

McDonald, Milo Fr.
American Ed...
c.2 AAM 8134

114678

AMERICAN EDUCATION:

The Old,

The Modern

and The "New"



MILO F. McDONALD

Copyright, 1952

By

MILO F. McDONALD

All Rights Reserved

Printed in the United States of America

**AMERICAN EDUCATION:
THE OLD, THE MODERN AND THE "NEW"**

By

MILO F. McDONALD, Ph.D., Litt.D.

American Education Association
New York

INTRODUCTION

This booklet has been written to present in compact form the essential facts connected with the development of those unfortunate tendencies which characterize our present day American public schools. We are of the opinion that the steady demand that there has been and still is for "Progressive" Poison in Public Education, the booklet we published last year, shows the American public to be genuinely interested in the public school systems of the several states and in the atheistic influences, with socialistic objectives, which are steadily undermining them. Professional school people and parents of children attending the public schools are desirous of ascertaining how the presently deplorable situation was conceived, who originated it and who is currently supporting it. For the purpose of answering these questions, in relatively brief form, this booklet was brought into existence. We hope it fills a present need. We hope it will promote a clearer understanding of the activities of those who are endeavoring to build a new social order in the United States of America, through the schools, as was done in Russia between 1917 and 1933.

The challenge is real. The enemies of our schools are to be found in the ranks of the "Progressives", the leadership of the National Education Association and the founders of the John Dewey Society who, with their followers have, for many years, been endeavoring to gain control over American education. They are endeavoring to change the whole social and political structure of our country by means of an educational program in our schools and the doctrine of the "freedom of self-expression". The unfortunate fact is that they have been to date notoriously successful. Their path has, however, within the past decade been beset by obstacles. These obstacles have been placed in the path of the Socialists in education by many men and women, throughout our country, who fully realize the goal the sponsors of the "new" American education seek to attain and are determined to prevent them.

The Social Frontiersmen of the "new" education, the leadership of the National Education Association and the "leftists" of both communistic and socialistic character, who are identical in all but the tactics they employ, now realize that their opponents are resolved to stop the further progress of "progressive" education in this country. So the true enemies of American education are now following the Soviet strategy and calling, in magazine articles, on platforms and over radio and television systems those who are opposing the further spread of anti-American doctrines in our public schools: "enemies of public education".

So the battle is joined. Last year we published "Progressive' Poison in Public Education" in an effort to clarify the issues involved. We were heartened by the reception accorded it. Now we present "American Education — The Old, The Modern and The 'New'." Our aim is to portray the history of "progressive" education, to show how old many of its cliches are, to indicate clearly how the "new" education which its supporters would fasten upon the public school systems of this country is in its history identified with those whose main hope is to destroy the United States of America which they regard as the last defense of Western civilization and in the process, Christianity upon which that civilization is founded. That hope is, of course, ultimately doomed to disappointment but in the meantime those now in our schools are in grave moral danger by reason of the type of education being offered and the dishonest practices being fostered by it. We are enemies of "Progressives". We hope our ranks may be swelled by others who will interest themselves in the "new" education, its origins and its objectives. In the hope that we may gain their interest this booklet has been written.

MILO F. McDONALD

June 1, 1952

American Education: The Old, The Modern and The "New"

The Old American Education

With the exception of Georgia all the American colonies were established during the seventeenth century. They were for the most part English in origin and with the exception of Maryland were constituted of adherents of Protestantism. The early settlers in Maryland were Catholic. Practically all the people who came to the New World from Europe were Christians. These essential facts account for the type of educational effort that was made in the early days of our country.

European Influences

The type of education that was established in the New World tended to pattern itself after the seventeenth century European model. England was famous for her many universities, her Latin schools and her academies. In the New World similar institutions arose in the life of each colony — some in the early life and some in the Revolutionary War period. All these institutions were characterized by religious atmospheres and practices. All were privately supported. Most were able to carry on by reason of philanthropic endowments. All were intended for the sons of those colonists who were in better financial circumstances. The colleges established in America were divinity schools. They existed for the purpose of preparing young men for the Christian ministry. Many young men of wealthy families were sent to England for their collegiate education.

