's existence.

Dialogue does not always need words. Buber suggests that people convey themselves most deeply through glances.(96) Moreover, dialogue is not restricted to any particular location or time.(97) Buber does however feel that dialogue is more prevalent among the working class than among any other. He adds that when dialogue arises among the working class that the wealthier classes have difficulty tolerating it.(98)

A SECOND LOOK AT THE NATURE OF EDUCATION AND THE TEACHER-HASSIDIC PARALLELS

Throughout his life Buber displayed a reverse prejudice for the working class. He reserved his dearest affections for the particular community within the working class that was the Hassidic community of the Shtetl. He finds much of what is good

and true to exist within their ranks.

Buber has a great deal of respect for the Hassids of the Shtetl and considers their teaching of brotherhood and equality a vital one for contemporary man.(99) He writes, "I consider the truth of Hassidism vitally important for Jews, Christians and other men. At this hour it is more important than ever before, for we are in danger of forgetting our purpose on earth and I know of no other teaching that reminds us of this so forcefully."(100) Buber knows of no other Jewish group that preaches his "dialogic" ideal of brotherhood and justice as clearly as do the Hassids.(101)

The real force of the Hassidic community is that it not only teaches "dialogue" but lives it in its daily life.(102) Each Hassid is the ideal teacher because he/she teaches the "dialogic" ideal by way of personal example.

The greatest of all the Hassidic teachers are called Tzaddik. These men live their lives in total congruence with their religious principles. Buber writes,"The wise man shall aspire that he himself be a perfected teaching and all his deeds bodies of instruction."(103) Moreover, the Tzaddik possesses the charisma necessary to summon students to his example.(104) Buber constantly refers to a magnetism which goes beyond the words which they speak. He explains that "there is no need to understand the (Tzaddik's) words,for the arrangement of the sounds give the followers all they need,more than any content would."(105) Elsewhere Buber describes an "oscillating presence"

which flows out of the Tzaddik.(106)

The Tzaddik must be even more than a consistent and charismatic model. He is also expected to possess a working knowledge of all the individuals in his community.(107) He needs to know their psychological make-up so well that he can know in advance exactly how his teachings will be perceived by each of them.(108) This acute sensitivity is his way of ensuring that his message is clearly understood and that it addresses the real needs of people.

Buber has great expectations for the Tzaddik. The Tzaddik has also to be a keen evaluator of the emotional strength of each parishioner. If the Tzaddik assesses that an individual is incapable of determining his/her own direction in life, then the Tzaddik must willingly take over for that person.(109) Paying no attention to formality or convention he will use whatever means at his disposal to "take hold of the dispersed person in front of him."(110) He is to carry this Jew on his shoulders until that Jew can walk on his/her own.(111) This is the meaning of the Hassidic maxim that "the Tzaddik must be capable of all because he must do all."

Before so intervening, the Tzaddik first tries to help the weaker people to help themselves. He does so by encouraging them to find their own solutions to their own problems. As a master clarifier the Tzaddik listens to the petitioner and rephrases the person's words so that their own truths may become clear to them.(112) In this way the Tzaddik helps people hook into their

own power.

The Tzaddik is also flexible. If he judges that a person has his/her own answers he will help him/her clarify these and immediately "bow out" of that person's life. The true Tzaddik is, as Buber pictures him, committed to the highest possible degree of parishioner self determination. The true Tzaddik also understands that there are responsible limits to self determination. If, for example, a person chooses to endanger his/her own life then the Tzaddik feels morally responsible to intervene.(113) He will not allow personal harm or severe failure, even at the expense of circumventing another persons right to self determine their own destiny.

Parishioners allow the Tzaddik to enter their lives because they feel that he is one of them. As Buber is fond of emphasizing, the Tzaddik is never above experiencing the same joys alongside his fellow Hassids.(114) He is also careful never to alienate people with too abstract speech. The Tzaddik who does not speak clearly is blamed for intimidating his students. Such is the force of the Hassidic proverb that "the disciple does not draw forth from the fountain when the master is called heavy tongued."(115)

Buber accuses the scholars, otherwise known as lamdanim, of violating this and other crucial pedegogic principles. In fact, Buber has nothing complementary to say about scholars who he understands spend most of their time in isolation analyzing texts.

Buber derides the lamdanim for not translating their factual knowledge of Torah into a life which models the principles of Torah.(116) It is with empassioned eloquence that Buber calls for their downfall. He writes, "the aim is a revolution-toward a new rank in which it is not the man who knows the Torah, but the man who lives it, who realizes it in the simple unity of life that stands in the highest place and the simple unity is, in fact more often found in the am ha'aretz than in the lamdan."(117) No longer will value be placed on the sharp witted teacher who does nothing to model Torah for his students.(118)

Buber chides scholars for displaying neither the energy nor the charisma sufficient to inspire parishioners into a belief of Judaism.(119) So also do they lack the commitment to guide the weaker amongst the Jews.(120) Moreover, scholars possess little awareness of the most basic physical and emotional needs of their students. This is because scholars are not yet aware of the full variety of their own emotional and physical states.(121) Unwilling to admit to the struggle between good and evil which rages within them they withdraw themselves from the real world in order to prevent this realization from occuring. Their aloofness will remain intact until such time that they become aware of this struggle and fight to overcome it.

Buber considers the making of a difficlt moral choice to be the ultimate religious experience. Since scholars are sheltered from life's storms they miss the opportunity to have such an

experience. So lacking, they can never be legitimate teachers within the Jewish community.(122)

At the same time that Buber disqualifies the scholar from teaching, he also admits that it is the rare Tzaddik who has ever reached the ideal expected of him.(123) He admits that only the greatest Tzaddiks have ever been able to empower petitioners with their own answers and then set them free without interference to live their lives.(124) Instead, most Tzaddiks infuse their own beliefs into their parishioners to an inappropriate degree.

Buber is also sufficiently realistic to realize that it was the rare Tzaddik who lived according to the principles of Torah with such consistency so as to be able to teach by his example alone. He writes, "the wise man himself is a perfected teaching and his deeds bodies of instructin, or where this is not granted him then he is permitted to give a transmission and exposition of the teaching."(125) In other words, if the Tzaddik is unable to teach Torah values by his personal example then he is allowed to convey their essence through a conceptual presentation. By so stipulating, Buber leaves the door open for a more "frontal" approach to teaching.

Clearly then, Buber is willing to allow for insufficient modeling or inappropriate intervention. The only thing which Buber cannot tolerate is the lack of a caring and loving attitude. According to Buber, it is the responsibility of the Tzaddik to compensate for the suffering in the world "by loving

his parishioners excessively."(126)

At one point Hassidism rescued Jewish life from the corruption of the facile and the familiar.(127) It reaffirmed that life is a mystery and that it is in that mystery that God could be found. It did not instruct about the mystery nor did it describe it. In its highest moments of education it modeled for Jews how to reach the mystery. Where this was not feasible it simply led them to it.

The Hassidism of the Shtetl also stressed that at every moment each person waited to be hallowed, not by thoughts or methodologies but by deeds.(128) This shifted the emphasis away from esoteric prescriptions and towards feelings. All persons, regardless of social status or formal education, could feel connected to God by relating with their fellow man in a just manner. According to Hassidism, this was the religious truth for all Jews.

Hassidism eventually succumed to its own acute awareness of the mystery of existence. According to Buber, this awareness became so taxing that it coerced Hassidism to flee into the safety of the traditional law.(129) As time went by, the Hassids lost their pure vitality and simplicity and became corrupt.

Just as the world no longer has "true" Hassidism it also has no "true" Tzaddiks. Despite their absence, their example lives on to illuminate the role of the present day teacher. Buber expects the same from professional teachers that he expected from the Tzaddiks. Goodblatt suggests that in so doing

Buber "places Herculian demands on the professional teacher."(130)

THE NATURE OF EDUCATION AND THE TEACHER-A DISCUSSION CONCLUDED

Buber considers trustworthiness to be the essential characteristic of an effective teacher. Teachers become worthy of their students trust when they relate to them in an honest, direct and humble manner.

Part of that honesty is a recognition on the part of the teacher that as similar as are their experiences, that there exists an essential difference between student and teacher. This being that the teacher has undergone life's struggles and won, whereas the student is still struggling.(131) Having already gone through the experience, it is the teacher and not the student who has become convinced that it is the eternal values of God and community which offer the best chance of success with those struggles. Knowing this, the teacher becomes willing to take an active part in "stamping" these same values into the characters of the students.(132)

In this sense the teacher is the "representative from God". Nothing must get in the way of that role. Friendship between student and teacher cannot be allowed to interfere with the task at hand.(133) Buber goes to great lengths proving that friendship between teacher and student is not only undesirable but that it is also impossible to establish.

Buber's first argument is that there does not exist the

equality between teacher and student necessary for friendship to develop. As Buber sees it, the teacher is able to feel what the student is experiencing but the student is too busy learning to empathize with, or understand the teacher. Even if the student is able to manage the effort, the wide gap in their life experiences prevents friendship from ever emerging.(134) Buber also suggests that because the teacher does not choose who will be in his/her class that the spontaneity necessary for true friendship is always missing.(135) Buber formalized this "one way" knowing by coining the term "inclusion".(136) This term deriving from the fact that the teacher can always "include" the student in his/her sphere of understanding but that the student can never do the reverse.

Buber summed up his feelings on friendship with the following quote in which he equates friendship with the Greek term "eros." He writes, "when eros overtakes the teacher one of two things occur. Either the teacher takes on himself the tragedy of the person and offers up an unblemished daily sacrifice, or the fire of eros enters his work and consumes it."(137) Buber is so afraid of friendship's ability to destroy objectivity that he writes, "beside it, all quackery appears peripheral."(138) Goodblatt adds that Buber's stance on friendship is a polemic against the "progressive" movement of his day. It is this movement which demanded that a significant amount of eros be injected into teaching in order that warmth return to the classroom.(139)

Teachers are able to compensate for their inability to form friendships with students. They so compensate by being able to understand every little aspect of their students characters. In this way, for example, they are sensitive to the fact that words have different meanings depending on which of their students voice them.(140) This the case, they stop discussions at regular intervals and ask students to clarify their meanings to one another.

Being an effective Buberian teacher is not a function of mental agility or even creativity. Buber goes so far as to call creativity an "overbilled talent." In no uncertain terms he writes, "I attack the domiant delusion of our time that creativity is the main criterion for human worth."(141) Buber feels that creativity is often used by teachers as a means of escaping the need for personal involvement.

Buber also notes the potential for creativity to be abused. He accuses some teachers of using creative techniques in order to elicit certain responses from students. Creative gimmicks disarm the student's finely balanced decision making ability by encouraging a surrender to the non-critical feelings which emerge with creativity.(142) Creativity moves the student along so quickly that he/she is not allowed the time to bring all his/her senses to bear on a careful and private digestion of his/her own experience.

In sharp contrast, the ideal teacher will take every opportunity to have his/her students confront reality in an

honest a way as possible.(143) In so doing the teacher must overcome the student's fear of what Buber called "concentration." This innate fear causes the student to divert his/her attention away from painful life events. Nonetheless, it is the teacher's responsibility to make sure that each student is exposed to the suffering and alienation existing in the world.(144) It is only this painful awareness which causes students to lose their "Pollyanna" vision of the world.

In order for teachers to do a proper job they must also be religious believers.(145) Buber expects all teachers to be permeated with the spiritual awareness that they stand in the presence of a Creator God.(146) If all teachers are themselves religious, then in a sense all education becomes religious education.(147) At that point the distinction between "secular" and "religious" education breaks down. As Buber understands it, if all teachers are "religious" then there is no need for "religion teachers" or even for "religious schools."(148)

By downplaying the need for religious institutions Buber's position plays directly into his own personal dislike for organized religious life. Although his bias mellows somewhat after World War II, there is no question that it remains fairly strong throughout his entire life.(149)

It is assumed that the ideal teacher will adopt Buber's attitude that organized religion is merely a polite attempt to pay lip service to God.(150) He/she will also be convinced that organized religion makes too few religious and social demands on

its followers.(151) Throughout his life, Buber stubbornly insisted that organized religion had reduced a vital religious message into bland moral maxims and intellectual platitudes.(152) It is the duty of the ideal Buberian teacher to persuade his/her students of this same attitude.

Buber's ideal teacher is also expected to acknowledge guilt as a fundamental and necessary life occurance.(153) Buber believes guilt to be the legitimate result of an individual failing to live up to valid expectations.(154) Guilt that is ignored often transforms itself into a neurosis.(155) Alternately, guilt so ignored loses its power to promote constructive personal change.(156) Buber particularly blames teachers employed by organized religious institutions for mishandling guilt.(157) They do so by allowing their students to too easily rationalize their guilt.(158) Nor do they possess the kind of intimate relationship with their students that allow these negative feelings to surface in the first place.(159)

We return full circle to the overarching necessity for trust. The ideal teacher must have his/her students trust so that they can be taken on the intense course of questioning that will lead them to God and to the Jewish people.

THE DIRECTION OF BUBERIAN EDUCATION

Buber believes that the future of humankind is in jeopardy. He laments that if humankind does not solve the crisis which it has created then it will destroy itself. Humankind has developed its moral character at a much slower pace than its technology,

and so can no longer master the social and economic systems which it has created.(160) Buber calls this monster gone out of control the "golem" of modernity.(161)

Buber claims that people must take on a certain type of religious faith in order to avert the crisis. He prescribes a mix of religious faith and humanism which he calls a "believing humanism."(162) In fitting fashion this was to be the name of the last volume which he wrote before his death. Many interpreters feel that it would have been more to the point for Buber to have named his philosophy a "believing existentialism."(163) Whatever the case may be, it is clear that a "believing humanism" became the crowning glory of Buber's thought. It was his greatest hope that all students would be educated toward a belief in this philosophy.(164)

Buber never defines his new philosophy. Its message seems to be that people meet God as they imitate God's righteous ways in their relations with others.(165) The experience of an "I-Thou" relationship thus becomes the highest religious state. No longer is the performance of mitzvot or ritual the highest form of Jewish religiosity.(166)

The "old Judaism" not yet vitalized by a humanism, continues to look to ritual observance for its reason d'etre. Its attempt is futile because the mitzvot no longer inspire as they once did. So also have the mitzvot become mechanized; habits which are totally separated from the circumstances and psyche of the modern person.(167) "Old Judaism" is thus left

mourning the corrosion of what once was the only genuine form of Jewish religious life.

"Believing humanism" offers an exciting alternative. Its reason d'etre is to give Jews freedom of choice in selecting those beliefs, rituals and mitzvot which will help them toward the "dialogic ideal."(168) In a "believing humanism" the highest command is to replace what once was a communal and historical responsibility to Judaism with one that is individual and present felt. So it is, that believing Jewish humanists feel an acute responsibility to choose their own Jewish way in every new situation in which they find themselves. In making these choices they seriously consult Jewish tradition, yet the final decision is totally their responsibility.(169)

Buber's emphasis on freedom of choice is purely rhetorical. It is totally incongruent that he advocates this freedom of religion while at the same time handing down such definite prescriptions about what Jews should believe. His pleas for religious autonomy pale when placed beside his call for teachers to persuade students into believing his brand of Judaism.(170)

"Believing humanism" leaves little room for individual variation. Without exception Jews are expected to be longsuffering, merciful and lovingkind according to the example of the God of the Hebrew Bible.(171) Buber attempts to disguise the directive nature of his interpretation by muddying the waters with philosophical questions. For example, he asks how it is possible that mortals imitate a God who after all, is

incomprehensible and unformed? Overcoming his momentary hesitations, Buber proceeds to dictate to modern Jewry exactly how they must conduct themselves.(172)

Buber is never really interested in the academic development of students. His sole interest remains molding the characters of Jewish persons according to his own philosophy. This is the true sense of his comment "that education worthy of the name is essentially education of character."(173)

Buber makes a distinction between the education of a person's character as opposed to his/her personality.(174) Weingreen writes that Buber equates personality with temperment and emotions, while he associates character with attitudes and values.(175) The mandate of the Buberian teacher is to change student attitudes and go no further. The teacher is neither permitted nor able to effect a change in the personality of the student. It is for this reason that Buber nowhere discusses how emotions can be harnessed in the service of educational change. Neither does he discuss the affective aspect of persuading students to believe in his philosophy of life.

Buberian teachers depend on the cognitive realm in order to move their students toward the vision which they have for them. That vision is more sophisticated than the mere hope that students "walk in God's ways." Teachers are expected to instruct their students how to establish a peaceful and equitable co-existence on the globe. This co-existence is called the "Kingdom of God on earth."(176) The student who emerges from the

Buberian class will have acquired the social and political attitudes necessary to maintain such a "Kingdom."

The student so taught will first acquire an appreciation for peaceful and intimate human contact. He/she will study how cities can be better planned for an ambiance conducive to dialogue.(177) At the same time the student is sensitized to the need of every nuclear family to own their own home.(178)

In political terms the development of a more equal and just society necessitates the dissolution of political camps.(179) According to Buber, loyalties to the ideologies of the "left" and "right" have for too long blinded people from recognizing that there is a commonality of concerns which all persons hold. As long as citizens of the world stand defensively on guard over their own ideologies, true dialogue will never occur. Buber felt that large segments of the Jewish population of his day showed no interest in the true concerns of other peoples. He considered it unfortunate that their apathy was protected behind the anonymous and impersonal ideologies to which they prescribed. The student who emerges from the Buberian classroom must possess a disdain for ideological loyalties of this sort.

Buber does not consider himself to be hypocritical when on one hand he demands an apolitical stance and on the other calls for the establishment of world socialism.(180) The socialism which he envisions is "true socialism" and as such operates above the political sphere. "True socialism" holds the only true hope for humanity. Only a socialist society will guarentee

fraternal and just relations between people. Buber believes that in sharp contrast to capitalism, socialism welcomes opportunities for honest and significant decision making on the part of all citizens.(181) Moreover, he considers it to be the only system willing to discuss the genuine health and welfare needs of the laboring class.(182)

Buber considers the Israeli Kibbutz to be the only institutionalized experiment in socialism which has ever succeeded.(183) It succeeded where others failed because its members made decisions based on the real needs of the moment. Members had also been willing to help each other, because there existed none of the animosity that economic inequality breeds.(184) Buber writes the following on the animosity so rampant in the capitalist world: "when social inequality splits the community and creates chasms between its members, then there can be no true people."(185) There will never be peaceful co-existence in the world until such time as a socialist society is put into place and wealth is more equally distributed.

Buber recognizes that socialism is not indestructable. While living in Israel he personally witnessed the disintegration of the socialism of the Kibbutz movement.(186) Problems arose when members became more interested in "empire building" than in the humanization of the workplace. Buber also notes how socialism lost much of its vitality when it no longer kept pace with new circumstances. For example, Kibbutz members ignored the presence of a new type of immigrant to the Kibbutz

and were subsequently unable to meet that immigrant's needs.(187)

Buber catagorically condemns the Kibbutz movement for having become agnostic and atheistic. He considers any socialism not religiously motivated to be a sham.(188) Buber wants his students educated toward a religious socialism.

Buber also insists that students be given a solid identity in their own particular religious faith.(189) Buber is emphatic that a truly cooperative "Kingdom" will only be the work of persons who have a solid grounding in their own particular world view.(190) Only so grounded will Jews have the confidence necessary to dialogue with peoples of different backgrounds.

Buber reels against universalists who insist that a cooperative world will come about only if all religious differences between people are first dissolved.(191) He writes, "Education does not presume to replace the world views by the world of commonality. It cannot supplant them and should not want to."(192) The natural unfolding of an honest relationship between peoples calls for a realization of differences along with a commitment to move beyond them. The student who emerges from the Buberian classroom must possess the maturity of character to understand the foolishness of universalism.

In conclusion, it is clear that Buber has a definite picture of the student that must emerge from formal education. This person will be called a "believing humanist." A Jewish "believing humanist" is grounded in his/her tradition and

exhibits existential leanings towards a socialist and communalistic lifestyle.

THE METHOD OF BUBERIAN EDUCATION

Wenger suggests that Buber is on principle opposed to the use of educational methods and techniques. He contends that Buber considers them to be contrived and mechanical and therefore out of step with his stress on spontaneity.(193) While Freedman agrees that Buber does not stress methodology, he does not believe that Buber is opposed to it.(194) He feels that Buber ignores methods simply becuase they are beyond his primary field of interest and his expertise.(195) This writer agrees that Buber's view on methods is a much more subtle and sympathetic one than Wenger suggests. There exists within Buber's writing not so much an ignorance of methods as a growing realization of their necessity.

To be fair, Buber's writings are scattered with conflicting messages regarding the value of educational methods and techniques. In his book Between Man and Man he unequivocally states "that no technique, system or program will help an individual relate in an "I-Thou" manner."(196) In A Believing Humanism he modifies his view and admits that methods are indeed necessary but must never become the overriding consideration.

When pressed in debate Buber related a similar opinion. He responded to his opponent that "without methods one is a dilittante. I am for methods but just in order to use them and not to believe in them...although I am not allowed to renounce

either typology or method, I must know in what moment I must give them up."(197) Clearly methods have a rightful, albeit limited, place amongst Buber's scheme of things.

It is difficult to identify those methods which Buber does indeed advocate. Perhaps the clearest of these is teacher self disclosure. Buber believes that students find meanings in their religious feelings only after their teacher has disclosed his/her own religious beliefs and practises to them.(198)

Teachers are first called on to convey to students their personal experiences of God's creative power.(199) According to Buber, students do not believe that God created a sustainable and meaningful world until their teachers, whom they trust, affirm that possiblity for them. Buber suggests that the most effective way to prove to students that God creates is for teachers to tell about the miraculous birth of humans or animals which they have personally witnessed.

Teachers are also expected to tell their classes about their moments of personal suffering, including how God's presence intervened to comfort and protect them. Buber's premise is that until students hear their teacher's story, they will not know where to look within their own lives for the often subtle signs of God's caring.

Buber stresses that self disclosure is only effective if it is honest. He thus writes,"a teacher unveils his relation to God so that another person can glimpse something of its meaning. He does not present his strength and his conviction only but he

also reveals his weaknesses and his doubt."(200) Only if teachers are painfully open will their words catch their students up in the action of God within real human life.

Buber believes that a relationship with God can only be consummated by prayer and sacrifice.(201) He testifies to the centrality of prayer and sacrifice by referring to them as "the two great servants which pace through the ages."(202) According to Buber, prayer can only have an effect on God if it is unselfishly poured from the heart with unrestrained dependence.(203) Prayer is considered to be one type of personal sacrifice. Truly religious people give unselfishly of their energy and resources at all times. Buber remains convinced that students will emerge from the classroom as religious Jews only if they are exposed to the intense religiosity of teachers. Indeed, Buber believes that if the student is so exposed that he/she needs no other influences or conditions in order for his/her religiosity to emerge.(204)

Buber gave power to prayer that he gave to no other ritual. Goodblatt concludes that Buber considers all rituals other than prayer to be "necessary evils" which remain in place if only to lend stability to the transmission of values between generations.(205) It is therefore understandable why Buber never demands that teachers convey their other ritual or Jewish life cycle experiences to their students.

Only after students have been effected by personal accounts of faith are they allowed to turn their focus to the study of

religious texts.(206) Buber fears that true faith will not develop if students prematurely depend on the second hand and legalistic accounts of faith that are in the Midrash and Talmud.(207) Only after students have responded to God on a personal level are they allowed to lean on the legalism found within Jewish religious texts.(208) Buber considers the study of text to be an essential, if not latter, part of the educational process. These documents are essential because they contain what Buber terms the "common memory".(209) It is the mass of common history safeguarded within this "Jewish archetype" which Buber feels has allowed Jews to remain both a strong and united people.(210)

Within this "commom memory" there also exists essential attitudes concerning Jewish religious identity.(211) By 1932 Buber had already observed that the "common memory" was disappearing as was the passion for handing it down through the generations.(212) He guesses that it had been within the last one hundred and fifty years that most Jewish parents have abrogated their responsibility of handing down the "common memory." They have done so because they believe that a more successful Jewish life can develop within the Diaspora and Israel without this "common momory." (213)

Buber hopes that Jewish youth will compensate for their parents neglect by directly taking upon themselves the passion of textual study.(214) He asks them to work unremittingly to regain this approach to the "ancestral treasure."

Buber recognizes that a passion for the textual study of the Bible is suppressed because of the unfair misrepresentation which the Bible has received. He laments that many distorted and sham messages are wrongly uttered in the name of the Bible.(215) The teacher's resonsibility is, according to Buber, to introduce students to a fresh look at that text. To facilitate this, students are encouraged to begin their study of the Bible with sections which they have not yet read. Furthermore, they are encouraged to read those sections out loud in the privacy of their homes. The only expectation made of them is that they listen to the words until they can in some way relate their own life experience to that which they read.(216)

Buber briefly recommends incorporating song, poetry and drama as teaching techniques to make the "classical texts" come alive.(217) At various points in his writings Buber hints that it is drama, more than any other method which has inspired his own learning.(218)

The ideal teacher not only educates students towards God but toward communiity as well. Buber believes that one formidable obstacle to harmonious interpersonal communication is that words have various meanings depending on the background of the person who speaks them.(219) Buber provides no concrete suggestions as to how to overcome this obstacle. Wenger on the other hand does suggest an approach. He calls on teachers to deliberately bring students from different ethnic, religious and economic backgrounds into one classroom so that they can

struggle with properly understanding one another. He suggests that Biblical words serve as a starting point for this clarification exercise.(220) In this way students can learn first hand about the difficulty of clear and honest communication and the importance of tolerating differences.

The problem with encouraging honest dialogue in the classroom, is that it increases the risk of conflict. Buber believes that classroom conflict can be used as a learning tool. First, teachers must acknowledge its presence in the classroom. By so doing they rid anger of its stigma and so allow it to naturally emerge within the classroom.(221) Once anger is out in the open they will instruct their students how to understand and cope with it.

According to Buber, the best method for teaching acceptable forms of anger is personal example. The teacher must never exhibit uncontrollable or violent anger and must never become verbally abusive. (222) The teacher's other responsibility is to teach students how to disarm their anger. He/she does so by teaching students to translate anger into a "language of needs."(223) For example, a student who might otherwise tell a teacher that he/she hates him/her, will admit that he/she really does not hate that teacher but is afraid that the teacher will not pay enough attention to him/her." It is also the teacher's responsibility to make certain that each conflict is resolved to every participants satisfaction. Buber suggests that the teacher interject "words of love" in order to assuage student

egos.(224)

Buber observes that words insufficiently convey what is fully meant. Instead, Buber considers silence the ultimate method of communication between persons.(225) In a mystic manner he describes silent communicatin as follows,"Even now the man does not speak a word or lift a finger. There is released a reserve of communication which streams forth and the silence bears it to his neighbor."(226) Silent communication is not the same as nonverbal communication. It is akin to an energy force oscillating between two individuals so predisposed.(227) Buber offers no methods according to which persons can improve the quality of their "silent communication."

Buber is never completely certain what worth he will ascribe to books as methods for teaching. He admits that in his youth he had preferred dealing with books to dealing with people. (228)In his later years he noticed that this was becoming less the case. The only books that he had come to have any use for were those which romanticized life and allowed him an escape from reality.(229) He came to regard even these books as illigitimate. He admits that such sanitized tales command respect but fail to evoke his love. They are simply not real enough to engage his deepest emotions.(230) Near the end of his days it is the concrete experience of relationship which remains of utmost value to him. He writes, "Many bad experiences with men have nourished the meadow of my life as the noblest book could never do and the good experiences have made the earth a

garden for me."(231)

Buber admits that since he has spent so much of his life reading and publishing, he must concede some importance to books.(232) This realization does not prevent him from castigating books for their essential inability to capture the flavor and complexity of human communication.(233)

Clearly Buber has a healthy regard for selected educational methods. This is the case despite the fact that Buber does not think in terms of educational methodology and probably could not identify three such methods if asked to do so.

A BUBERIAN CURRICULUM

True to his unsystematic nature, Buber never developed a curriculum which reflected his educational philosophy. In fact, he never discusses curricular concerns as such.(234) Many interpreters throw up their hands when faced with this vagueness. Still others offer shallow expressions of what a hypothetical Buberian curriculum would look like. Among the later, Herberg suggests that a Buberian curriculum is a "liberal arts" education.(235) This writer finds this conclusion unacceptable. Although Buber is interested in a broad array of social issues there is no doubt that his approach to them is not always "liberal." Such a broad label does an injustice to the complexity of a proposed Buberian curriculum.

The Social Issue Component of the Buberian Curriculum

The overriding theme of the Buberian curriculum is building towards the "Kingdom of God on earth." Students who participate

in this mission are educated in social issues, personal theology and intercommunity relations. As an existentialist Buber wishes to highlight the most immediate and painful aspect of the human condition. This means beginning the curriculum with a study of social issues.

War is one of the social issues which most concerns Buber. At the most basic level he expresses shock at the human destruction which war causes. He writes, "how can I withstand the infinity of this moment...happenings pour into my blood, shrapnel wounds and tetanus, screams and death rattle, and the smile of the mouth above the crushed body."(236) Buber adopts a very honest and realistic picture of war. A similarly honest account of war must be one part of the Buberian curriculum.

Of all the horrid aspects of war Buber most emphasized the propogandization of the fighting man. Most soldiers fight whomever they are persuaded is the enemy. Yet within each soldier there exists a deep conviction that he/she who has been so designated is neither as different nor as threatening as he/she has been led to believe. This the case, the true battlefront in a war is the individual soldier's inner struggle between these two conflicting messages.(237) Students who study war must above all understand the great struggles of conscience which accompany every military battle.(238)

Buber hopes that students studying war also learn to identify the psychological and political lessons which will help avert further wars.(239) To say that Buber can retrieve some

lessons from war is not to assume that he is not terribly afraid of a global war. He wonders aloud whether or not a "pantechnical" war will put an end to civilization. He asks students to seriously question politicians whether they are doing their part to advance a dialogue of peace. He urges them to convince politicians that it is they who must initiate that dialogue if the other side will not.(240) Buber suggests that students be educated in civil disobedience tactics in order to best persuade politicians of their responsibility.(241)

Despite his fear of global war Buber does not condone paccifism. In wars where there are "legitimate" values at stake it is the duty of good men to fight to preserve them. In this spirit he writes to Gandhi that "We (the Jews) have not proclaimed, as you do and did Jesus, the son of our people, the teaching of non violence. We believe that a man must sometimes use force to save himself or even his children..."(242) War is a morally acceptable but desperate alternative to dialogue. Students must acquire practise distinguishing between legitimate and illegitimate violence.

Students have an example within recent Jewish history of a case where violence is considered legitimate. In 1947 Buber complimented the Jews of Palestine for their self restraint. He was amazed that up to that point they had not answered in kind to the years of blind violence perpetrated upon them. Yet if the "good" continued to be destroyed by the evil then they would have no choice but to use force.(243)

Buber was very much aware of the tensions existing between the indigenous Arab population of Palestine and the more recent Jewish settlers. In 1939 he called for a genuine peace between two opposing but morally valid claims.(244) In his own day this suggestion was considered radical by many.(245) He advocates that Jews and Arabs form a Mid-Eastern Federation along the lines of the European Common Market. This arrangement calls for a close sharing of resources and expertise between Jew and Arab.(246)

Buber is unable to maintain his fair and objective stance. He eventually comes out in clear defence of his people by attempting to debunk a traditional pro-Arab stand. Time and again Buber attacks those persons who would give Palestine over to the Arabs simply because in 1939 they are the majority in the land.(247) He stresses that the Arabs have only settled there by virtue of military conquest and were thus themselves there immorally. Going further, he suggests that if ancient Jewish habitation is to be usurped by Arab conquest then the Jews have the right to regain Palestine by any means "short of conquest."(248) Feeling perhaps somewhat guilty for justifying violence, Buber admits in a vague way that Jews are wrongly oppressing the Arab population of Palestine.(249)

While not categorically opposed to the taking of life in war, Buber is absolutely opposed to capital punishment. It is with uncharacteristic clarity that he lists his objections to it.(250) The student who emerges from the Buberian classroom

will be as well versed on the Palestinian refugee problem happening ten thousand miles away as on capital punishment cases occuring in his/her own city. Inculcated with Buberian perspectives on these issues he/she will invariably voice views very similar to Buber's.

Buber devotes even fewer pages to a discussion of "family breakdown" than he does to capital punishment. As early as the Thirties Buber warns that the instiution of the family is in grave danger. Unfortunately, he never describes the exact nature of the crisis. He does however hint that the family is losing its sense of warmth and mutual helpfulness and that herein is found the root of the problem.(251)

Buber gives only fleeting mention to the marriage partnership. Still it is clear that he considers the traditional "man-woman" arrangement the ultimate "I-Thou" relationship.(252) He claims that no society will ever maintain itself without this arrangement.(253) He considers adultery the primary enemy attacking this time honored institution.

Buber's writings also evince some awareness of the generational tensions existing between parents and children. Buber comes dowm squarely on the side of parents on this age old issue. He concludes that "as long as a society cares about maintaining the connection between generations and transmitting forms and contents in a well regulated manner, then a society must expect children to honor their parents."(254) Of note is the conservative tone of this excerpt as well as the absence of

any discussion of the rights of children.

Sexual attitudes also fall within Buber's perview. He advocates a Jewish orientation which recognizes the naturalness of sexual activity but does not glorify it as the "be all and end all" of human existence.(255) Proper sexual activity must be guided by a religious attittude of sanctification. Although never defining "sanctification", Buber hints that the attitude that "sex is dirty" is one which desanctifies sex.(256)

Buber leaves the door to his curriculum open to include the study of all social issues. He does so by linking his social concern with a theology which concerns itself with the redemption of all the world. This theology refuses to give up hope on even the most despised elements of society.(257) Under no circumstances is the Jew allowed to split the world into one blessed and one damned half, only then concerning him/her self with the less ugly half. Through dialogue any Jew can heal even the most socially outcast including the child abuser, the alcoholic and the senile.

The Theological Component of the Buberian Curriculum

What a Jew does and what he/she believes are inseparably bound up with one another.(258) For this reason a great deal of emphasis within the Buberian curriculum must be given to the establishment of an appropriate Jewish theology. Through the "selective sieve" of the teacher the student is exposed to the theology of Martin Buber. To be fair, Buber never states in so many words that his students may only be exposed to his

theology. Nor does he prohibit students from studying other theologies. Yet at the same time he never encourages students to learn other theologies besides his. Nor does he ever give any credence to the views of other theologians.

Professor Alvin Reines of Hebrew Union College characterizes Buber's theology as a neo-orthodoxy.(259) In most aspects Buber is indeed very close to traditional Rabbinic theology. Yet his is a theology with a difference. It is distinct from Rabbinic Judaism in that it is existentially grounded. Buber does not start with the account of Sinai and from there reason that God exists to take an active interest in the world. Nor does Buber rely on the Bible as his primary evidence that God meets Israel. Buber prefers to prove the existence of God "from the ground up." It is only because Buber feels the presence of God in his own life that he has faith in a caring God.

Buber is very insistent that the God whom Jews come to know be a God in the traditionally theistic sense.(260) Like the Rabbis of old, Buber's God is neither a power nor a force but an actual being who cares for people in the same way that humans care for one another. It is precisely because God is so caring that humans are obliged to obey His commanding voice.(261) Yet how does man communicate with an incomprehensible God so as to know His demands?

Buber has a firm belief that individuals are able to meet God in their every day lives. He never describes the nature of

the meeting except to say that it is contentless.(262) No words pass between humankind and God, so persons are left from the encounter with only an experience of God's presence. The only other thing which Buber is willing to say about the meeting is that it can in no way be understood by the faculty of reason.

Buber considers the Bible to be a human attempt to report on some such ancient contact.(263) Since it tries to describe that which is inherently undescribable it is not considered a full account of the meeting between God and humankind. Herberg explains that "the Bible to Buber is neither an infallible God-written document, nor merely the folk literature of Israel; it is taken in full seriousness as the continuing witness of the believing community to its encounteer with God, and it is therefore taken as essentially, and in every part, both human and divine."(264) Just as the relationship between humankind and God is an undissectible intermingling so is the Bible an inseparable combination of divine will and human form. As such it is neither to be raised to the status of fundamental truth nor reduced to the category of figurative speech.(265)

Buber believes that it is through the Bible that God makes known at least some of His plans for humankind. Traditional Judaism contends that it is through the Halakah of the Bible that God particularly makes known those plans. Herberg does an injustice to the subtle complexity of Buber's attitude to Halakah when he describes it as "fundamentally negative."(266)

It is clear that for Buber the soul of Judaism is not the

Halakah. Under no circumstances must the goal of Judaism become the successful implementation of the law.(267) What God wants most from humans is that they relate to each other in a just and open manner. Yet it is not enough that persons are simply aware of that instruction. In order for it to mean something it must be concretized and made explicit. Halakah serves this purpose for Buber. He writes, "without law, that is, without some clearcut and transmissible line of demarcation between that which is pleasing to God and that which is displeasing to Him, there can be no historical community of divine rule on earth."(268) It is for this reason that, since Sinai, Judaism cannot be understood outside of the law.(269)

Despite his deep appreciation for Halakah, Buber was aware that it was being abused in his own day. He reels against the inflexable application of the law undertaken by Rabbis and laymen alike. What are meant as fluid indicators are infused with a narrow certainty not theirs to employ.(270)

These same religious authorities mislead themselves into believing that there exist no mitzvot outside of those recorded in Jewish scripture. According to Buber, the mitzvot of scripture are only the realm of things which have explicitly been given to humankind to hallow.(271) Revelation of further ways to serve God occurs in the present day.(272) Buber laments that many Jews are unaware of this dynamic and so are stifled in their religious observance.(273) The Buberian curriculum must educate contemporary Jewry as to the proper dimensions of the

Halakah.