In addition there were in America in colonial times dame schools. These were numerous particularly in New England and New York. These dame schools were for the younger children. The instruction was all tutorial, the teachers were not especially well prepared and came from the ranks of the town spinsters and soldiers who had returned wounded from their participation in conflicts with the Indians. In these dame schools tuition was charged. It is true, however, that schools

also existed for the poorer children. These charity schools, as they were called, were not public institutions but were supported by organized philanthropic groups interested in the education of the poor. Except for elementary education, that is, except for the work done by the dame and the charity schools, which accommodated both sexes, no provision was made for the education of girls.

All the schools were under church control and religious instruction constituted a most important part of their work. Ethical ideals were also an essential part of the curriculum in all colonial schools. The religious strains and stresses in the mother country strengthened the belief among the colonists that the religious note should permeate all school work. The too frequent unfortunate result, as we know from our study of history, was to fasten upon the New World the misunderstandings, prejudices and hates of seventeenth century Europe. Yet the colonists had knowingly migrated, it is true, to a land of opportunity, but also to one of danger and of struggle. They had done so, in large part, so that they might preserve their religious beliefs and practices. While we cannot commend or approve the bigotry and narrow-mindedness that followed their insistence upon their sectarian biases, we can understand the reason for them. Colonial America became in accordance with their inherited beliefs ardently Christian and vigorously Protestant. This Protestant Christianity was reflected by the schools they established in all the colonies, with the exception of Maryland, which, in its early days, as we have said, was Catholic.

Maryland had been established in 1634 by Leonard Calvert, second son of George Calvert, the first Lord Baltimore, at whose request the charter granting him proprietary rights was granted by his friend, King Charles I, of England. It was in Maryland, says Bancroft, that "Religious liberty obtained a home, its only home in the wide world." The purpose of the first Lord Baltimore in founding the colony of Maryland was to establish in the New World a refuge for Irish families of the Catholic faith who had been dispossessed from their homeland, the County of Ulster, in Ireland, by the action of the English government to make room for Scotch immigrants. Through the practical Christianity of the proprietor and the subsequent ratification of his recommendation by the Maryland assembly in 1649 freedom of religious worship was granted to all Christians in the colony. The famous "Toleration Act" of Maryland read:

"That no person or persons professing to believe in Jesus Christ, shall from henceforth be any ways troubled, molested or discountenanced for or in respect of his or her religion"

The Toleration Act of Maryland was in strong contrast, it must and is generally admitted to be, with the lack of consideration shown in the other colonies of Christians for Christians whose theological concepts differed from theirs. As a matter of fact the tolerance exhibited by the people of Maryland became in brief time the means of their undoing. When in the year following the promulgation of the Toleration Act the Puritans of Virginia who wished to settle elsewhere because of the intolerance shown to them by their present neighbors, petitioned for the right of settlement in Maryland, permission was granted to them. They founded a settlement at Providence, the site of the present city of Annapolis. It was not long, however, before the Catholic founders of Maryland suffered at the hands of those to whom they had shown tolerance. The Puritans who had come from Virginia, with the aid of others of their faith within the colony, seized the government of Maryland and repealed the Toleration Act. In 1658, when the authority of Lord Baltimore was re-established, the act was restored to the statute books and tolerance once again became a governing principle in the colony. At the time of the Protestant Revolution, upon the accession of William and Mary to the throne of England, the Toleration Act was again repealed. It was not until the American Revolution became imminent and unity against England imperative, that Catholics were treated with tolerance in a colony which they themselves had established upon exceedingly tolerant principles.

We have elaborated upon the history of the colony of Maryland because the lessons taught by that history need emphasis today. For that reason we shall refer to them when we consider the "new" education. As a result of the campaign initiated in Maryland by the Puritans who had found Virginia distasteful to them and had sought and found asylum within the Catholic colony, the original settlers of Maryland and their children lost the rights which the New World had, for a brief time, given them. In Maryland Catholics were subsequently denied admission to the higher institutions of learning which had been established in the colony. They were forced to provide their own higher schools. Under the leadership of the Jesuits they did this in 1745 by the establishment of a classical academy at Bohemia Manor.