Buber recognizes that the attempt to educate the contemporary Jew about God will be an uphill battle. He writes that the "typical (Jewish) individual is no longer capable of believing in God."(274) He does not blame the faulty application of the Halakah for the widespread crisis of faith which he observed amongst Jews even in his own day. He suggests that many are falling away from a belief in God because they no longer know how to trust any one or anything outside of themselves.(275) The armor of false self sufficiency distances humankind from God. Buber demands that humankind make the first move toward God. Only once an individual turns to embrace God will God in turn move to care for that person.(276)

While most persons are incapable of a belief in God others simply choose not to believe in Him. Those who make this choice maintain that they cannot retain a belief in God while inhabiting a world wherein there is so much human suffering. Buber's theology responds by itself maintaining that God cannot intervene to prevent suffering from occuring. God's role is confined to comforting the faithful who suffer.(277) God comes to them in relationship and so eases their burden.

Regardless of the difficulty of believing in God to do otherwise is to do disservice to Israel's special relationship with God. Buber looks with disdain upon Jews who define their Jewishness in political and ethnic rather than religious terms.(278) His fear is that without a religious sense Jews will

become just one other people among many who define themselves through national or ethnic characteristics. If they do not set themselves apart from other peoples according to this religious sense, they will perish in political battles alongside them.(279)

It is for this reason imperative that teachers instill students with a strong and proper religious sense. Buber specifies exactly which theological beliefs are proper and it is these beliefs that must be advocated within a Buberian curriculum.

The Intercommunity Component of the Buberian Curriculum

There is great pressure brought to bear upon Diaspora Jewry to conform to a secular Jewish identity.(280) This dark grey cloud is for Buber the overriding theme of Jewish life outside of Israel. He writes, "The insecure Jew strives for security, the Jewish community which cannot be classified strives to be classified...Jewry disintegrates into small particles (in order to) comply with the nations demands. The urge to conform becomes a cramp."(281) The Gentile majority permits the Diaspora Jew to have a Zionist identity, but a religious identity is too unsettling a one for them to allow.

For all his pessimism Buber never gives up hope in the abiding spirituality of Diaspora Jewry. He stubbornly believes that a Jew is simply unable to lose the essential parts of his/her Jewish religious belief. He calls these beliefs "foci" and considers them so deeply entrenched in each Jew's psyche

that they never stop functioning.(282) Even though a Jew might be unaware of their presence these "foci" continue to guide that Jew in his/her most honest and private moments.(283)

The Diaspora Jew is also confronted with Christian antisemitism. Buber feels that as long as Jews stubbornly uphold the Law that Chrisians will hold animosity toward them.(284) Jews will also be eternally despised by Christians for glorifying sex and being too permissive in its regard.(285) They will continue to be a "sinister spector" until such time that they either lose their religious identity or move to Israel.(286)

Given the strained relationship between Jews and Christians it is somewhat surprising that Buber does not outline a specific curricular plan to increase dialogue between the two groups. In fact, Buber never stresses the necessity to better educate Jewish students in relating with their Christian neighbors. On one level Buber takes it for granted that the two groups will cooperate on social projects and that this cooperation will lead to meaningful dialogue. On another, he believes that the Jewish-Christian "track record" is so poor that energies are better placed elsewhere. In the end it is Aliyah and not interfaith education which is the real hope of the Jewish future.

Until the time of Aliyah Jewish students will have to be educated toward a certain understanding of Christianity. The first thing that they will have to understand is that Jesus was

a great person but was in no way divine. Buber thinks highly of Jesus' social conscience. As far as false messiahs go, Buber considers Jesus "incomparably the purest, the most legitimate of them, and the one most endowed with real Messianic power.(287) Buber also stresses to his students that Jesus lived as a Jew and had retained a deep commitment to the Halaka.(288)

Buber also expects his students to understand that Pual of Tarsis corrupted the original monotheism of Christianity and forced it to turn its back on the Halaka.(289) Buber believes Christian faith to be inferior to Jewish faith to the extent that it is influenced by Pauline doctrine. Considerations of Paul aside, Buber still considers Judaism to be a more effective religious path than Christianity.(290)

Buber is much more interested in educating Jews about their own religion than about the religion of others. He is concerned that some deeply spiritual Jews have left the Jewish fold because they have not been properly taught the spiritual beauty of Judaism.(291) Buber recognizes that Jewish religious education usually does not teach about the spiritual core of Judaism. He feels that it will be an uphill battle convincing the Jewish establishment that indeed the most special part of Judaism is its spiritual core.(292)

The Role of Philosophy in the Buberian Curriculum

With a discussion of subject content now concluded we turn to a discussion of a procedural matter. What is the legitimate role of philosophical inquiry in the process of education?

Buber's writings present an ongoing preoccupation with this question. He considers philosophical inquiry to be an indispensable but also nonessential part of education.(293) It is indispensable because it guarentees "that the thought of man is connected" and it is nonessential because it is relies on the "I-It" manner of knowing.(294)

Buber's argument with philosophy comes when it deludes itself into thinking that it is the only legitimate path to knowledge.(295) While knowledge born of faith is very different from philosophical knowledge, it was not to be considered weak or unsubstantial in comparison to it.

On a more fundamental level, Buber attacks philosophy for its inability to inspire people to the task of building "the Kingdom of God on earth." He writes,"no thought can build up ones religious life and the strictest philosophical certainty cannot endow the soul with the attitude that the imperfect world will be brought to its perfection."(296) Buber is afraid that Jews might come to see philosophical inquiry as a substitute for dialogue and prayer. He warns them that "no God is loved through the enterprise of logic."(297)

Buber approaches philosophy with extreme caution.(298) Usually he sees it as a problematic but necessary activity. Sometimes he perceives it as an opponent of true religiosity. As such he tries to neutralize its force by dismissing it as an irrelevant intellectual activity which occurs on a "plane above most persons and events."(299)

Conclusion

Several commentators hypothesize on the direction that the Buberian curriculum takes. The only thing they all agree on is that while Buber considers relationships paramount, it is the acquisition of certain attitudes which he stresses in his curriculum.(300) Relationships take a second seat behind the inculcation of religious and moral teachings. True to his philosophical underpinnings, Buber tries to make his curriculum existential. He wants it to be flexible and present centered rather than rigid and irrelevant to students needs. The curriculum is however not flexible nor is it based on the expressed needs of the students.

Goodblatt suggests that whatever subject matter is taught in the Buberian classrooom, it must be useful to the student's expressed needs.(301) In this capacity he suggests that the following subjects be taught in all American schools:1)vocational studies 2)natural sciences 3)social sciences 4)literature 5)sociology and 6)history. To say that Buber would be sympathetic to Goodblatt's choices is pure conjecture. In fact Buber did not advocate a fixed subject approach to education and so would part with Goodblatt even from the outset.(302)

The only other thing that is certain about Buber's curriculum is that many of the positions contained therein are in no way liberal. His notions on marriage and intergenerational dynamics are particularly conservative according to the opinion

of much of contemporary Americam Jewry. At the same time, his strong opinions on socialism and capital punishment put him far to the left of much of that same group. Any Buberian curriculum will be a very curious mix of extremes. All further conclusions about the Buberian curriculum remain necessarily in the air.

CHAPTER FOUR

PARALLELS IN THE EDUCATIONAL THOUGHT OF CARL ROGERS, JANUSZ KORCZAK AND MARTIN BUBER

Rogers, Korczak and Buber lived on three different continents. One was a pediatrician, one a psychologist and another a theologian. Each however had an abiding interest in education. Given the marked demographic differences between the three men, it is of interest to know if their teaching philosophies are similar. Does there emerge from their writings some common directions which can be useful to the development of Reform Jewish education?

The search for similarity begins with what the thinkers themselves write about one another. It is clear that Rogers and Buber are aware of each others work. However, it is improbable that there exists connections between either of these thinkers and Korczak.

Rogers makes reference to Buber throughout his books. The references are always lauditory. In fact, Rogers considers Buber to be his mentor. He writes that his first exposure to Buber's thinking occured while working in the student counselling department at the University of Chicago. Some theological students who worked with him suggested that he read both Kierkegaard and Buber. Rogers' response to the material was enthusiastic. He writes, "It was the feeling, my gosh, here are friends of mine that I never knew I had. Here are people who

discovered the same set of things that I have and who have gone beyond what I've gone through in a number of significant ways."(1) It is clear that Rogers considers his approach essentially the same as Buber's.

Rogers perceives that his philosophy is closest to Buber's in the area of relationships. In 1961 he wrote of his own philosophy that "(it) could all be summed up in a beautiful statement by Martin Buber who says that the good teacher must be a really existing man and he must be really present to his pupils; he educates through contact."(2) According to both Buber and Rogers, it is not audio visuals, books nor even subject matter that is the real channel for educational growth. Significant educational progress is the result of two persons experiencing a certain quality of human interaction. Only through such relationships can educational potential be released.

Both Rogers and Buber further postulate that certain attitudinal conditions must be present in order for a teacher/student relationship to be educationally facilitative. Rogers equates the attitudinal conditions of his philosophy of relationship with the conditions of Buber's same philosophy.(3) The "I-Thou" climate that Buber advocates appears to Rogers to be the same as the "core condition" climate which he posits. When asked to describe his own approach, Rogers thus responds that "it is a memorable "I-Thou" relationship." He then procedes to stress that both he and Buber emphasize "immediacy" in

relationships.(4) Additionally, he relates that both of them stress "absolute self dtermination" and so are even more identical than first understood.(5)

Rogers further suggests that both he and Buber consider "realness" to be a priority condition of a educationally growthful relationship. To conclusively prove the commonality between them, he describes the essence of his own philosophy in Buberian terms. He describes "core condition" relationships as those "rare moments when a deep realness meets a deep realness in the other, (in other words) it is a memorable "I-Thou" relationship as Martin Buber the Jewish existentialist philosopher would call it."(6)

Rogers repeatedly emphasizes that he, like Buber, is an existentialist.(7) According to Rogers, both he and Buber are even more alike in that, unlike their European counterparts, both are "optimistic existentialists." On a superficial level both Rogers and Buber do indeed emphasize the individual and his/her necessity to deal with the present. For these reasons they can rightfully be considered sharing a commitment to an existentialist perspective. This however is where the similarity between the two men breaks down.

In 1957 Buber and Rogers met at the University of Michigan for a dialogue. The proceedings of their discussion reveal that there are more differences in the philosophies of the two men than Rogers ever understands. Maurice Freedman, the world's foremost expert on Buber, was struck on that same night by the

essential differences between the two men. He writes, "(before the dialogue) I was struck by the resemblances between the two thinkers and since then I have also become aware of the differences in their approaches."(8)

Three essential differences are evident from the dialogue. The first concerns the issue of student self determination. It is obvious from the proceedings that Buber considers it permissible for the teacher to exercise terrific influence over the student.(9) Nor does Buber place strict limitations on such interference. Buber submits that a teacher may interfere in the life of a student on the grounds that the student is "hurting" his/her self. This writer suggests that according to such a vague criterion almost any teacher interference is legitimated.(10) It is in sharp contrast that throughout the whole dialogue Rogers never once mentions any desire to influence a student. Even if that student is at risk, he/she must continue to determine his/her own course of study.

During the dialogue Buber makes known his disappointment that Rogers does not interfere in the life of his students in order to make them more communally minded.(11) He makes it clear that he does not fully accept his students until such time as they conform to his expectatons in this regard.(12) Buber mocks the principle of self determination which Rogers appears to hold sacred.(13)

The second point of issue is the status of students and teachers within the educational relationship. Buber stresses

that this relationship is never one of equals.(14) In no way can students relate to their teachers as equals. This is because they are in no significant way capable of understanding or assisting their teachers. Buber claims that even during full educational dialogue that there exists an impenetrable wall between the two.(15) Rogers responds that in his educational relationships equality of status and understanding does exist, albeit at rare moments.(16)

The third difference is the issue of relationship to self.(17) Rogers takes Buber to task for not recognizing the value of this relationship. He is especially concerned since it is the prerequisite for any "I-Thou" relationship. He writes, "before a person can meet another in an "I-Thou" relationship he must meet aspects of himself which he has not recognized before."(18)

This writer suggests that Rogers is so driven by his own tendency to generalize that he ignores most of the crucial distinctions existing between himself and Buber. It is clear from their dialogue that Rogers stresses the commonality between the two much more than does Buber. This "whitewashing" over differences continues over the years and is evident in all of Rogers' writing.

Gordon confirms that Buber does not see his approach as similar, but rather opposed to Rogers.(19) Buber understands his approach to be a clear alternative to the "progressive education" of which he considers Rogers representative. In his

native Germany Buber met educators like Rogers. Like Rogers, they advocated that students be free to discover their own problems and work only on matters that interest them.(20) Buber railed against this approach then and does so again when confronted with it in the person of Carl Rogers at the University of Michigan.

Buber feels that students are like the members of a jazz band. As long as they stay on the same melody line each is allowed to add a few of their own unique sounds. Yet the task at hand is clear and freedom is not permitted to interfere with it. Buber feels that by giving his students an "I-Thou" relationship that this in some way makes up for the limited freedom which they have. By providing this element of humanity within an otherwise inflexible system, Buber believes that he is offering a fine alternative to both the authoritarian and permissive extremes of teaching styles.

Buber does not properly understand Rogers' true import for if he did he would perceive the commonality between them. As previously discussed, Rogers is not directionless. Popular interpreters ignore his deterministic bent. For that matter, so too do they ignore the doctrinaire and deterministic side of Buber.(21) In reality it appears that Rogers is not as true a representative of the "progressive" school as Buber believes. In fact, Rogers limits the self determination of his students almost as much as does Buber. The only difference being that Rogers is more subtle about doing so.

It is ironic that Buber criticizes Rogers and not Korczak. It is Korczak and not Rogers who is the true representative of the "progressive" school movement. It is Korczak who gives his students the most power to determine their own lives. He does so primarily by resisting the temptation to mold the political and economic ideologies of his students.

It is unfortunate that Kurzweil blurrs the essential differences between Korczak and Buber.(22) According to his interpretation, these men are essentially similar in that they are both "imbued with a love for the child, a sense of mission, and the ability to identify themselves with the pupil."(23) While it is true that both Buber and Korczak are fired with a sense of mission, it is clear that their manner of loving children is very different. Buber loves children in a domineering and formal way. Korczak loves his children with constant affection and attention to their needs.

Despite their differences the three pedagogues have much in common. At this point it is appropriate to highlight some of the obvious similarities between them.

All three are of one mind that a teacher's greatest resource is his/her self. The teacher's ability to engage a student in a safe and stimulating relationship is considered by all three men to be primary to all educational growth. Both Buber and Rogers stress in their writing what Korczak stresses by his example; that no book or theory can educate as well as human contact.

In addition, they all believe that teachers must not rely on gimmicks or theories to develop relationships. Relationship building is essentially determined by one's intuition, ability to self disclose and prior experience in relationship building. Both Rogers and Korczak add that a high degree of self awareness is another essential tool of relationship building. In contrast, Buber does not place importance on the dynamic of self awareness.

All three pedagogues also agree that the expert teacher need not be a scholar. Buber speaks to the issue most forcefully stating that a lamdan is, by definition, too isolated from the world of real concerns and relationships to be an effective teacher. While Rogers does not speak out as forcefully, it is noteworthy that the aspect of scholarship is conspicuously absent from his list of criterion for effective teaching. Korczak suggests that any scholarship that does not have practical application is empty. A devotion to the accumulation of knowledge for knowledge sake is completely absent from the doctor's message. Critics may argue that he can afford this de-emphasis because he does not see his main goal to be the fostering of academic growth. Nevertheless, his opinion stands.

Nor is it the primary goal of education to produce scholars. Education worthy of the name is supposed to teach persons how to successfully live in the world. Although in agreement as to the goal of education, they differ in their expectations of how students must be equipped in order to best

function in the contemporary world.

Rogers stresses that students must be taught how to think in a critical and independent manner. This ability is crucial in that it allows a person to distinguish between his/her own values and beliefs and those imposed upon him/her by society.

Although a spiritual man, Rogers never claims that a person must acquire an organized religion or even a faith in God in order to function most fully in society.

Buber does not feel that a critical mind is the singlemost essential ingredient necessary for fulfillment. Although paying lip service to the importance of critcal thought, he stresses that people must hold a certain belief and ethical code in order to be fulfilled.

Korczak stresses yet another angle of human development. He believes his students best prepared for life when they are taught how to relate with others in a harmonious way. To facilitate the process students are instilled with self awareness and a healthy dose of self esteem.

Though the pedagogues hold different educational aims, clearly all three recognize that effective education is education of the whole person. Whether it means stressing critical thought, religious faith or interpersonal relations, there is always more to education than giving students facts. This said, it is apparent that each of the thinkers paid various attention to the role of emotions in the educational process. Roger's classroom recordings demonstrate that he is very

sensitive to emotions and constantly aims at getting persons more in touch with their emotional side. No such records exist of Korczak's teaching. Yet it clear from observers that he too helps students deal with their emotions. In stark contrast, Buber is only minimally interested in the emotional side of persons. While it is true that he stresses the importance of empathy it is also true that this is as far as his interest and expertise with emotions takes him.

There are other issues where partial agreement among the pedagogues exists. The first of these is the matter of "disequilibrium". True to their existentialist roots, both Buber and Rogers speak of the need to roust people from their complacency before educational growth can occur.(24) Students must be made to feel uncomfortable with their perceptions and beliefs before they are truly motivated to explore new ways of understanding. While Korczak does not believe that a student be coddled, neither does he feel that an adult has the right to purposefully render a child "off balance" so that learning may procede. In consonance with his other views he feels that such a strategy is far too open to abuse to be practical.

Nor does Korczak insist that the students who emerges from his classroom hold specific political and personal values. As Kolberg suggests, Korczak did "teach his underlings ethical philosophy but he did not expect his student's to develop a particular ethical or religious philosophy."(25) So, while Korczak was seen to hold certain expectations, these were

relatively broad and left much room for individual manouvering. Korczak respected his students rights to determine their own beliefs more than did either Buber or Rogers.

Korczak also sets himself apart from the other pedagogues by not setting up limits to his contact with students. He cares for their every need and is openly affectionate. Moreover, he calls on all teachers to love and be friends with students. We have no idea if in the course of daily life he actually was friends with his students. We do know however, that he insisted on doing the same chores as they and that he did them alongside his students. Both Buber and Rogers put limits on the closeness that can exist between student and teacher. Buber does so because of the danger of playing favorites and Rogers because of his fear of emotional enmeshment.

Korczak and Buber both agree that the teacher presents a personal model to students and that they learn much from this example. Buber talks more about this aspect than does Korczak. He even seems to suggest that he is the proper adult model. Kohlberg suggests that Korczak is too busy being a role model to talk about it. He writes, "Janusz Korczak was truly an exemplary moral educator. But he did not define his role in those terms. He did not define himself as a role model, to use the current jargon. To think of one's role as exemplary...is to risk arrogance and an attitude of superiority to the students and it is to risk a recurring sense of failure for those who are not saints."(26) Though Korczak believes in the efficacy of role

modeling, his character and philosophy prevent him from discussing the concept at any length.