Uniformity

The organization of educational facilities was similar throughout all that part of colonial America which came to form, in time, the United States. In the rural areas, in the North and uniformly throughout the South the growth of a public school system was slow. It was not until 1821 for instance that the first public high school was established in Massachusetts, the state which during its colonial history had paid most attention to the formal education of the young. In 1827 Massachusetts provided by legislative enactment that every town of five hundred families should maintain a public high school.

In the matter of the content of education and the methods of teaching employed in the schools throughout the colonial period and extending far into the young life of the new republic there was relative uniformity. The content in the elementary schools embraced the fundamentals of reading, writing and arithmetic through fractions. In the higher schools the classical studies dominated. The method of teaching was largely that of "backing the book" as it was called and reciting, that is, telling the teacher what had been memorized from the pages of the text-book. As a matter of fact this method prevailed until approximately the closing quarter of the nineteenth century and to a limited extent even thereafter. In 1925 the writer in a visit to the United States Military Academy at West Point saw this method in use. The socialized lesson constitutes one of the elements, as we shall attempt to indicate later, which differentiates modern American education from the old with which we are presently concerned.

The moral training which should eventuate as a result of education was stressed in the early schools of this country both during the colonial period and extending far into our history as a united nation. It was discernible in the period when schools were under private or church control and was insisted upon when public systems of schools were organized. Religious values were considered of great merit and there was insistence upon their preservation. This insistence led to difficulties in the organization and administration of all tax supported schools. The most notable of these difficulties occurred in Massachusetts and in the City of New York.

Massachusetts

In Massachusetts during the eighteen forties interest in the public schools and their conduct was strong. As we have indicated, in the schools of the country and particularly in New England there was a strong religious note. It was what they considered an attack upon this tradition coupled with the announced campaign of the new secretary of the State Board of Education, Horace Mann, that caused the educational unrest in the forties. There was in Massachusetts strong religious denominational feelings. Sectarian bias and bigotry were loudly voiced and defended. The Secretary of the State Board of Education was himself a most tolerant man but the past history of Massachusetts and of the other states as well had built up among the people, aided in the forties by clergymen and by the religious press of the period, fixed, standardized re-actions to the reforms attempted by Horace Mann. The fact that the forties were the years of the great immigration of Irish Catholics to America intensified the opposition. Prior to this time there had been strong disagreement among the different Protestant sects but they did not approach the resentment and bigotry that manifested itself at the flood of Irishmen who came to the New World and who in large numbers went into the mills of Massachusetts during the fifth decade of the nineteenth century. The early history of the relatively new republic was the result of the work, as expressed at the time, of English Protestantism. Through her schools, however, thought the majority of the people of Massachusetts and of the other states as well, Protestantism was to be kept in the ascendancy. Horace Mann's reforms, to their thinking, threatened this ascendancy. The fact that the vast majority of those coming into Massachusetts at the time as immigrants to the new world of North America, whose government promised freedom from oppression were, as we have said, Irish and Catholic, did not help the situation.

Horace Mann was a man of deeply religious tendencies. His family ties were all strictly Calvinistic affinities. To him, however, the continuance of the spirit of sectarianism in the schools meant the defeat of any prospect of victory in his efforts to establish a system of schools under state control. It was his desire to break the control which religious groups and charitable organizations held over education in Massachusetts. If schools were to come under state control then public funds, so announced Mann, must no longer be given to sectarian groups.

If the stigma of charity was to be removed from the elementary schools of Massachusetts then public funds, accumulated as a result of taxes imposed upon all the people, must be under the control of representatives of all the people and not of special church groups. Moreover, said Mann, in many of the addresses he delivered throughout Massachusetts, in the period we are considering, the whole purpose of the schools must be changed. People must cease to look upon them as the perpetuators of denominational creeds. Their aim must be the preparation of the young people for a life of worthy citizenship. Civic responsibility should become the watchword of the public schools, instead of denominational loyalty.