Korczak and Rogers, the doctor and the psychologist, both emphasize the importance of certain dynamics that Buber completely neglects. By ignoring the "I-I" category (relation to self), Buber negates the inherent worth of the solitary person. At the same time Buber gives no direction to the socially or otherwise handicapped student who cannot yet relate to others.

Buber is also alone in totally ignoring relationships between students. He prefers to see students as a monolithic whole whose relationships between each other are both stock and unimportant to the direction of learning. According to Buber, the only important relationship is the one that exists between student and teacher.

It is also apparent that Buber is alone in his insensitivity to the need of acceptance in the classroom. In contrast, both Rogers and Korczak place heavy stress on this dynamic.

We end on a curious and relevant thread of commonality which does exist between the three. None of the pedagogues has much faith in the capacity of organized religion to educate the character of children. All three consider religious educational institutions to be inherently constraining, superfluous and too slow to change. At best they are necessary evils needed to provide some continuity of information between generations.

It is clear that a definite though limited educational

direction emerges from the thought of these three pedagogues. A Reform education so directed will stress education for life and will de-emphasize any impractical accumulation of knowledge. As education for life its scope will be necessarily broad, encompassing an honest and critical approach to religious as well as social and personal issues. The teacher's greatest resource for facilitating this process will be his/her ability to establish honest and sensitive relationships. To conclude more than this does a disservice to the views which the thinkers hold, for at the deepest level the search for commonalities between them is very difficult and even somewhat strained.

CHAPTER FIVE

IMPEDIMENTS TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ROGERIAN EDUCATIONAL MODEL IN THE REFORM JEWISH COMMUNITY

The stereo-typical consumer of American and Canadian Reform education is under twenty, possesses elementary Jewish knowledge and is middle class. As behooves a member of this class, his or her life is busy with a multitude of social and personal interests. In 1973 Cutter described this typical consumer as "the quiet constituent who comes from a marginal and apathetic Jewish family, and asks for less, rather than for more, Jewish exposure."(1) So quiet are these persons that some Reform educators deny their existence. Instead, they operate on the illusion that most Reform Jews are extremely committed and Jewishly knowledgeable.(2)

In a 1977 article entitled "Facing the Future of Jewish Education", Eugene Borowitz echoed Cutter's sentiment. He pointed out that since Emancipation most Jews have placed only peripheral value on being Jewish. He concluded that for most Jews being Jewish "is nice but is not very important, and while something to be proud of, it is not worth too much effort."(3)

Translated into educational terms, this means that most Reform Jewish parents will see to it that their children receive enough of a Jewish education so that they develop a pride in their Jewish identity. They are however, not sufficiently

committed at this time to ensure that their children receive a solid cognitive and affective working knowledge of Judaism. Nor are they committed enough to become significantly involved in their children's Jewish education. Jewish education is, for the middle class family, seen more often than not as just one more lesson among the myriad of lessons that children must be exposed to in order to lead fuller lives. As one among many its status is as Borowitz concludes, definitely "marginal."(4)

During the Eighties we see a new dynamic evolve which brings with it an additional problem for Reform education. It is widely recognized that North American life is increasingly traditional and conservative. There is no doubt that there are those among the ranks of Reform Jewry who feel the call back to more tradition. These Reform Jews exist within the same educational system as those who are only marginally interested in knowing about Judaism. How the Reform educational system will deal with an increasing polarization of its constituents is a question which will become increasingly important in the future.(5)

Another sign of our changing times is that the population is getting older. Borowitz predicts that Reform congregations will face decreasing enrollment and even the possibility of empty classrooms if they continue to primarily educate the young.(6) He cautions that unless an obligation to teach middle and senior adults is resurrected, Reform educators will be doing much less teaching in the next decade. For Borowitz, the silver

lining around the ominous cloud is that if Reform properly educates its elderly then the job of educating their children and grandchildren will be made easier.(7)

The Reform educational system will not only be struggling with difficult demographic conditions. It will also experience difficult monetary concerns.(8) Borowitz suggests that in the face of competing national and international demands the Reform educational system will have to fight even harder to maintian its current level of budget allocations.(9)

Pedegogical concerns also confront Reform education. One such concern is that the system is abrogating its responsibility to teach students the basic skills and information necessary for them to be able to chose how they will practise Judaism. Cutter suggests that Reform schools are stressing the humanistic and affective realm at the expense of cognitive skills. He writes "that (an emotionally charged study of Israel) can too easily become vicarious Judaism. Any student would rather dance U'shavtem Mayim than study the Shulchan Aruch or Isaac M. Wise's life."(10) At one time, Reform education was unique because the secular system did not offer an affective aspect in the classroom. Cutter suggests that this is no longer the case; today's secular education may offer ample affective exposure. It is no longer necessary for Reform education to overcompensate for a lack of affective learning by overstressing the affective in religious school.(11)

Borowitz joins Cutter in discouraging an over emphasis on

emotionally powerful content. He fears that a reliance on teaching "affective" events leads to unfortunate results. He is concerned that students are becoming emotionally oversaturated and so are numbed to the material which is presented to them.(12) He suggests that Reform's challenge will be to arouse and draw out the emotions of students in a more subtle and varied manner than is presently the case.(13)

The Reform educational system is also being called upon to promote a high degree of brother and sisterhood amongst its students. Cutter's priority is that Reform students of various Jewish backgrounds develop a tolerance and respect for each other.(14) Taking another approach, Borowitz asks teachers to ensure that students develop a deepfelt and working sense of their Jewish responsibility to non-Jews.(15)

It was in the face of these difficult problems that in 1975 the Reform educational system chose to institute new goals for itself.(16) From 1975 through 1977, the Union of American Hebrew Congregations-Central Conference of American Rabbis Joint Commission on Education worked diligently to produce an interim curriculum which would meet the challenges ahead. As a result of their efforts emerged a full curriculum entitled "To See the World Through Jewish Eyes."

This new curriculum follows the Reform tradition of utilizing progressive educational philosophies and methodologies. Borowitz points out that while other Jewish movements have historically taken outdated approachs to

education, Reform has busied itself implementing innovative approaches designed to improve Jewish education.(17)

Reform has not contented itself to sit back on past laurels. Bennett attempts to prove according to his analysis of goals and learning activities, that the new curriculum has taken from the best of humanistic thought. In this regard he outlines the following emphases: 1)personal choice 2)life skills development 3)personal meanings 4)incorporation of the affective 5)stress on tzedakah 6)commitment to caring 7)attention to the needs of special learners and 8)the recognition of different learning styles.(18)

While this curriculum clearly satisfies the requirements of mainstream religious humanists, it is on several grounds opposed to the Rogerian brand of humanism.

Rogerian humanism leaves no place for individuals to make a definite commitment to any independent entity or power outside of themselves. Despite Rogers' vagueness, it is clear that he believes that people make their own meanings without any significant help from God or religious tradition. Rogers also rejects the necessity of forming religious denominations. He sees them as unnecessary barriers between people.(19) If Rogers could review the U.A.H.C. curriculum, he would delight that students are encouraged to find their own personal meanings of God. At the same time he would appreciate neither the necessity for stressing God nor the need for a bureaucratic institution called Reform Judaism.(20)

Rogers would also criticize the new curriculum for not giving students enough freedom of choice. For example, the goals of the curriculum state that all students so exposed will adopt prayer. Rogers would feel that this stipulation a priori restricts the decision making capabilities of students.(21) Moreover, Rogers would not prematurely restrict the student's field of vision by asking, as does the curriculum, that students enter theological study through the context of Reform Jewish thought alone.(22) Students are unable to make full and informed choices until they are exposed in a nonjudgemental manner to the thought of all Jewish denominations.

The new curriculum calls on students to further the cause of justice, freedom and peace.(23) Rogers would hope for a more forcefully put goal; one that stresses first hand involvement in getting to know the pain and suffering in the world. As well, a Rogerian goal on justice would direct students to become less competitive and to equitably distribute their personal wealth.(24)

Although Rogers does not realize it until later in life, he is a definite adversary of the technological capitalist society.(25) According to his view, no one happily survives the harsh realities of the market place. The people who cannot successfully compete are forced into unemployment. Yet the worst victims are those which the system keeps, for it is they who are forced to put their personal relationships and interests in second place behind the demands of their jobs. Rogers believes

that success in the market place and full human development are mutually exclusive goals.

Reform constituents will feel very threatened by a philosophy of education which questions the moral legitimacy of the very economic system in which they participate. For example, many Reform Jewish physians will be upset if, within the context of Jewish education, their children discuss the moral flaws of the current state of privitized health care. Yet such sensitive messages are exactly the ones which Rogers wants to discuss within the classroom.

There are several other problems that Reform Jewish parents will have with Rogers' approach to education. They will question just how well a Rogerian teacher who dislikes the capitalist system can prepare their children for a successful future within that system. As Teller confirms, Jews will criticize "student centered" education for being neither sufficiently academic nor competitively based.(26)

Many Reform constituents will be equally alienated by Rogers call to expose their children to "all aspects of life, including the brutal and the tragic" in order that they will learn to find meaning even in life's harshest moments. Most parents believe that life will soon enough confront their children with tragedy without their having to be purposefully exposed to it. Such premature exposure is considered by them to be definite overexposure. Still other parents insist that such a sensitive task is solely the responsibility of parents. Indeed,

few parents trust such exposure to a teacher of Jewish studies who generally works with their children on a part time basis.

Other Reform constituents argue that Rogerian humanism is most inappropriate, not because it is adversarial to mainstream American values, but because it holds a totally unrealistic picture of children.(27) Their experience at home does not convince most Reform Jewish parents that children can develop constructively without firm external boundaries first being established. Nor are these parents persuaded that their children have the inherent discipline to persevere on their own in the acquisition of difficult skills. They prefer to see their role and that of teachers, as encouragers and rewarders. They believe that it is these functions which are indispensible to their childrens success.

Rogers' empathy for children leads him to believe that all children are oppressed. This in turn causes him to drastically overestimate what children can develop into without adult guidance. His fanciful notion of human nature convinces him that left to their own devices, children naturally direct themselves toward appropriate interests, skills and values. The vast majority of Reform Jewish parents will demand that their children be given at least some grounding in basic skills and values before they are left to make choices for themselves.(28)

Even if Rogers' philosophy is accepted by the majority of Reform Jewry, there remains serious doubt as to whether the present cadre of Reform educators possess the mind set and

skills to properly implement such an approach.

In 1977 the National Association of Temple Educators published a comprehensive study of the current state of Reform Jewish educators. The study was conducted by Rabbi Stuart Gertman and entitled, "And You Shall Teach Them Diligently." Though the study is nine years old its results are all that presently exist to inform us in this area.

The study reveals that Reform educators have moved further away than ever before from Rogers' key educational goals. For example, a comparison between the years 1961 and 1975 shows a decreased interest in the Rogerian goals of self awareness and social justice.(29) It is possible to counter this claim by pointing out that in 1975 Jewish educators were more interested than ever before in the largely affective goal of "building Jewish identity." This however does not compensate for the absence of Rogerian concerns such as decision making, personal impact and other dynamics which are the basis of a commitment to educating for better self awareness.

This same study finds that Reform Jewish educators lack the requisite degree of self awareness necessary to implement a Rogerian "core condition" environment. (30) When asked to identify their pedegogical style a large majority chose to identify themselves as humanistic. Upon investigation most were found to operate along very traditional lines, especially in the elementary and the pre-Confirmation years. Gertman suggests various political and psychological rationale for the distorted

self perception. Regardless, the reality remains that many Reform educators do not yet possess either the political freedom or the personal capability to accurately evaluate themselves and therefore cannot be considered self-aware.

Many Reform educators are simply not in the position to implement the Rogerian philosophy. First of all, the majority of educators do not remain at the same job long enough to build up the necessary level of trust among students and parents.(31) More importantly, Gertman finds that "educators serving suburban congregations do not tend to have expertise in curriculum and in educational psychology."(32) For the average teacher such courses are necessary prerequisites for setting up a successful Rogerian climate.

Gertman also finds significant attitudinal barriers which prevent the implementation of the Rogerian approach. He observes that there is a tendency among Reform educators to underestimate the learning capacity of younger religious school students.(33) In other words, young children are not exposed to the wide range of subject matter that older children are exposed to. Teachers save the deeper and more diverse material for students in grades four and up.(34)

This tendency is especially ingrained in the case of sensitive subjects such as theology and sex ethics. Although most schools teach theology, the students of the most impressionable ages are given no theological instruction.(35) During the year under investigation social ethics were taught in

only fifty one per cent of Reform religious schools. Even then, only the students in grades seven and higher were exposed to them.(36) Students wishing a learning experience in the field of sexual ethics had also to wait until grade seven.(37) Rogers would also be interested to learn that only twelve percent of religious schools offered any instruction in sexuality. It is clear that the vast majority of Reform institutions are ignoring the social and personal issues of most concern to Rogers.

The study concludes that educator apathy is also an impediment to the utilization of creative approaches such as the Rogerian.(38) It reports that teachers tend to use innovative methods only when the troublesome or bored behavior of their students necessitates it. The younger children who are more easily satisfied by traditional modes of teaching receive just that.(39) This explains why class field trips, a mainstay for the Rogerian educator, are only implemented in grades six and up.(40)

Before discussing some of Rogers owm misgivings about the implementation of his approach, it is profitable to look at the reception received in Reform circles to the existentially based Confluent brand of humanistic education. This philosophy of education is the idea of William Cutter of the Los Angeles campus of the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion. It stresses learning through personal meanings and is a philosophy which calls for a cognitive/affective balance.(41) Although it does not provide a specific curriculum, this

approach is implemented in a large minority of Reform religious schools.(42)

The principles of Confluent education are in most cases identical to Rogerian principles. They are so similar that it is predicted that the implementation of the Rogerian approach will face some of the identical obstacles reported in conjunction with the implementation of the Confluent approach.

Cutter finds that many teachers are unable to successfully implement his approach due to their inflexibility. They are unable to tolerate the unexpected outcomes of spontaneous and honest discussion.(43) As well, they are very frustrated when spontaneous discussion hinders the implementation of their pre-planned goals.(44) Just as difficult for them is sitting back and letting students direct their own learnings. This is doubly difficult for teachers when there is a risk of student failure. Many teachers exhibit an overwhelming need to protect their charges from disappointment and sadness and so must interfere.(45) Cutter suggests that until teachers are made more self aware they will be unable to begin overcoming these obstacles.(46)

Cutter considers Confluent education an "artful approach which is choreographed with the utmost difficulty." He notes that it is particularly difficult for teachers to shift back and forth between course content and the personal meanings which their students bring to it.(47) He adds that most teachers never get to this practical stage because their attitudes prevent them

from it.(48)

Cutter alludes to other obstacles which exist outside the person of the teacher. He hints that some Reform Jewish educators criticize his approach for not providing a specific curricular model.(49) Others criticize his refusal to submit his approach to the rigors of scientific evaluation.(50) Still others malign the approach for being so liberal that it is incompatible with Reform Judaism. Cutter asserts that such criticism is the compensatory over reaction of liberal Jews who feel that they should be more religious and feel guilty because they are not. Unable to punish themselves, they direct their anger toward Confluent education.(51)

Although the Confluent and Rogerian philosophies are very similar, crucial differences between them do exist. These differences make the Confluent approach more readily acceptable than the Rogerian to the Reform Jewish community.

The first of these differences involves social class affiliation. The Confluent approach has no radical social agenda bound up with it. Cutter makes it clear that it is an ideologically neutral vessel which any group can use to advocate its own beliefs.(52) In reality the approach is developed for middle class needs. Cutter writes, "discussions are held which attempt to integrate people's needs with the prescribed imperatives of Jewish tradition and middle class society."(53) In sharp contrast, Rogers' approach is agnostic, antagonistic to the middle class and at best gives only cautious approval to the

participation of individuals within communal organizations.

Confluent education is also preferred by the Reform community because it offers students structure. Cutter's approach outlines long range goals.(54) It also sets up clear behavioral parameters for both teachers and students. Neither is offered absolute freedom, but is instead given a modified degree of independence which Cutter calls "self support." He offers "self support" because he does not consider absolute free choice to be in consonsance with the communal demands of Jewish tradition.(55) Cutter even goes so far to say that if done sensitively, it is legitimate for a teacher to impose his/her values upon students. He cautions Rabbis not to become glib in embracing the cliches of freedom.(56) Rogers on the other hand, considers any but the vaguest of goals harmful to the human spirit. Nor at any point does Rogers concern himself with behavioral parameters.

Rogers outlines many obstacles to an implementation of his own approach. He considers the most easily surmountable one coming from students who need to adjust to a more active role in the classroom.(57) He feels confident that parents will also be easily won over to his approach. He predicts some initial jealousy but is certain that as parents get involved in encounter groups that their jeaslousy over Rogers' success with their children will subside.(58) He also assumes that parents will be able to accept their childrens classroom disclosure about home life. Finally, Rogers is certain that he will be able

to allay parental fears that academic progress will suffer on account of his approach.

Rogers identifies his most stubborn opposition emerging from the professional teaching community.(59) He perceives teachers to be highly threatened by an approach which cares little about training and qualifications and reduces effectiveness to the ability to build relationships.(60) He understands that teachers are further threatened by an approach which calls on them to talk less and listen more.(61)

Rogers suggests that these teachers are victims of their own narrow thinking. Many continue to be baffled as to how academic excellence can be achieved alongside emotional growth.(62) These teachers castigate any colleague who appears to sell academic achievement short.

Rogers concludes that teachers simply do not like the thought of giving up the power that they now possess.(63) He suggests that any financial rationale brought agianst his approach is merely a cover up for the power issue.(64)

Whether based on the observations of scholars in education or Rogers himself, it is clear that the impediments to the implementation of the Rogerian philosophy within the Reform community are significant. Nevertheless, this author believes that there are many positive aspects within Rogers educational appraoch. These will be highlighted in the following section.

CHAPTER SIX

AN OVERALL ANALYSIS OF THE APPLICABILITY OF THE ROGERIAN PHILOSOPHY TO REFORM JEWISH EDUCATION

Rogers contends that the educational system improperly equips students to lead responsible and harmonious lives in today's world. He warns that schools can no longer afford to be mere repositories of facts and skills which hold little relevance to everyday concerns. He asks for a new emphasis on personal emotional growth, intergroup functioning and on the attainment of skills and information that students themselves deem relevant. For Rogers this is the essence of education regardless of the age or the life experience level of the student.