It was true, as we have indicated, that the majority of the early settlers in this country were English Protestants. It was likewise true that a great many Irish Catholics had come to this country during the colonial period. Many had settled in the South. In the Revolutionary War Period Washington had occasion to thank Irish Catholics for their patriotic defense of the country in which they had recently settled. During the third decade of the nineteenth century vast numbers of other Irish Catholics left their motherland to seek their fortunes in the New World. Many of these settled in New England. By reason of agricultural conditions in Ireland and the difficulty of finding employment there during the forties, Irish immigration to this country had increased rapidly. It was this situation which added major difficulties to the problem confronting them.

The cry raised against Mann was that his efforts would make the American public school a Godless institution. There were many well-intentioned Americans who believed in Mann's program and saw in it the only path by which the schools could be brought under public control who replied that if the abolition of sectarianism in the public schools would make American public education Godless "then Godless let it be". It was not, however, until 1855 that Massachusetts provided by an amendment to the State constitution for the establishment of the reforms which Horace Mann had initially proposed. In accordance with the law as it was finally placed on the statute books the Bible was to be read, without comment, in opening the day's work in each public school classroom. In the daily reading of the Bible and of the singing of the Lord's Prayer Mann had always believed. The formal teaching of either, by reason of the intrinsic nature of the material presented in class,

he contended, would introduce the accentuation of religious differences and destroy all effort to foster public education. He wished, however, the thought of God to be perpetuated in the schools in a manner similar to the manner in which we, as a nation, have attempted to perpetuate our dependence upon Him and to indicate our loyalty to Him by inscribing upon our coins "In God We Trust". Mann was religious but neither bigoted nor biased. This was shown throughout his career in Congress to which he was elected to serve out the un-expired term of John Quincy Adams who died in 1848. Mann made many friends among his former enemies but not enough of them to win for him the governorship of Massachusetts for which he was a candidate in 1853. Shortly thereafter he accepted the presidency of Antioch College, at Yellow Springs, Ohio. He died in 1859 and in his last public address spoke these words: "Be ashamed to die until you have won some victory for humanity".

The work of Horace Mann influenced the efforts to establish education upon a public basis in other states. Not all people were convinced, however, that Mann's solution of the problem, the almost complete secularization of the education of the young, was the correct one. There were many people, Protestants and Catholics alike, who believed that the proposals he was making were not adequate. They urged that a way be found to achieve a solution of the problem connected with the allotment of public funds for educational purposes so that those who wished to follow Mann's ideas of the almost complete secularization of education might do so and that those who wished religious values to permeate the education of their children should be permitted their share of the public funds, for the purpose of realizing their aims. This proposed solution of the problem seemed to them in strict conformity with the thought of religious freedom for all its citizens which the United States espoused. They agreed that Horace Mann was honest in his effort to solve an exceedingly grave and fundamental problem but they did not believe his solution to be the correct one.

New York

In the State of New York difficulties arose over the question of the financial support of education. In this State, as in all others with the exception of Massachusetts, at the time of which we are speaking, the year 1824, there were no "public schools" as we understand the term today. There were private schools in which tuition fees were paid and

“charity schools,” that is schools for the education of the children from the poorer families. In the City of New York in November, 1824, there was established by State law a provision that required the Common Council of the City to govern money to be appropriated by the State Legislature for the support of schools and to designate “the institutions or schools which should be entitled to receive such school moneys”. As early as 1805 the original fund had been created and by legislative enactment it had been increased several times. In 1824 discrepancies in the financial accounts of the governing agencies were revealed and in consequence in that year it was proposed that a plan of requiring the Common Council of the city to designate corporations to receive State school funds be adopted. These corporations, when once nominated by the Common Council, became directly responsible to the Secretary of State to whom regularly they were to render accounts of their use of State funds. The corporations designated by the Common Council in accordance with the law which was enacted in 1824 were the Public School Society and four religious institutions, two under Protestant and two under Catholic control.

The Public School Society

The Public School Society was originally incorporated in 1805 as, according to its charter “The Society for Establishing a Free School in the City of New York, for the Education of such Poor Children as do not belong to or are not provided for by any Religious Society”. In 1808 its charter was extended to all children who were in need of free education and its name was changed to “The Free School Society of New York”. In 1826 its name was again changed to “The Public School Society of New York” and its trustees were authorized to provide for the education of all children in the City of New York who were not otherwise provided for “whether such children were or were not the proper subjects of gratuitous education”. Anyone could become a member of the society by making a contribution to its funds. The members of the Common Council by reason of their offices were also, according to the law, members of the Society. The Trustees of the Public School Society were one hundred in number. Fifty of the trustees were elected by the total membership and those elected selected fifty additional trustees.