There is a real need to shift the goals of education in the direction which Rogers indicates. The average student spends a large part of his/her day in the classroom. This fact alone necessitates that the school take upon itself significant responsibility to teach life skills. No longer will the acquisition of facts or abstract formulae be the primary goal of education. Instead, schools will concentrate on teaching children various life skills, including the functional way to cope with conflict and the way to become a mature decision maker. In many homes such crucial lessons are not taught. This makes it doubly important that schools be in the forefront of

teaching and reinforcing these lessons in personhood. Without the stable and professional attempts of schools in this regard, children of tomorrow will have difficulty growing up as independent, critical thinking and socially able adults. Rogers most important message is that the schools must, above all else, teach their charges to be persons rather than receptacles for this or that subject matter.

There are those who attack Rogers' message and do so in an inflammatory and superficial manner. Theologians like Woods and Hunt are notorious among them for misrepresenting Rogers' approach.(1) They report that Rogers pays no heed to intellectual development and that his students grow up without requisite technical skills. They also claim that Rogers' students develop into self centered individuals who refuse to conform to social expectations and so corrode the social fabric. Such statements are based on a partial reading of Rogers and serve only to mask these critics real concern that Rogers is not a clear believer in a personal God.

Rogers' second area of concern is that the classroom is often times an inhumane place. The need to convey material takes precedence over the need to understand and communicate personal feeling, needs and meanings. To underscore his total dismay with this situation, Rogers formulated a group of core conditions which he argues must be present in order for successful learning to take place. These core conditons of empathy, warmth and unconditional positive regard remain the most succinct and

powerful statement on learning climate existing to date. Both the research and this author's teaching experience testify to their indispensability. Without them no significant learning can ever occur. This does not mean that there are no problems with them. As Rogers formulates them they are indeed incomplete, too unqualified and overemphasized.

In actual fact there should be at least two more core conditions. Somewhere Rogers should express the need to give behavioral boundaries as well as the need to provide students with appropriate levels of academic direction. As a result of this absence, it appears that Rogers is totally against the imposition of structure and expectations upon students. This is not a totally complete understanding of Rogers most complicated views on the subject. In reality he does see the need for some external guidelines. Still, based on the conspicuous absence of clear formulations to the contrary, Rogers is considered by some to be an extremist who advocates anarchy in the classroom.

Rogers makes it very easy for readers to misunderstand his total view. At points he comes out with totally unrealistic evaluations about the nature of students. He proposes that given a warm and accepting learning climate that a student cannot help but be a highly motivated and self disciplined individual. Anyone who is a parent or teacher knows how simplistic and untrue such an evaluation is. It is no wonder that over the years Rogers was never able to present research evidence proving the intrinsically good nature which he postulated. Most

important though, such extreme remarks tend to color his whole approach as unrealistic and do a disservice to the strengths found therein.

Nor is the writer certain just how seriously Rogers takes his own philosophical musings. Records of Rogers classroom interactions suggest that he is not as trusting of human nature as his philosophy suggests. Indeed Korczak suffers from the same inconsistency. His views about human nature are as "rose colored" as Rogers. In theory he also considers youths to be even more self disciplined and perceptive than adults. Despite his theoretical enthusiasms, Korczak is never reluctant to impose rules and expectations upon students.

A second fundamental flaw in the core conditions involves their application. Rogers naively believes that a student can never get too much of any core condition. My own experience as a teacher and social worker suggests otherwise. The presence, for example, of too much empathy is often times very threatening and otherwise counterproductive to the educational process.

The fatal flaw of the core conditions happens at the point that Rogers makes them more than the context of education. Rodway correctly observes that over time Rogers begins to consider empathy, warmth and regard as the very stuff of education rather than the prerequisites for it.(2) In this regard Rogers comes very close to the rhetoric of Buber. In theory Buber also believes that the only factor that facilitates learning is the presence of a deep personal teacher-student

relationship. Somehow the student learns all the lessons he/she needs in life just by participating in a deep relationship with the teacher. The fundamental difference between Rogers and Buber is that Buber only pays lip service to the centrality of relationship while in practise he very much relies on traditional pedagogic goals and methods to inform his classroom behavior.

Rogers' views on desired teacher qualities are inspiring and possess none of the flaws associated with the core conditions. His view that a teacher's greatest resource is his/her own life experience and emotional posture is very much applauded. In this regard he holds the identical view as Buber and Korczak. All three men rightly insist that teachers must look less for support from their accumulated degrees and professional demeanor and more to their own strength as well integrated emotional beings.

It is also curious that both Rogers and Buber agree that a teacher must not become a friend with his/her students. The writer feels that both men are correct, each for their own valid reasons. Friendship is not what most students want, it is often threatening to them and at its worst it encourages dependency.

Despite the flaws Rogers appears to be suggesting an improved direction for Jewish religious schools. Many Reform religious schools can benefit from a student centered education. As things stand today, students are left unchallenged and out in the cold. What they learn is too often not what is relevant to

them but rather what the teacher may know most about. As well, the material is taught in an uncreative manner at a pace that leaves only the slowest students feeling challenged. Given this sad state of affairs it is totally understandable how the primary role of most religious school teachers has become that of disciplinarian.

Such claims run to the heart of the system and are very threatening for teachers to hear. Put on the defensive, it is nearly impossible for them to give the Rogerian approach a fair hearing. Even if it receives a hearing it will not be implemented. Many teachers lack the self awareness and mastery of subject material necessary to shift back and forth between content and process. As Cutter underscores, it is very difficult to choreograph true humanistic education. Still other teachers are unwilling to give up the power and authority which accompanies the directive approach. Most teachers like to be "center stage" and feel cheated by the more passive role which a Rogerian approach requires of them.

Most teachers will mask their real concerns with various "smokescreen" critiques of Rogers. The first of these is that the Rogerian approach is anti-Jewish because it believes in situational ethics and stresses man as the final authority and meaning maker. Such opinions are probably prescribed to by the majority of North American Reform Jews and thus do not invalidate the Rogerian approach.

The second "diversionary" critique claims that Rogers does

not believe that a teacher should give direction or otherwise make interventions in the classroom. A closer look shows that he does insist that teachers guide and participate in the learning of their students. He asks teachers to intervene in direct inverse proportion to the students ability to guide their own learning.

Finally, there are teachers who complain that Rogers philosophy is irrelevant because he never provides a "play by play" instructional book on how to implement his philosophy. In truth, Rogers never provides such a tool. He is too inexperienced a teacher to ever do so. More than this though, the element of spontaneity which is so important to his philosophy could not have survived if such a tool had ever been provided. This is not to say that Rogers totally leaves teachers out in the cold. He provides teachers with a extensive list of learning resources meant to facilitate Rogerian learning.

At the same time, Rogers never provides learning objectives or sample curricula for his work in the classroom. Nor are there any objective third party reports describing just exactly what Rogers does in the classroom. Given the absence of such documents, it is impossible to ascertain exactly what is Rogers actual teaching approach. There are enough inconsistencies in his writings to make educators doubly suspicious that they can ever truly know exactly how Rogers acted with his students.

Vagueness is also the "Achilles heel" of Buber and Korczak. Their writings are unclear and show no attention to definitions,

criteria or detail.

There are too many flaws in the Rogerian approach to adopt it "wholesale" for the Reform movement. Yet we must give prominence to some of Rogers crucial messages including core conditions, teacher realness and the notion of facilitation. At the same time we are compelled to dismiss his position on student initiated learning.

It is fortunate that we can supplement Rogers' approach with that of Buber's. Buber's emphasis on structure and purpose can well be combined with Rogers stress on empathy and respect for the student's perspective. The two together can provide a finely balanced education for the Reform Jewish student of today. It is this balanced tenor which, from the outset, seems to be the tenor of the Korczakian approach.

What is unfortunate is that none of the three pedagogues provide a comprehensive "fleshing out" of their educational philosophies. It is the mandate of concerned Reform Jewish educators to develop these models.

CHAPTER SEVEN

A MODEL FOR BAR/BAT MITZVAH TRAINING FOR REFORM JEWISH ROGERIAN RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

Introduction and Purpose:

The Bar/Bat Mitzvah continues to be a prominent life cycle event among North American Jewry. Studies indicate that if Jewish parents expect nothing else of their children Jewishly, they do expect that they participate in a Bar/Bat Mitzvah ceremony. Given the centrality of this event in the North American Jewish psyche it is no surprise that Reform Temples spend much effort preparing Bar/Bat Mitzvah candidates.

Traditionally that preparation has focused on assisting candidates to master Hebrew and other liturgical skiils involved in a Sabbath service. Even today the vast majority of Reform Bar/Bat Mitzvah preparatory programs almost exclusively stress rote memorization of Hebrew.

Psychological research suggests that adolescents need much more stimulation than memorization offers. Ages twelve and thirteen should be a time of great emotional, social and intellectual activity.(1) It is at this time that teens want to question everything about themselves, including their Jewish identity. It is also a time when they want to learn how to work with others. Erikson warns of the particular importance of these watershed years in the healthy development of competent,

independent persons. Indeed, it is at this time that the adolescent either uses his/her energies to meet a diversified world or shrinks back into the safety of the maternal home.(2)

An appropriate Bar/Bat Mitzvah course should meet the particular needs of this age group. As well it must recognize the peculiar interests which teens have. Successful skill acquisition is one such interest. Students who emerge from this Rogerian course will have mastered the Hebrew for Torah, Haftorah and the central prayers. They will also have learned to chant. Yet there are several other of their interests which are usually totally neglected in Bar/Bat Mitzvah courses. Early adolescents are preoccupied with the need to be free to figure out who they are. As well, they are keenly interested in larger questions of meaning and want to determine for themselves what the "truth " is. Finally, they have a great desire to learn how to be genuine and fair with others.

Psychologists are also clear on what adolescents need from the teacher who prepares them for Bar/Bat Mitzvah.(3) Teens need to be heard and they need to be given work that they perceive to be relevant and serious. They also need to be given the message that they are trusted and that their efforts are important.

The Rogerian approach fits the particular needs and interests of the adolescent in very exciting ways. The empathy and nonjudgementalness which Rogers advocates are both the prerequisites and the lessons of adolescent education. Certainly the three core conditions will inform the classroom process in

the following paradigm.

Rogers also stresses emotional growth. Researchers report that, although teens need to understand their emotions, they resist focusing in on them.(4) At their age they are most concerned with how others feel about them and not how they themselves are feeling. Teachers are informed by this same research that if emotions are to be dealt with, that caution be taken that exposure is never forced and that no teen is ever ridiculed.(5) Certainly this position is in keeping with the relaxed spirit of Rogers' approach.

Carl Rogers has always been interested in giving young people freedom to explore both the events and people around them and the values within them. In doing so he has always strived for honesty and clarity. It is thus no surprise that the content of the following paradigm stresses honest intrapersonal investigation as well as keen investigation into the social and spiritual lives of diversified groups of persons.

It is only recently that Reform educators have begun to interest themselves in the developmental challenges of Bar/Bat Mitzvah preparation. It is the author's contention that Rogers' work can greatly inform them.

Based on the needs of the Jewish adolescent and the philosophy of Carl Rogers, there emerge two goals which form the foundation of this curriculum. The Reform Jewish Rogerian Bar/Bat Mitzvah student will be:

1) An honest person who can clearly express his/her own needs

and decisions within a group and who can democratically deal with the variant decisions of others.

2) A person who searches for a transcendent meaning to life and who can understand the variant meanings which other persons have given to life.

From these goals emerge certain guiding principles which further inform the curriculum.

Principles of a Reform Jewish Rogerian Bar/Bat Mitzvah Course:

The Reform Jewish Rogerian Bar/Bat Mitzvah student will be:

(1) A decision making person who actively participates in deciding what aspects of Judaism and related areas he/she will study.

(2) A sensitive person who recognizes the different needs of all persons and who will explore these.

(3) An affirming person who recognizes the inherent worth of all persons and can identify positive qualities in every person.

(4) A self determining person who believes in the right of all persons to believe, think and act in a manner of their own choice, providing that the freedom of all individuals is ensured.

(5) A spontaneous person who at all times welcomes open discussion about all aspects of life.

(6) A communicative person who can listen attentively and

be deeply empathic.

(7) A self aware person who is aware of the many influences which shape his/her life and can discern among them his/her own beliefs and feelings.

(8) A person who is his/her own locus of evaluation.

(9) A person who has high self esteem and a positive self concept, who can encourage the same in others.

(10) A spiritual person who feels his/her own smallness in contrast to the grandeur of the Universe,

(11) Knowledgeable about contemporary social problems and will explore personal ways of alleviating the suffering which they cause.

Hebrew Language Skills and the Rogerian Bar/Bat Mitzvah Curriculum:

The above principles do not stress the acquisition of Hebrew and liturgical skills. It is assumed that, concurrent to their participation in the Rogerian unit, students receive weekly tutorial sessions in those skills. For many, these tutorials will an extension of the Hebrew studies which Temples require of candidates for several years preceding the ceremony. For reasons of continuity it is best if the same teacher facilitates both the Rogerian unit and the Hebrew tutorials.

For the Bar/Bat Mitzvah ceremony the student of average skill will be encouraged to master the following:

a) Reading or chanting of eight verses form the Pentateuch.

b) Reading or chanting of eight verses from the Prophetical selection.

c) Reading or chanting of the central prayers, including the blessings for the reading of the Pentateuchal and Prophetical selection.

The Rogerian Bar/Bat Mitzvah Teacher:

The most engaging Rogerian principles will be sabatoged by the wrong sort of teacher or adult facilitator. The teacher who can successfully implement the Rogerian approach must above all be non-directive. A gentle and supportive demeanor is necessary in order to draw out of students their own feelings and personal meanings. Nothing is more damaging to educational growth than a non-validating or harsh teacher who attempts to dictate to others what their course of learning should be.

The ideal teacher must also be relevant. It is the existential concerns of students which must be addressed. The skillful Rogerian teacher will be able to make some linkages between the thought of years past and contemporary concerns. When this is not possible, the teacher must be guided by student feedback to put aside irrelevant material.

The relevant teacher also has at his/her command a multiplicity of resources which students may draw upon. The teacher must be able to realistically evaluate how easily students can access these materials. In turn, he/she must be available to provide appropriate assistance.

The ideal teacher is not only called upon to share his/her

time and resources. Of utmost importance is the teacher's ability to share his/her feelings and to express them in a tolerant, clear and nondefensive manner. It is especially in this regard that the Rogerian teacher acts as a role model. This does not mean that the teacher should be a friend to students. It is prohibited for a teacher to become so enmeshed in the lives of students that his/her influence becomes overbearing or prevents student self sufficiency.

The entire interaction of the teacher depends on the extent to which he/she is self aware. For example, the teacher who does not understand his/her own need to be needed will be unable to stop unnecessarily interfering in the educational lives of students. Nor will the unaware teacher be able to treat each child with warmth and non-judgementalness. Until personal biases are uncovered and compensated for, teachers will remain trapped in a subconscious net they know little about. Sensitivity to self is the fertile ground into which Rogerian attitudes and strategies must be sown.

The teacher who teaches the Bar/Bat Mitzvah course should also possess some mastery of the liturgical and Hebrew skills necessary for participation in this life cycle event. It is assumed that these traditional skills will be taught in conjunction with the paradigm that follows.

The candidates overall success in Bar/Bat Mitzvah preparation cannot ultimately be judged by his/her liturgical prowess. It is the student's speech given during the actual

ceremony which must serve as the tool for evaluation. The course succeeds to the extent that the adolescent's remarks are relevant, sensitive and thoughtful.

What follows are the details and sample curricula for the Rogerian Bar/Bat Mitzvah course.

SETTING: The sample curricula are designed for use in a medium sized Reform congregation. Classes meet on a weekly basis after regular school hours. Their duration is determined by the participants, with one and a half hours being the suggested length. Recesses are determined according to the wishes of the majority. The classroom where these sessions are held is to be furnished with comfortable seating and carpeting. There should also be room to hang posters if participants so desire.

PARTICIPANTS: Eight students is an optimum number when working with adolescents. If numbers are greater then another group should be formed. This number should be evenly divided between males and females. An adult facilitator will be present at all sessions. Guests will only be invited upon the request of the majority of the participants.

Objectives:

A. Cognitive: Participants will be able to:

1) Determine three study topics which are relevant to the group as prospective B'nai Mitzvah.
2) Demonstrate an effort to make the learning environment condusive to learning.
3) Devise a group plan for studying those subjects of interest.

4) Clearly outline personal learning expectations.

5) Identify criteria by means of which they can ascertain their learning progress.

6) Identify and explain to others four personal Jewish beliefs.

7) Identify two Jewish beliefs and/or practises shared with their parents.

8) Identify two Jewish beliefs and/or practices not shared with their parents.

9) Defend the above two beliefs/practises on the basis of their own life experience.

10) Explore the beliefs and practises of a Jewish community and describe three Jewish beliefs/practises which are different from the ones they hold.

11) Support the above communities reasons for engaging in those beliefs/practises which they do not hold.

12) Identify and tell about a social problem which effects persons in their city.

13) Report the personal story of a person in their community who is effected by the above social problem.

14) Identify one place in Jewish scripture where there is a message about each one of the following: self determination, human suffering and spirituality.

15) Identify in the scriptures of other religions one message on spirituality.

16) Differentiate two ways in which the way they treat suffering persons is effected by their being Jewish.

17) Identify two actions which can be taken in their community that will alleviate the suffering of others.

18) Describe in three different ways what it means to be spiritual.

19) Identify six events/situations/people that make them feel spiritual.

20) Explore whether there is a distinction between believing in God and feeling spiritual.

21) Identify two causes of stress which can be associated with a Bar/Bat Mitzvah.

22) Compose a scrapbook which accurately describes their memories of the Bar/Bat Mitzvah event.

23) Identify two ways in which their post Bar/Bat Mitzvah Jewish identities can be developed.

B. Affective: Participants will be able to:

1) Identify three occasions when the needs of others in the group were recognized and three times when they were not.

2) Identify five groundrules for appropriate interpersonal communication.

3) Recognize and label twenty feeling states existing in one's self and other group members.

4) Paraphrase any statement made by group members.

5) Identify three feelings which they will take away from the Bar/Bat Mitzvah experience.

As budding adolescents, children of Bar/Bat Mitzvah age possess a great deal of new potential. Often this energy is

defeated by adults who do not allow them to experiment and make some serious choices for their own lives. What is instead the case is that adults impose their own values and images on these children. The attempt to mold often creates much tension and open revolt. Lesson plans one and two attempt to support the adolescent in his/her quest to experiment and be independent.

LESSON PLAN #1-Decision Making

(1) Objectives A.1,A.3.(See above)

(2) Content/Resources: chairs, string, video camera, four biographies of Soviet refusniks of different ages [available from local Soviet Jewry committee], resource cart, poster paper, crayons.

(3) Mode of Learning: large and small group discussion, role plays, brainstorming.

(4) Strategy/Learning Experience:

A. Set Induction- Bring students into classroom where chairs are strewn and strings are tied between chairs. Video tape students reaction and play it back to them. Especially note proactive and reactive responses. Ask students whether people go through life passively reacting to what has been placed before them or whether they choose their own actions, values, etc.

B. Facilitator leads brainstorming. Students recall television shows in which characters let others choose how they would feel or act and what their beliefs would be.

C. Each group of two students is given a biography of a Soviet refusnik. They are to list the times when that refusnik

was given no choice in his/her actions, beliefs, etc.. Each dyad is given a choice of either composing a poster or a role play about what it feels like to have no choice.

D. Facilitator shares with the group one action or belief which he/she had little or no choice in adopting. He/she explains how he/she felt. Next he/she explains that in school students often have no choice in what they want to learn or how they will learn it.

E. To introduce students to a new classroom method of learning the facilitator will divide the group into dyads. He/she will instruct the pairs to teach each other the Hebrew blessings before and after the Torah reading. Students have fifteen minutes to accomplish this task. Students are notified that if they choose they may use the instructional tapes and books which are on the resource cart in the far corner of the room.

F. Large group discussion on pros and cons of learning in this manner.

G. Students are asked to brainstorm on topics of interest to them as prospective B'nai Mitzvah. Before doing so they are given time to look through the resource cart which has materials on political, social and religious topics which are related to Judaism.

H. Group must agree on three topics of mutual interest and must determine a plan for studying those topics. Facilitator only guides the group process when asked or when the group

appears to be floundering.

(5) Time: The session should last about one hour and twenty minutes. The breakdown for the eight experiences is as follows: A-8 minutes. B- 5 minutes. C- 20 minutes. D- 5 minutes. E- 15 minutes. F- 5 minutes. G- 10 minutes. H- 10 minutes.

(6) Room:Large classroom.

(7) Evaluation: The teacher will ask students to privately write a few words about their impressions of the lesson. The teacher will ensure that the comments will be kept anonymous and confidential. The teacher collects the evaluations and integrates them.

LESSON PLAN #2-Being True to Self

(1) Objectives:A.6,A.7,A.8,B.1,B.2,B.3,B.4.(See Above)

(2) Content/Resources: Questionnaire on Jewish identity [see attached], collections of Jewish and general poetry, role play cards, several household magazines, blackboard, three parents.

(3) Mode of learning: large and small group, role plays.

(4) Strategy/Learning Experience:

A. Set Induction-Ask students who they are and write down their responses on the blackboard. Hand out a questionnaire on Jewish identity and ask students and parents to prioritize the list of Jewish beliefs and practices according to their importance to them.

B. Ask for volunteers to role play difficult scenarios in Jewish identity which involve parents and children. Facilitator

encourages adults and children to take on the part of the other. [Sample scenarios: a) You are considering purchasing a German made car and your Holocaust survivor parents are upset. What do you do? b) You make your school basketball team, and then find out that the games are played on Friday nights when you usually go to synagogue with your parents. Will you do anything about it? c) You overheard a friend of your parents say that all non-Jews are stupid and uncultured. What do you do?]

(C) Large group discussion of what parents and children felt that they needed to protect in their respective positions.

(D) Facilitator emphasizes that parents and children both have different needs according to their different stages in life. He/she then goes on to explore how similar parents and children are in their beliefs and practises as Jews. The results of two random questionnaires are placed on the board and discussed. There will most likely be some diferences between the generations. If no one else does so, the facilitator points out that some differences are natural because we are all individuals.

E) Large group breaks into dyads and finds poetry which talks about being true to oneself. i.e. Hugh Prather. Notes to Myself. Love and Courage.

F) Large group will brainstorm on reasons why a person might feel pressured into acting contrary to his/her beliefs and values. In dyads participants will look at magazine advertisements to ascertain some additional reasons why people

may act differently than their own beliefs and values would suggest. Facilitator and students differentiate between proud and unproud reasons for maintaining one's own position.

(G) Facilitator reads Midrash of Abraham destroying his father's idols. This story represents the importance of having one's own values and beliefs while at the same time communicating them in a appropriate manner. Focus on the ending and ask group if this is an appropriate way for a person to go about standing up for his/her own needs, values and beliefs. Have participants experiment with different endings to the story. Facilitator will emphasize the importance of respectful and open communication between individuals each struggling to be true to themselves.[The teacher relates that although Abraham was converted to Judaism his parents were not. The Rabbis have it that his father operated a shop which sold religious symbols for the polytheisic religion which he practised. In his religious zeal Abraham stormed into the shop and destroyed all the inventory.]

(5) The lesson should last about seventy minutes. The breakdown of the seven learning experiences is as follows:A- 5 minutes. B- 20 minutes. C- 5 minutes. D-10 minutes. E- 10 minutes. F-10 minutes. G- 10 minutes.

(6) Room: One large room.

(7) Evaluation: Group writes down impressions of the lesson. Those who volunteer share comments with the entire group. The teacher collects all comments for his/her perusal.

Developmental psychologists report that it is important for adolescents to be exposed to diverse aspects of life. They add that early teenagers are particularly interested in questions of fairness.(6) Lesson three presented below reflects both the above aspects. These same researchers affirm that adolescence is a time of questioning about meaning in life and personal identity. It is during these important years that teens develop their first real loyalties to philosophies or groups which offer meaning. Lesson four below addresses this developmental need of the students involved.

LESSON PLAN #3-Social Awareness

(1) Objectives: A.13,A.14,A.16,A.17,B.3,B.4 (See Above)

(2) Content/Resources: video of local newscast, two guests (with first hand knowledge of social problems), two Rabbinic selections on suffering.

(3) Mode of Learning: activities, presentations, large and small groups.

(4) Strategy/Learning Experience:

A. Set Induction: Facilitator shows video of evening newscast. He/she then asks how many do not watch the news because it is too depressing, boring (i.e. numbing effect).

B. Facilitator introduces two guests who each are personally effected by a local social problem (i.e. poverty, neglect of the elderly, physical handicap). The large group is divided into two. Each group must develop a list of questions and then proceed to interview one of the guests. After the

interviews students regroup and report their findings to the class.

(C) Large group brainstorms on a list of human rights for those who suffer.

(D) Large group divides into two. Each subgroup is given a Rabbinic text to interpret. These texts emphasize the feelings of those who suffer.

(E) Groups of four present their interpretation of the Rabbinic selection to the large group.

(F) Volunteers role play on seeing the world through "suffering eyes".

(G) Class decides on a social problem which they would like to follow through the newspapers. They discuss the logistics of making a scrap book out of their study.

(H) As a summary, facilitator and students compose two sayings on suffering.

(5) Time: The session should last about ninety minutes. The breakdown for the eight experiences is as follows: A- 5 minutes. B- 45 minutes. C- 10 minutes. D- 5 minutes. E- 5 minutes. F- 5 minutes. G- 10 minutes. H- 5 minutes.

(6) Room: One large room.

(7) Evaluation: By first giving his/her own honest evaluation, the teacher encourages group members to publicly present their own evaluations.

LESSON PLAN #4-Spirituality

(1) Objectives: A.10,A.11,A.19,A.20,B.1,B.3,B.4. (See

Above)

(2) Content/Resources: Collection of records which the facilitator considers spiritual, books on American Indian and Oriental religions, books and recordings of the religious practises of two lesser known Jewish communities (i.e. the Morrocan and Ethiopian), art supplies.

(3) Mode of Learning: Large and small groups, activities.

(4) Strategy/Learning Experience:

A. Set Induction- Large group brainstorms on what they are feeling and thinking when they are moved spiritually.

B. Facilitator presents two songs which are spiritually moving for him/her. He/she explains what feeling spiritual is about for him/her.

C. Large group divides into two with each subgroup exploring the religious rituals of the American Indian or Oriental person. Subgroups decide where to place each ritual on a spirituality scale of least to most spiritual.

D. Each subgroup now takes one of the lesser known Jewish communities and explore their rituals. After compiling a list of rituals they must place these on the same spirituality scale. Next they must take what they considered a ritual of lesser spiritual quality and explain why the community maintains the practise. The class regroups and the subgroups present arguments that may take the form of role plays, artwork, etc.

E. The large group now brainstorms on objects/thoughts/persons that make them feel spiritual.

Facilitator points out areas of commonality and may choose to present some notions of what Jewish theologians have considered spiritual.

F. Large group divides into dyads. Each pair develops a spirituality collage which expresses some of the objects/thoughts/persons which make them feel spiritual.

(5) Time: The session should last about eighty five minutes. The breakdown for the six learning experiences is as follows. A- 5 minutes. B- 10 minutes. C- fifteen minutes. D- 25 minutes. E- 10 minutes. F- 20 minutes.

(6) Room: One large room.

(7) Evaluation: By publicly presenting his/her own honest and clear self evaluation, the teacher will encourage students to do the same.

LESSON PLAN #5-Follow-up

Note: Adolescence is a time of emotional upheaval but it is not a stage when persons particularly like to look at their emotions. During the teen years individuals feel extremely vulnerable and so are wary of disclosing emotions.(7) As well, they are more interested in how they appear to others then in what they are feeling. These factors make emotional growth during adolescence difficult.

In an attempt to encourage teens to reflect on both their lives and their emotions, the Rogerian unit offers a post Bar/Bat Mitzvah ceremony session. On this occasion students are able to undertake safe reflection about the life cyle event. At

the same time they will be given a chance to put some formal closure on it. In turn, they will be introduced to future options in the development of their Jewish identity.

(1) Objectives A.21,A,22,A.23,B.5 (See above)

(2) Content/Resources:Bar/Bat Mitzvah questionnaire [See Stephen Rittner. Creative Bar/Bat Mitzvah Teaching pgs.27-29], graph, pictures, momentos from the Bar/Bat Mitzvah day (i.e. special response cards, napkins), scrapbook, camera, refreshments.

(3) Mode of Learning: large and small group discussion, role plays, guests.

(4) Strategy/Learning experience:

A. Set Induction- Have students once again fill out the values questionnaire they completed upon first beginning the course. Have them plot out their reponses on a graph to see if they have changed.

B. Facilitator shares some reflections about "great and terrible" moments in his/her Bar/Bat Mitzvah "weekend". He/she then explains that since his/her day, that new social factors have made for different pressures at Bar/Bat Mitzvah time (i.e. blended families, transiency, increased rate of intermarriage). The class will role play two or three scenarios around these issues.[Sample scenarios: a) You have just moved from a different city and you hardly know any kids to invite to your Bar/Bat Mitzvah. Does it matter to you? b) Your parents are divorced. You live with your natural mother and stepfather. You

do not see your natural father but would like to invite him to your Bar/Bat Mitzvah. Your mother is opposed. How do you feel?]

C. Students spend time composing a scrapbook to remember their Bar/Bat Mitzvah weekend. One page of the collection is devoted to the Bar/Bat Mitzvah class. The group poses for a picture which may go on this page. Students may also trade autographs, handprints etc. to go on this page.

D. The class brainstorms on things they would like to do/study/see in order to develop their future Jewish identity. If applicable, the facilitator may share some of his/her own experiences in this regard.

F. Refreshments are served and the session concludes with a party.

(5) The session should last about eighty minutes. The breakdown for the four learning experiences is as follows: A-10 minutes. B- 20 minutes. C- forty minutes D-10 minutes.

(6) Room: One large room.

(7) Evaluation: By first giving his/her own honest evaluation, the teacher encourages group members to publicly present their own evaluations.

Questionnaire on Jewish Identity

What Characterizes Me as a Jew?

In the spaces provided below you are requested to give ten different answers to the question" What beliefs and practises characterize me as a Jew?". Try to list things which characterize you as a Jew at present.

In order to complete this activity, we need maximum quiet and concentration. This questionnaire may be shared with the group but will remain anonymous.

1).....

2).....

3).....

4).....

5).....

6).....

7).....

8).....

9).....

10).....

FOOTNOTES

Rationale

1) Bennett, J., "Towaards a Synthesis of Reform Jewish Education," (Rabbinic Thesis. Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, 1984) p. 46.

CHAPTER ONE

1) Rogers, C., Freedom to Learn, p. vi.

2) Rogers, C., "Toward a Modern Approach to Values: The Valueing Process and the Mature Adult," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology (1964), p. 160.

3) Rogers, C., Freedom to Learn in the Eighties, p. 2-3.

4) Rogers, C., Freedom to Learn, p. vii.

5) Rogers, C., Freedom to Learn in the Eighties. p. 198.

6) Ibid., pgs. 198, 217.

7) Rogers, C. Freedom to Learn, p. 158.

8) Ibid., p. 73.

9) Ibid.

10) Ibid., p. 279.

11) Ibid., p. 288.

12) Ibid., p. 286.

13) Rogers, C., On Becoming a Person, p. 114.

14) Ibid., p. 36.

15) Hiemstra, W., "About Rogers' Philosophy of Man," Journal of Pastoral Care (1964), p. 32.

16) Ibid., p. 33.

17) Rogers, C., Client Centered Therapy, p. 489.

18) Rogers, C., On Becoming a Person, p. 91.

19) Ibid., p. 92.

20) Rogers, C., Freedom to Learn, p. 291.

21) Ibid., p. 291.

22)Rogers,C., Freedom to Learn,p.24.

23)Evans,R.I., Carl Rogers:The Man and His Ideas,p.65.

24)Ford,A. "Toward Immediacy-the Core Conditions and Communications Training" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Alberta,1979), p.18.

25)Ibid.,p.236.

26)Ibid.,pgs.172,177,183.

27)Ibid.,pgs.26,177.

28)Ibid.,p.178.

29)Ibid.,p.183.

30)Rogers,C., Freedom to Learn,p.169.

31)Rogers,C., On Becoming a Person,pgs.32-35.

32)Ibid.,p.35.

33)Ibid.,p.32.

34)Ibid.,p.33.

35)Rogers,C., Client Centered Therapy,p.217.

36)Rogers,C., Freedom to Learn,pg.228.

37)Ibid.,p.229.

38)Ibid.,p.228.

39)Ibid.,p.230.

40)Rogers,C., On Becoming a Person,pg.55.

41)Rogers,C., Freedom to Learn,p,166.

42)Rogers,C., On Becoming a Personp.34.

43)Ibid.,p.50.

44)Rogers,C., Carl Rogers on Personal Power,p.84.

45)Rogers,C., Freedom to Learn.p.112.

46)Evans,R.I., Carl Rogers:The Man and His Ideas,p.38.

47) Rodway, P., Carl Rogers: Bridge to Social Work Practice p. 13.

48) Rogers, C., On Becoming a Person, p. 50.

49) Rodway, P., Carl Rogers: Bridge to Social Work Practice p. 14.

50) Ibid., p. 17.

51) Rogers, C., Client Centered Therapy, p. 112.

52) Ibid.

53) Rogers, C., Freedom to Learn, pgs. 164-65.

54) Rodway, P., Carl Rogers: Bridge to Social Work Practice, p. 19.

55) Rogers, C., Freedom to Learn in the Eighties, pgs. 184-185.

56) Rogers, C., "Questions I Would Ask Myself If I Were a Teacher" Journal of Education (1975), p. 138.

57) Evans, R. I., Carl Rogers: The Man and His Ideas, p. 80.

58) Milhollan, F., Forisha, B., From Skinner to Rogers: Contrasting Approaches to Education, p. 117.

59) Rodway, P., Carl Rogers: Bridge to Social Work Practice, p. 21.

60) Evans, R. I., Carl Rogers: The Man and His Ideas, p. 81.

61) Shulman, L., The Skills of Helping Individuals and Groups, p. 46.

62) Ibid.

63) Ibid., p. 11.

64) Ibid., p. 73.

65) Ibid., p. 5.

66) Ibid.

67) Ibid. p. 4.

68) Ibid. p. 142.

69) Ibid. p. 5.

70) Rogers, C., Carl Rogers On Personal Power, p. 70.

71) Rogers, C., Freedom To Learn, pgs. 9, 144.

72) Ibid., p.144.

73) Tenenbaum, S., "Rogers and Non-Directive Teaching," Educational Leadership (1959), p.297.

74) Rogers, C., "Questions I Would Ask Myself If I Were a Teacher," Journal of Education (1975), p.139.

75) Ibid., p.134.

76) Tenenbaum, S., "Rogers and Non-Directive Teaching," Educational Leadership (1959), p.301.

77) Rogers, C., Freedom To Learn, p.140.

78) Ibid., p.136.

79) Rogers, C., "Questions I Would Ask Myself If I Were a Teacher," Journal of Education (1975), p.136.

80) Rogers, C., Freedom To Learn, p.131

81) Ibid.

82) Ibid., p.132.

83) Shulman, L., The Skills of Helping Individuals and Groups, p.89.

84) Rogers, C., "Questions I Would Ask Myself If I Were a Teacher," Journal of Education (1975), p.137.

85) Rogers, C., Freedom To Learn, p.154.

86) Ibid., p.201.

87) Ibid., pgs.196-97.

88) Ibid., p.144.

89) Ibid., p.135.

90) Rogers, C., Carl Rogers on Encounter Groups, p.7.

91) Rogers, C., Freedom To Learn, p.134.

92) Ibid., p.133.

93) Ibid., p.134.

94) Ibid., pgs.54.

95) Ibid., p.13.

96) Ibid.,p.15.

97) Ibid.

98) Ibid.,p.20.

99) Ibid.,p.17.

100) Rogers,C., Freedom to Learn in the Eighties,p.71.

101) Ibid.,p.58.

102) Ibid.

103) Rogers,C., Freedom To Learn,pgs.32,36,37.

104) Ibid.,p.43.

105) Ibid.,p.42.

106) Ibid.

107) Ibid.,p.32.

108) Rogers,C., Freedom To Learn In the Eighties,p.73.

109) Ibid.

110) Ibid.,p.168.

111) Ibid.,pgs.167,214,215.

112) Ibid.,p.202.

113) Rogers,C.,"The Project at Immaculate Heart:An Experiment in Self Directed Change," Journal of Education(1970),p.172.

114) Rogers,C., Freedom to Learnp.328.

115) Ibid.,p.195.

116) Ibid.,p.333.

117) Ibid.,p.329.

118) Ibid.

119) Rogers,C.,"The Project at Immaculate Heart:An Experiment in Self Directed Change," Journal of Education(1970),p.194.

120) Ibid.,p.198.

121) Ibid.,p.186.

122) Ibid.,p.187.

123) Ibid.

124) Ibid.

125) Ibid.p.232.

126) Griggs,P., "A Study of a Teachers Corps Project in Inner-City Louisville," (Ph.D. dissertation,Northwestern University,1972)pgs.3-8.

127) Rogers,C., Freedom To Learn,p.117.

128) Ibid.,p.118.

129) Ibid.

130) Rogers,C., Freedom To Learn In the Eighties,p.221.

131) Ibid.,p.73.

132) Ibid.,pgs.208,209.

133) Ibid.

134) Ibid.

135) Ibid.p.221.

136) Ibid.p.217.

137) Rogers,C., Freedom To Learn,pgs.59,60.

138) Ibid.,pgs.60,131-32.

139) Rogers,C.,"Questions I Would Ask Myself If I Were a Teacher," Journal of Education(1975),p.137.

140) Rodway,P., Carl Rogers:Bridge to Social Work Practice,p.64.

141) Ibid.,p.63.

142) Evans,R.I., Carl Rogers:The Man and His Ideas,pgs.158-163.