Between 1826 and 1840, the year in which the great challenge to its work was made, the Public School Society had established nearly

one hundred schools in the City of New York. In these schools were taught the fundamentals of a purely secular education and in addition those general principles of religion and morality common to all Christian denominations. The trustees of the Society belonged in the main to the various Protestant sects represented in the city. There were, however, a few Catholics on the Board of Trustees.

Objections to the schools were raised by the Catholics whose children attended them. They protested on the ground that religious teaching should permeate all the education of the young since, so they contended, there could be no genuine morality unless it were founded on religion. To complete secularization of the schools they were opposed. But, they contended, it was not true that religion was being taught without sectarianism for said the most Reverend John Hughes, D.D. Catholic Bishop, later Archbishop, of New York, who led the protest of his people in the city: "If you exclude all sects, you exclude Christianity. Take away the distinctive dogmas of the Catholics, the Baptists, the Methodists, the Presbyterians, and soon you have nothing left but deism."

Bishop Hughes contended that sectarianism was being taught in the schools. The version of the Bible that was read was objectionable to Catholics. Moreover it was not read without comment but teachers in the schools, by comments and explanations made, tended to destroy the faith of Catholic children attending the schools.* The net result was that religious equality, granted by the Constitution of the United States, was being destroyed locally by the public schools in the City of New York.

* The question of the Bible in the public school came to the fore again in 1844. In that year the deputy-superintendent of public schools in the City of New York, Dr. Reese, urged the adoption of a resolution by the Board of Education to compel all public school teachers to read to the children a portion of the Bible daily. The resolution provided that in those schools which had on register a preponderance of Catholic children the Douay version of the Bible should be used. The Board of Education would not consent to the compulsory use of any one version and denied that the superintendent of schools had the right to make any such provision. A long and heated discussion followed. Bishop Hughes though present at the meeting remained silent throughout it. Dr. Reese, in the course of the meeting, denied emphatically that Dr. Hughes had at any time made any effort to exclude the Bible from the public schools. The Bishop's silence was attributable to the fact that by reason of his past experiences he had no interest in promoting the purposes of those who would make of the schools and of the religious question a controversial political issue. He had long since determined that the only proper course was to devote himself to the problems connected with the building up of a parochial school system.

In the city, at this time, there were estimated to be nearly twelve thousand Catholic children. About five thousand attended parish schools that had been established, usually in the basements of church buildings. Only about three hundred Catholic children attended the public schools. The remainder, more than half of the total number of Catholic children in the city, received no formal education of any kind or in relatively few instances attended private schools at which tuition was paid. The situation was genuinely deplorable. The parochial schools were few in number and those few were heavily overcrowded. The Catholics constituted relatively the larger part of the poor people in the city. It was impossible for them to support their churches, contended the bishop, and, at the same time attempt an extension on their present financial means, of the parochial school system in the city. At this time there was only one parish school building.

Bishop Hughes therefore asked that an adequate portion of the State funds be assigned to the support of the parochial system of schools, which after all was a truly American request, he added, since the United States was a Christian country, with equality for all Christian denominations, and not specifically a Protestant country as the schools conducted by the Public School Society in their patterns seemed to assume it was. The result of this request, making a clear revelation of the issues involved, stirred up strong opposition in the city.

Despite the opposition and the clamor there seemed to be evidence in the spring of 1841 that the Legislature favored the suggested plan. In a message to the Legislature, Governor Seward referred to the difficulty and seemed disposed to settle it along the lines suggested by Bishop Hughes. It was only just, however, contended some that before action was taken by the State Legislature, the matter should be brought before the Common Council of the city. Those who favored this plan of action pleaded for it on the basis of the necessary preservation of home rule.