143) Ibid.,p.159.

144) Ibid.

145) Rogers,C., Carl Rogers On Personal Power,p.31.

146)Evans,R.I., Carl Rogers:The Man and His Ideas,pgs.103,162,164,165.

147)Ibid.,p.165.

148)Ibid.

149)Ibid.,p.169.

150)Ibid.

151)Rogers,C.,"Toward a Modern Approach To Values:The Valueing Process in the Mature Adult," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology(1964),p.162.

152)Ibid.

153)Rodway,P., Carl Rogers:Bridge to Social Work Practice,p.71.

154)Rogers,C., Carl Rogers On Personal Powerpgs.105,123.

A Rogerian Critique

1)Jamison,W.,"Carl Rogers-A Philosophical and Educational Critique" (Ph.D. dissertation.University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill,1974)pgs.2,3.

2)Ibid.,pgs.24-31.

3)Ibid.,p.137.

4)Frank,R.,"Carl Rogers-Self,Freedom and Education" (Ed.D. dissertation. University of Massachusetts,1973)p.100.

5)Ibid.,p.90.

6)Jamison,W.,"Carl Rogers-A Philosophical and Educational Critique" (Ph.D.dissertation,University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill,1974)p.40.

7)Ibid.p.62.

8)Ibid.

9)Ibid.,p.37.

10)Ibid.,p.i.

11)Evans,R.I. Carl Rogers:The Man and His Ideas,p.xxxvi.

12)Ibid.

13)Ibid.

14) Ibid.

15) Jamison, W., "Carl Rogers-A Philosophical and Educational Critique," (Ph.D. dissertation, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1974) p.148.

16) Ibid., p.149.

17) Ibid., p.161.

18) Ibid., p.82.

19) Ibid., p.84.

CHAPTER TWO

1) Hanna-Mortkowicz, O., Mister Doctor, p.8.

2) Kulawiec, E., "Janusz Korczak: A Unique Educator," Women's American ORT, (1981), p.7.

3) Wolins, M., ed. Selected Works of Janusz Korczak, p.viii.

4) Ibid., p.498.

5) Savitz, H., "Janusz Korczak: Physician, Author, Educator, Child Psychologist and Martyr of Nazi Persecution," (Name of Publication Unknown), p.38.

6) Wolins, M., ed. Selected Works of Janusz Korczak, p.vi.

7) Ibid.

8) Ibid., p.493.

9) Ibid., p.468.

10) Ibid., pgs.469, 486.

11) Ibid., p.489.

12) Ibid., p.498.

13) Ibid., p.474.

14) Ibid., p.468.

15) Ibid., p.473.

16) Ibid., p.466.

17) Ibid., p.476.

18) Ibid.

19) Ibid., pgs.12, 13.

20) Ibid., p.12.

21) Ibid., p.14.

22) Ibid., p.39.

23) Ibid., p.15.

24) Ibid.

25) Ibid.,p.14.

26) Ibid.

27) Ibid.,p.492.

28) Ibid.,p.213.

29) Ibid.,p.76.

30) Ibid.,p.218.

31) Piziali,P.,"A Historical Study of the Origin and Current Status of Child Advocacy Concepts with Particular Attention to the Contributions of Janusz Korczak,"(Ph.D.dissertation,George Washington University,1981)p.70.

32) Wolins,M.,ed. Selected Works of Janusz Korczak.p.76.

33) Kurzweil,Z., Modern Trends in Jewish Education.pgs.182,183.

34) Piziali,P.,"A Historical Study of the Origin and Current Status of Child Advocacy Concepts with Particular Attention to the Contributions of Janusz Korczak,"(Ph.D.dissertation.George Washington University,1981)p.70.

35) Wolins,M.,ed. Selected Works of Janusz Korczak.p.240.

36) Ibid.

37) Ibid.p.130.

38) Ibid.,p.3.

39) Ibid.,p.489.

40) Ibid.p.49.

41) Ibid.,p.76.

42) Ibid.,p.64.

43) Ibid.,p.122

44) Ibid.,p.482.

45) Ibid.,p.486.

46) Ibid.,p.469.

47) Ibid.

48) Ibid.,p.87.

49) Ibid.,p.xxxviii

50) Ibid.,pgs.8,9,67.

51) Ibid.,p.479.

52) Ibid.,p.58.

53) Ibid.

54) Piziali,P.,"A Historical Study of the Origin and Current Status of Child Advocacy Concepts with Particular Attention to the Contributions of Janusz Korczak,"(Ph.D.dissertation,George Washington University,1981)p.76.

55) Wolins,M.ed. Selected Works of Janusz Korczak,p.479.

56) Wolins,M.ed. Selected Works of Janusz Korczak,p.71.

57) Ibid.

58) Piziali,P.,"A Historical Study of the Origin and Current Status of Child Advocacy Concepts with Particular Attention to the Contributions of Janusz Korczak,"(Ph.D.dissertation,George Washington University,1981)p.76.

59) Wolins,M.ed. Selected Works of Janusz Korczak,p.71.

60) Ibid.

61) Ibid.,p.xxxvii.

62) Ibid.,p.73.

63) Ibid.,p.54.

64) Ibid.,p.89.

65) Ibid.,p.196.

66) Ibid.

67) Ibid.,p.xxxvii.

68) Ibid.

69) Ibid.,p.xxxiv.

70) Kurzweil,Z., Modern Trends in Jewish Education,p.175.

71) Wolins,M.ed. Selected Works of Janusz Korczak,p.485.

72) Piziali,P.,"A Historical Study of the Origin and Current Status of Child Advocacy Concepts with Particular Attention to the Contributions of

Janusz Korczak,"(Ph.D.dissertation,George Washington University,1981)p.81.

73)Ibid.

74)Ibid.

75)Kurzweil,Z., Modern Trends in Jewish Education,p.193.

76)Wolins,M.ed. Selected Works of Janusz Korczak,p.55.

77)Ibid.

78)Piziali,P.,"A HIstorical Study of the Origin and Current Status of Child Advocacy Concepts with Particular Attention to the Contributions of Janusz Korczak,"(Ph.D.dissertaion,George Washington University,1981)p.89.

79) Kohlberg,L., The Philosophy of Moral Development.p.407.

80)Ibid.,p.406.

81)Ibid.,p.407.

82)Wolins,M.ed. Selected Works of Janusz Korczak,p.205.

83)Ibid.,p.153.

84)Ibid.

85)Ibid.

86)Kurzweil,Z., Modern Trends in Jewish Education,p.190.

87)Ibid.,pgs.192,194.

88)Ibid.,p.192.
89)Kohlberg,L., The Philosophy of Moral Development.p.405.

CHAPTER THREE

1)Goodblatt,Rabbi P.,"Five Basic Concepts of Martin Buber's Philosophy of Education:A Critical Analysis,"(Ph.D.dissertation,University of California, Los Angeles,1976)p.3.

2)Ibid.,p.49.

3)Gutnick,N., Martin Buber:Implications for Social Work,p.5.

4)Ibid.

5)Goodblatt,Rabbi P.,"Five Basic Concepts of Martin Buber's Philosophy of Education:A Critical Analysis,"(Ph.D.dissertation,University of California, Los Angeles,1976)pgs.50,77.

6)Ibid.,p.60.

7)Wenger,E.,"Implications of the Thought of Martin Buber for the Teaching /Learning Process in Christian Education,"(Ph.D.dissertation,Northwestern University,1964)p.119.

8)Goodblatt,Rabbi P.,"Five Basic Concepts of Martin Buber's Philosophy of Education,"(Ph.D.dissertation,University of California,Los Angeles,1976)p.53.

9)Schaeder,G., The Hebrew Humanism of Martin Buber,p.210.

10)Ibid.

11)Buber,M., Between Man and Man,p.78.

12)Ibid.,p.79.

13)Ibid.

14)Goodblatt,Rabbi P.,"Five Basic Concepts of Martin Buber's Philosophy of Education,"(Ph.D.dissertation,University of California,Los Angeles,1976) p.29.

15)Schaeder,G., The Hebrew Humanism of Martin Buber,p.210.

16)Buber,M., Between Man and Man,p.152.

17)Ibid.,p.10.

18)Friedman,M., Martin Buber:the Life of Dialogue,p.123.

19)Buber,M., Pointing the Way,p.111.

20)Buber,M., Between Man and Manpgs.30,31.

21)Ibid.,p.87.

22) Ibid.

23) Ibid.

24) Ibid.,p.88

25) Buber,M., A Believing Humanism.p.119.

26) Buber,M., Between Man and Man.p.88.

27) Buber,M., A Believing Humanism.p.95.

28) Buber,M., A Believing Humanismp.133.

29) Buber,M., Between Man and Man.p.91

30) Buber M., Israel and the World:Essays in a Time of Crisis.p.210.

31) Ibid.,p.171.

32) Buber,M., Between Man and Man.p.91.

33) Buber,M., Pointing the Way.p.20.

34) Ibid.,p.21.

35) Ibid.p.110.

36) Buber,M., Israel and the World:Essays in a Time of Crisis.p.95.

37) Buber,M., A Believing Humanism,p.169.

38) Buber,M., Between Man and Man.p.95.

39) Ibid.,pgs.95,105.

40) Buber,M., Between Man and Man.p.102.

41) Buber,M., Pointing the Wayp.98.

42) Buber,M., Between Man and Man,p.111.

43) Buber,M., Pointing the Way.p.98.

44) Ibid.

45) Buber,M., Between Man and Man.p.111.

46) Ibid.

47) Buber,M., Israel and the World:Essays in a Time of Crisis.p.41.

48) Ibid.,p.42.

49) Ibid.

50) Ibid.,p.43.

51) Ibid.,p.45.

52) Ibid.

53) Ibid,p.48.

54) Ibid.

55) Ibid.p.47.

56) Ibid.

57) Ibid.,p.48.

58) Ibid.

59) Ibid.

60) Buber,M., Between Man and Manp.105.

61) Ibid.

62) Wenger,E.,"Implications of the Thought of Martin Buber for the Teaching/Learning Process in Christian Education,"(Ph.D.dissertation, Northwestern University,1964)p.185.

63) Ibid.,p.119.

64) Ibid.,p.125.

65) Goodblatt,Rabbi P.,"Five Basic Concepts of Martin Buber's Philosophy of Education:A Critical Analysis,"(Ph.D.dissertation,University of California, Los Angeles,1976)p.29.

66) Ibid.

67) Buber,M., A Believing Humanism.p.139.

68) Ibid.

69) Ibid.

70) Ibid.

71) Buber,M., I and Thou.p.23.

72) Buber, M., Between Man and Man, p. 125.

73) Buber, M., Pointing the Way, p. 81.

74) Ibid., pgs. 9, 224.

75) Ibid.

76) Ibid.

77) Buber, M., A Believing Humanism, pgs. 60, 101.

78) Ibid., p. 149.

79) Ibid., p. 172

80) Evans, R. I., Carl Rogers: The Man and His Ideas, p. 82.

81) Buber, M., A Believing Humanismp. 138.

82) Gove, P., ed. Websters Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary. p. 996.

83) Goodblatt, Rabbi P., "Five Basic Concepts of Martin Buber's Philosophy of Education: A Critical Analysis," (Ph. D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1976), p. 29.

84) Buber, M., The Origin and Meaning of Hassidism, p. 44.

85) Wenger, E., "Implications of the Thought of Martin Buber for the Teaching/Learning Process in Christian Education," (Ph. D. dissertation, Northwestern University, 1964) p. 59.

86) Goodblatt, Rabbi P., "Five Basic Concepts of Martin Buber's Philosophy of Education: A Critical Analysis," (Ph. D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1976) p. 49.

87) Ibid., p. 83.

88) Schaeder, G., The Hebrew Humanism of Martin Buber, p. 206.

89) Wenger, E., "Implications of the Thought of Martin Buber for the Teaching/Learning Process in Christian Education," (Ph. D. dissertation, Northwestern University, 1964) p. 120.

90) Kohanski, A., Martin Buber's Philosophy of Interhuman Relations, p. 8.

91) Goodblatt Rabbi P., "Five Basic Concepts of Martin Buber's Philosophy of Education: A Critical Analysis," (Ph. D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1976) p. 124.

92) Buber, M., Between Man and Man, p. 95.

93) Goodblatt Rabbi P., "Five Basic Concepts of Martin Buber's Philosophy of Education: A Critical Analysis," (Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1976) p. 10.

94) Buber, M., Between Man and Man, p. 305.

95) Ibid.

96) Ibid.

97) Ibid., p. 9.

98) Buber, M., Meetingsp. 9.

99) Buber, M., Israel and the World: Essays in a Time of Crisis, p. 187.

100) Buber, M., The Origin and Meaning of Hassidism, p. 23.

101) Buber, M., Israel and the World: Essays in a Time of Crisis, p. 187.

102) Buber, M., The Origin and Meaning of Hassidism, p. 128.

103) Ibid.

104) Buber, M., Between Man and Man, p. 105.

105) Buber, M., Pointing the Wayp. 7.

106) Buber, M., The Origin and Meaning of Hassidism, p. 147.

107) Ibid., p. 44.

108) Ibid.

109) Ibid., p. 43.

110) Ibid., p. 147.

111) Ibid., p. 43.

112) Ibid., pgs. 142, 149.

113) Ibid., p. 234.

114) Ibid., p. 210

115) Ibid., p. 71.

116) Ibid., p. 60.

117) Ibid.

118) Ibid.,p.71.

119) Ibid.,p.42.

120) Ibid.

121) Ibid.,p.52.

122) Ibid.,pgs.52,82..

123) Ibid.,p.148.

124) Ibid.

125) Ibid.,p.128.

126) Ibid.,p.140.

127) Ibid.,p.128.

128) Ibid.,p.42

129) Ibid.

130) Goodblatt,Rabbi P.,"Five Basic Concepts of Martin Buber's Philosophy of Education:A Critical Analysis,"(Ph.D.dissertation,University of California, Los Angeles,1976)p.29.

131) Herberg,W., The Writings of Martin Buber,p.224.

132) Ibid.

133) Buber,M., Between Man and Man,p.94.

134) Goodblatt,Rabbi P.,"Five Basic Concepts of Martin Buber's Philosophy of Education:A Critical Analysis,"(Ph.D.Dissertation,University of California, Los Angeles,1976)p.206.

135) Ibid.

136) Buber,M., Between Man and Man,p.101.

137) Goodblatt,Rabbi P.,"Five Basic Concepts of Martin Buber's Philosophy of Education:A Critical Analysis,"(Ph.D.dissertation,University of California, Los Angeles,1976)p.55.

138) Ibid.

139) Ibid.,p.52.

140) Buber,M., A Believing Humanism,p.128.

141) Buber, M., Pointing the Way, p.8.

142) Ibid.

143) Ibid., p.105.

144) Ibid., p.98.

145) Buber, M., A Believing Humanism, p.101.

146) Ibid., pgs.101, 126.

147) Goodblatt, Rabbi P., "Five Basic Concepts of Martin Buber's Philosophy of Education: A Critical Analysis," (Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1976) p.xii.

148) Ibid. pgs.175, 178, 184.

149) Buber, M., Pointing the Way, p.112.

150) Herberg, W., The Writings of Martin Buber, p.240.

151) Buber, M., A Believing Humanism, p.123.

152) Ibid., p.115.

153) Ibid., p.140.

154) Buber, M., Pointing the Way, p.110.

155) Herberg, W., The Writings of Martin Buber, p.240.

156) Buber, M., Israel and the World: Essays in a Time of Crisis, p.90.

157) Buber, M., A Believing Humanism, pgs.140, 141.

158) Ibid., p.141.

159) Buber, M., A Believing Humanism, p.140.

160) Buber, M., Between Man and Man, p.158.

161) Ibid.

162) Buber, M., A Believing Humanism, p.34.

163) Ibid., p.22.

164) Ibid., p.119.

165) Herberg, W., The Writings of Martin Buber, p.269.

166) Buber, M., Between Man and Man, p. 113.

167) Buber, M., The Origin and Meaning of Hasidism, p. 138.

168) Buber, M., Between Man and Man, p. 113.

169) Berkowitz, E. A Jewish Critique of the Philosophy of Martin Buber. p. 5

170) Wenger, E., "Implications of the Thought of Martin Buber for the Teaching/Learning Process in Christian Education," (Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University, 1964) p. 122.

171) Ibid., p. 131.

172) Ibid.

173) Weinstein, J. Buber and Humanistic Education. p. 45.

174) Buber, M., Between Man and Man, p. 104.

175) Weinstein, J. Buber and Humanistic Education. p. 45.

176) Buber, M., Israel and the World: Essays in a Time of Crisis, p. 170.

177) Buber, M., A Believing Humanism, p. 94.

178) Ibid.

179) Ibid. pgs. 133, 201, 243.

180) Buber, M., Pointing the Way, p. 112.

181) Ibid., p. 172.

182) Herberg, W., The Writings of Martin Buber, p. 93.

183) Ibid., p. 135.

184) Buber, M., Isreal and the World: Essays in a Time of Crisis, p. 109.

185) Ibid., p. 110.

186) Herberg, W., The Writings of Martin Buber, p. 140.

187) Ibid. p. 136.

188) Buber, M., Pointing the Way, p. 114.

189) Ibid.

190) Ibid., p. 102.

191) Ibid.,pgs.98-102.

192) Ibid.

193) Wenger,E.,"Implications of the Thought of Martin Buber for the Teaching/Learning Process in Christian Education,"(Ph.D.dissertation, Northwestern University,1964)p.156.

194) Goodblatt,Rabbi P.,"Five Basic Concepts of Martin Buber's Philosophy of Education:A Critical Analysis,"(Ph.D.dissertation,University of California, Los Angeles,1976)pgs.78,79.

195) Ibid.

196) Buber,M., Between Man and Man,p.16.

197) Buber,M., Pointing the Way,p.164.

198) Wenger,E.,"Implications of the Thought of Martin Buber for the Teaching/Learning Process in Christian Education,"(Ph.D.dissertation, Northwestern University,1964)p.176.

199) Buber,M., Israel and the World:Essays in a Time of Crisis,p.100.

200) Ibid.

201) Ibid.p.176.

202) Ibid.p.178.

203) Ibid.p.177.

204) Wenger,E.,"Implications of the Thought of Martin Buber for the Teaching/Learning Process in Christian Education,"(Ph.D.dissertation, Northwestern University,1964)p.179.

205) Goodblatt,Rabbi P.,"Five Basic Concepts of Martin Buber's Philosophy of Education:A Critical Analysis,"(Ph.D.dissertation,University of California, Los Angeles,1976)pgs.182,184,205.

206) Buber,M., Between Man and Man,p.92.

207) Ibid.
208) Ibid.

209) Buber,M., Israel and the World:Essays in a Time of Crisis,p.146.

210) Ibid.,p.147.

211) Ibid.

212) Ibid.,p.148.

213) Ibid.

214) Ibid.

215) Ibid.,p.193.

216) Ibid.

217) Buber,M., Pointing the Wayp.66.

218) Buber,M., Meetings,p.34

219) Buber,M., Pointing the Way,p.66.

220) Wenger,E.,"Implications of the Thought of Martin Buber for the Teaching/Learning Process in Christian Education,"(Ph.D.dissertation, Northwestern University,1964)p.147.

221) Buber,M., Pointing the Wayp.145.

222) Ibid.

223) Ibid.

224) Friedman,M., Martin Buber:the Life of Dialoguep.180.

225) Buber,M., Between Man and Man,p.3.

226) Buber,M., A Believing Humanismp.230.

227) Buber,M., Pointing the Way,p.3.

228) Ibid.,p.4.

229) Ibid.

230) Ibid.

231) Ibid.

232) Ibid.,p.7.

233) Ibid.,p.4.

234) Goodblatt,Rabbi P.,"Five Basic Concepts of Martin Buber's Philosophy of Education:A Critical Analysis,"(Ph.D.dissertation,University of California, Los Angeles,1976)p.175.

235) Ibid.

236) Buber, M., Pointing the Way p.60.

237) Ibid., p.117.

238) Ibid.

239) Ibid.

240) Ibid., p.193.

241) Ibid., p.222.

242) Ibid., p.145.

243) Ibid.

244) Ibid., p.143.

245) Ibid., p.145.

246) Ibid.

247) Ibid.

248) Ibid.

249) Ibid.

250) Buber, M., Israel and the World: Essays in a Time of Crisis, p.87.

251) Herberg, W., The Writings of Martin Buber, pgs.129, 141.

252) Buber, M., Israel and the World: Essays in a Time of Crisis, p.86.

253) Ibid.

254) Ibid., p.86.

255) Ibid., p.177.

256) Ibid., p.178.

257) Buber, M., Israel and the World: Essays in a Time of Crisis, p.35.

258) Ibid., p.20.

259) Reines, A. Elements in a Philosophy of Reform Judaism. p.53.

260) Ibid.

261) Ibid.

262) Ibid.

263) Buber, M., Israel and the World: Essays in a Time of Crisis, p.97.

264) Herberg, W., The Writings of Martin Buber, p.26.

265) Buber, M., A Believing Humanism, p.114.

266) Herberg, W., The Writings of Martin Buber, p.38.

267) Ibid., p.241.

268) Ibid.

269) Ibid.

270) Buber, M., The Origin and Meaning of Hassidism, p.318.

271) Ibid., p.48.

272) Buber, M., Between Man and Man, p.92.

273) Ibid., p.102.

274) Buber, M., Israel and the World: Essays in a Time of Crisis, p.184.

275) Friedman, M., Martin Buber: the Life of Dialogue, p.128.

276) Ibid., p.142.

277) Buber, M., A Believing Humanism, p.105.

278) Buber, M., Israel and the World: Essays in a Time of Crisis, p.185.

279) Ibid., p.184.

280) Ibid., p.169, 170.

281) Ibid.

282) Ibid., p.38.

283) Ibid.

284) Ibid., pgs.192, 212.

285) Ibid., p.180.

286) Buber, M., A Believing Humanism, p.115.

287) Ibid., p.116.

288) Buber, M., Pointing the Way, p. 119.

289) Buber, M., Israel and the World: Essays in a Time of Crisis, p. 180.

290) Friedman, M., Martin Buber: the Life of Dialoque, p. 277.

291) Buber, M., Israel and the World: Essays in a Time of Crisis, p. 16.

292) Herberg, W., The Writings of Martin Buber, p. 308.

293) Buber, M., Israel and the World: Essays in a Time of Crisis, p. 141.

294) Herberg, W., The Writings of Martin Buber, p. 143.

295) Buber, M., A Believing Humanism, p. 130.

296) Buber, M., Between Man and Man, p. 57.

297) Ibid., p. 141.

298) Ibid., p. 57.

299) Buber, M., A Believing Humanism, p. 130.

300) Goodblatt, Rabbi P., "Five Basic Concepts of Martin Buber's Philosophy of Education: A Critical Analysis," (Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1976) p. 80.

301) Ibid., p. 48.

302) Ibid., p. 9.

CHAPTER FOUR

1) Evans, R. I., Carl Rogers: The Man and His Ideas, p. 70.

2) Rogers, C., Freedom To Learn, p. 101.

3) Ibid.

4) Evans, R. I., Carl Rogers: The Man and His Ideas, p. 25.

5) Ibid.

6) Rogers, C., Freedom To Learn, p. 101.

7) Evans, R. I., Carl Rogers: The Man and His Ideas, p. 70.

8) Friedman, M., ed. The Knowledge of Man, p. 166.

9) Ibid., p. 182.

10) Ibid., p. 183.

11) Ibid., p. 184.

12) Ibid.

13) Ibid., p. 183.

14) Ibid., p. 170.

15) Ibid., p. 175.

16) Ibid., p. 173.

17) Goodblatt, Rabbi P., "Five Basic Concepts of Martin Buber's Philosophy of Education: A Critical Analysis". (D.Ed dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1976) p. 103

18) Ibid.

19) Gordon, H., "Realizing Martin Buber's Educational Philosophy: An Examination of Martin Buber's Educational Thought and It's Relation to Kibbutz Education," (Ph.D. dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1980) p. 45.

20) Ibid.

21) Goodblatt, Rabbi P., "Five Basic Concepts of Martin Buber's Philosophy of Education: A Critical Analysis," (Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1976) p. 84.

22) Kurzweil, Z., Modern Trends in Jewish Education, p. 197.

23) Ibid.

24) Rodway, P., Carl Rogers: Bridge to Social Work Practice, p.91.

25) Kohlberg, L., The Philosophy of Moral Development, p.406.

26) Ibid., p.407.

CHAPTER FIVE

1)Cutter,W.,"Present Status Of Jewish Education," CCAR Yearbook,(1973) p.168.

2)Ibid.

3)Borowitz,E.,"Facing the Future of Jewish Education," Jewish Education (1977),p.34.

4)Ibid p.33.

5)Cutter,W.,"Present Status of Jewish Education," CCAR Yearbook,(1973) p.168.

6)Borowitz,E.,"Facing the Future of Jewish Education," Jewish Education, (1977)p.38.

7)Ibid.

8)Ibid.p.35

9)Ibid.

10)Cutter,W.,"Present Status of Jewish Education," CCAR Yearbook,(1973) p.172.

11)Ibid.

12)Borowitz,E.,"Facing the Future of Jewish Education," Jewish Education(1977),p.38.

13)Ibid.,p.37.

14)Cutter,W.,"Present Status of Jewish Education," CCAR Yearbook,(1973) p.168.

15)Borowitz,E.,"Facing the Future of Jewish Education," Jewish Education(1977),p.38.

16)Bennett,J.,"Towards a Synthesis of Reform Jewish Education,"(Rabbinic thesis,Hebrew Union College-JIR, 1984)pgs.227,234,242.

17)Borowitz,E.,"Facing the Future of Jewish Education," Jewish Education(1977),p.36.

18)Bennett,J.,"Towards a Synthesis of Reform Jewish Education,"(Rabbinic thesis,Hebrew Union College-JIR,1984)pgs.236,237,244.

19)Teller,G.,"Humanistic Education:A Clarification of it's Meaning for Jewish Education,"(Ph.D. dissertation,Wayne State University,1976)p.24.

20) Bennett, J., "Towards a Synthesis of Reform Jewish Education," (Rabbinic thesis, Hebrew Union College-JIR, 1984) p. 256.

21) Ibid., p. 228.

22) Ibid.

23) Ibid.

24) Evans, R. I., Carl Rogers: The Man and His Ideas, pgs. 162, 163.

25) Rogers, C., Carl Rogers On Personal Power, p. 90.

26) Teller, G., "Humanistic Education: A Clarification of its Meaning for Jewish Education," (Ph. D. dissertation, Wayne State University, 1976) pgs. 18. 40.

27) Ibid., p. 39.

28) Ibid., p. 103.

29) Gertman, Rabbi S., "And You Shall Teach Them Diligently"-A Study of the Current State of Religious Education in the Reform Movement, p. 49.

30) Ibid., p. 40.

31) Ibid., p. 13.

32) Ibid., p. 15.

33) Ibid., p. 33.

34) Ibid., p. 39.

35) Ibid., p. 37.

36) Ibid., pgs. 36, 37, 38.

37) Ibid.

38) Ibid., p. 40.

39) Ibid., p. 4.

40) Ibid., p. xii.

41) Cutter, W., "Affect and Cognition in Jewish Education-Some Comments on the Promise of a Project," Jewish Education (1978), p. 22.

42) Gertman, Rabbi S., "And You Shall Teach Them Diligently"-A Study of the Current State of Education in the Reform Movement, p. 19.

43) Cutter, W., "Affect and Cognition in Jewish Education-Some Comments on

the Promise of a Project," Jewish Education(1978),p.23.

44)Ibid.

45)Ibid.,p.28.

46)Ibid.,p.24.

47)Ibid.,p.23.

48)Ibid.

49)Ibid.,p.31.

50)Ibid.

51)Ibid.

52)Ibid.,p.28.

53)Ibid.

54)Ibid.,p.24.

55)Ibid.,p.29.

56)Cutter,W.,"Present Status of Jewish Education," CCAR Yearbook,(1973) p.171.

57)Rogers,C.,"Questions I Would Ask Myself If I Were a Teacher" Journal of Education(1975),p.107.

58)Rogers,C., Carl Rogers On Personal Power,pgs.78,81.

59)Evans,R.I., Carl Rogers:The Man and His Ideas,p.xxx.

60)Farson,R.,"A Quiet Revolutionary," Education(1974),p.25.

61)Rogers,C., On Becoming a Person,p.309.

62)Rogers,C., Freedom To Learn In the Eighties,p.24.

63)Farson,R.,"A Quiet Revolutionary," Education(1974),p.25.

64)Rogers,C., Carl Rogers On Personal Power,p.96.

CHAPTER SIX

1)Jamison,W., "Carl Rogers-A Philosophical and Educational Critique," (Ph.D.dissertation,University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill,1974)pgs16,23.

2)Rodway,P. Carl Rogers:Bridge to Social Work Practice,p.21.

CHAPTER SEVEN

1)Winokur,H., "A Psychosocial Analysis of Jewish Life Cycle Liturgy," (Rabbinic Thesis,Hebrew Union College-JIR,1976)pgs.36-38.

2)Ibid.,p.37.

3)Ibid.,p.41.

4)Ibid.,p.40.

5)Ibid.

6)Ibid.

7)Ibid.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Works Cited and Consulted

Martin Buber

Berkowitz, Eliezer. A Jewish Critique of the Philosophy of Martin Buber. New York: Yeshiva University Press, 1962.

Buber, Martin. Tales of the Hasidim:The Early Masters. New York: Schocken Books, 1947.

Buber, Martin. The Origin and Meaning of Hasidism. New York:Harper and Row,1966.

Buber, Martin. Israel and the World:Essays in a Time of Crisis. New York: Schocken Books, 1948.

Buber, Martin. The Way of Man According to the Teaching of Hasidism. London: Boutledge and Paul, 1950.

Buber, Martin. Pointing the Way. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957.

Buber, Martin. Between Man and Man. New York: Macmillan Co.,1965.

Buber, Martin. I and Thou. New York: Charles Scribner and Sons, 1970.

Buber, Martin. Meetings. La Salle, Illinois, 1973.

Cohen, A. [illegible]. Tel Aviv: Yachdav,1976.

Dianon, N. Martin Buber:Jewish Existentialist. New York: Oxford University Press, 1960.

Friedman, M. Martin Buber:the Life of Dialoque. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976.

Friedman, M.ed. The Knowledge of Man. London: G. Allen and Unwin, 1957.

Goodblatt, Pincus. "Five Basic Concepts of Martin Buber's Philosophy of Education: A Critical Analysis". D.Ed. dissertation. University of California, Los Angeles. 1976.

Gordon, Haim. "Realizing Martin Buber's Educational Philosophy: An Examination of Buber's Educational Thought and its Relation to Kibbutz Education", D.Ed. dissertation.George Peabody College for Teachers. 1980.

Gutnick, N. Martin Buber:Implications for Social Work. Calgary: University of Calgary. 1979.

Herberg, W. The Writings of Martin Buber. Cleveland: World Publishing Co., 1970.

Herberg, W. Four Existential Theologians. New Jersey: Associated University Press, 1982.

Kohanski, A. Martin Buber's Philosophy of Interhuman Relations. New Jersey: University Press, 1982

Schaeder, G. The Hebrew Humanism of Martin Buber. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1973.

Schlipp, P.and Friedman, M. The Philosophy of Martin Buber. La Salle, Illinois: Open Court Publishing Co., 1967.

Weinstein, J. Buber and Humanistic Education. New York: Philosophical Library, 1975.

Wenger, Eugene, "Implications of the Thought of Martin Buber for the Teaching /Learning Process in Christian Education". Ph.D. dissertation. Northwestern University. 1964.

Zink, W. Martin Buber. Bonn: Hohwacht-Verlag, 1978.

Janusz Korczak

Cohen, A. _____. Tel Aviv: _____, 1973.

Falkowska, M. A Chronology of the Life, Activities and Works of Janusz Korczak. Warsaw: Kosciuszko Foundation, 1978.

Hanna-Mortkowicz, O. Mister Doctor. London: Peter Davies, 1965.

Jaworski, Marek. Janusz Korczak. Warsaw: Interpress Publishing, 1978.

Kohlberg, L. The Philosophy of Moral Development. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1981

Korczak, Janusz. _____. Israel: Ghetto Fighters Publishing House, 1974.

Korczak, Janusz. The Ghetto Years. New York: Holocaust Library, 1978.

Kulaweic, Ed. The Warsaw Ghetto Memoirs of Janusz Korczak. Washington,D.C.: University Press of America, 1978.

Kulaweic, Ed. "Janusz Korczak-A Unique Educator." Womens American ORT (Jan. 1981):7

Kurzweil, Z. Modern Trends in Jewish Education. New York: Thomas Yoseloff, 1964.

Piziali, P. "A Historical Study of the Origin and Current Status of Child Advocacy Concepts with Particular Attention to the Contributions of Janusz Korczak".Ph.D. dissertation. George Washington University, 1981.

Savitz,H. "Janusz Korczak:Physician, Author, Educator, Child Psychologist and Martyr of Nazi Persecution." Publication Unknown

Wolins, Martin. Selected Works of Janusz Korczak. Warsaw: National Science Foundation, 1967.

Carl Rogers

Borton, J. "Reform Without Politics in Louisville." Saturday Review (Jan. 1972): 36-42.

Cole, A. "A Personal Struggle With Religion: Significant Fact in the Lives and Work of the First Psychologists." Journal of Religion (April 1982): 71-77.

Evans, Richard. Carl Rogers: The Man and His Ideas. New York: E.P. Dutton and Co., 1975.

Farson, R. "Carl Rogers: Quiet Revolutionary." Education (Winter 1974): 32-37.

Ford, A. "Immediacy, the Core Conditions and Communication Training-An Exploration of Interrelationships." Ph.D. dissertatioon. University of Alberta. 1979.

Frank, R. "Carl Rogers-Self, Freedom and Education." Ed.D. dissertation. University of Massachusetts. 1973.

Glaser- Kirschenbaum, H. "Carl Rogers- the Study of a Psychologist and Educator." Ed.D. dissertation. Temple University. 1975.

Griggs, P. "A Study of a Teachers Corps Project in Inner-City Louisville." Ph.D. dissertation. Northwestern University,1972.

Heimstra, F. "The Nature of Man." Journal of Pastoral Care (Winter, 1964): 34-38.

Jamison, W. "Carl Rogers: A Philosopical and Educational Critique." Ph.D. dissertation. Loyola University of Chicago. 1961

Martin, Francis. " A Study of Carl Rogers Philosophy of Persons and its Implications for Church Education." Ph.D. dissertation. Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. 1973.

May, Rollo. Existential Psychologists. New York: Random House, 1961.

Millholen. Forisha. From Skinner to Rogers. New York: Delacorte Press, 1977.

Rodway, P. Carl Rogers:Bridge to Social Work Practice. Calgary: University of Calgary, 1980.

Rogers, C. Client Centered Therapy: Its Current Practice, Implications and Theory. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1951.

Rogers, C. On Becoming a Person. Massachusetts: Riverside Press, 1961.

Rogers, C., "Toward a Modern Approach to Values:the Valueing Process in the Mature Adult." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology (Winter,1964): 160-167.

Rogers, C., Stevens, B. Person to Person California: Real People Press, 1967.

Rogers, C. Freedom to Learn Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1969.

Rogers, C. "Questions I Would Ask Myself If I Were a Teacher." Journal of Education (Winter,1974): 134-140.

Rogers, C. Carl Rogers on Personal Power. New York: Delacorte Press, 1977.

Rogers, C. Freedom to Learn in the Eighties. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1983.

Rogers, C. "The Project at Immaculate Heart: An Experiment in Self Directed Change." Journal of Educational Psychology (Oct. 1983): 172-196.

Shulman, L. The Skills of Helping Individuals and Groups. Illinois: Peacock Press, 1979.

Tenenbaum, S. "Rogers and Non-Directive Teaching." Educational Leadership (Feb.,1959): 296-303

General and Jewish Education

Bennett, J. "Towards a Synthesis of Reform Jewish Education." Rabbinical Thesis. Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion (Cincinnati). 1984.

Bogot, Howard. "Foundations for Change: Perspectives on Process" Journal of Reform Judaism (Spring ,1982): 69-74.

Borowitz, Eugene. "Facing the Future of Jewish Education" Jewish Education (Spring,1977): 33-40.

Chazan, B. The Language of Jewish Education New York: Hartmore House, 1967.

Cutter, William. "Present Status of Jewish Education" CCAR Yearbook (1973): 167-173.

Cutter, William. "Affect and Cognition in Jewish Education: Some Comments on the Promise of a Project." Jewish Education (Spring,1978): 22-31.

Denton, D. Existentialism and Phenomenology in Education. New York: Teacher's College Press, 1974.

Gertman, Stuart. And You Shall Teach Them Diligently- A Study of the Current State of Religious Education in the Reform Movement. New York: N.A.T.E., 1977.

Greene, M. Existential Encounters for Teachers. New York: Random House, 1967.

Lesnoff-Caravaglia, G. Education as Existential Possibility. New York: Philosophical Library, 1972.

Reines, A. Elements in a Philosophy of Reform Judaism. Cincinnati: Institute of Creative Judaism Press, 1976.

Rich, J. Innovations in Education: Reformers and Their Critics. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1981.

Teller, Gerald. "Humanistic Education: A Clarification of its Meaning for Jewish Education." Ph.D. dissertation. Wayne State University. 1976.

Van Cleve, M. Existentialism in Education. New York: Harper and Row, 1966.

Winokur, H. "A Psychosocial Analysis of Jewish Life Cycle Liturgy." Rabbinical Thesis. Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institue of Religion (Cincinnati). 1984.

Wirsing, M. Teaching and Philosophy:A Synthesis. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1972.