Politics and the Schools

This suggestion seemed reasonable and was accepted. Actually it was a political ruse. Education was a State matter then as it is now and the question should have been referred to the Legislature as the Governor in his message had suggested. There were those in the City

of New York then, as there are now, who saw in the schools and in school questions opportunity for political advantage. In consequence the solidarity of the Catholics in the city, one-fifth of its total population, was broken by ambitious and unprincipled partisans, many of them Catholics, who for personal political advantage, for votes and for jobs, disrupted the campaign for the use of public funds to support all Christian schools whether they maintained a narrowly secular course of study or one devoted to the idea that all formal education should be permeated by religious values.

At the time of these happenings Dr. Hughes was in Europe. When he returned on July 18, he immediately issued a call for action. On July 20 a meeting was held and Bishop Hughes once again clearly outlined his position. He told those present at the meeting, at which his assistant, Rev. Dr. Power presided, that there were certain essentials to be kept in mind. These were:

1. The issue was a profoundly serious one.
2. The Church was in grave danger of becoming embroiled by politicians in matters with which it had no concern and from which it should hold itself aloof.
3. This was a matter of deep religious significance and he, the Catholic bishop, would lead the campaign to gain a just settlement of the issues involved. If politicians, however, with their customary practices, were to enter into the discussion of the question he would reluctantly be forced to desist.

Unfortunately politics did enter into the question. As a result of the reference of the problem to the Common Council the following plan of settlement of the issues raised was eventually proposed by a Committee of the Council:

1. That the Public School Society govern the administration of the parochial school system.
2. That no religious doctrine be taught during the ordinary school day.
3. That instruction in the Catholic religion be given at the end of the school day but that in such instruction no reference be made to other denominations or their teachings.

4. That State funds be allotted to the Catholic parochial schools on the basis of the relationship the number of children in them bore to the total number of children in the schools conducted by the Public School Society.

The Common Council rejected the foregoing proposals which, as a matter of fact, like most compromises, actually pleased neither side. Bishop Hughes again took the lead in the controversy and as a result of his recommendations a memorial was directed to the Legislature asking for a State settlement of the educational problems in the City of New York. In consequence Hon. John C. Spencer, Secretary of State and by reason of his occupancy of that office, in accordance with State law, superintendent of its public schools, made a report providing for a complete change in the school system of the City of New York. The report of the secretary made the following recommendations:

1. A commissioner of education should be elected in each ward of the city. All the commissioners would constitute a City Board of Education.
2. The general school laws of the State should be extended to all public schools in the city.
3. All powers now held by the Public School Society should be transferred to the commissioners.
4. All State public school money should be paid to the commissioners and used by them for the support of the schools under their jurisdiction.

To the recommendations the Public School Society strongly objected; though they presented no prospect of help for the Catholic schools, yet Dr. Hughes approved because, to his mind, they meant the end of the Public School Society. When, however, the recommendations of the Secretary of State were sent to the Legislature for approval the opposition became so strong that the legislators, fearing political consequences, tabled the whole matter and said that to provide a cooling off period and time to study at greater length the proposals of the Secretary of State the question should go over until January, 1842. The basic idea was that the question should be made an issue to be decided by the election of November, 1841. It was not settled by this election, however, and action was, thereby deferred until the following year.

The results of deferring action on the Secretary of State's school plan was to make the election of 1842 in the City of New York probably the stormiest in the local history of that area. Unfortunately Bishop Hughes was, against his better judgment, drawn into the controversy. During the campaign he was vilified by newspaper editorials and by the type of practical politicians, both lay and clerical, in his own Church as well as out of it, which the City of New York even to this day seems to breed. He was, however, by nature of militant disposition. He fought back with the result that even his own episcopal residence on Mulberry street was attacked and rocks and bricks were thrown through its windows. Fortunately the Bishop was not at home at the time.

Later Bishop Hughes regretted exceedingly the course of events in the election campaign of 1842 because by reason of the trend that had been established he had been placed among the advocates of the tendency toward the growth of secularism in the public schools. Though within a short period of time after the election had been held and the issues decided he took occasion to declare the whole system of "Godless education", as he described the pattern of thinking on the school question which the election had established, radically unsound; still he could even then see no other course of action he could have taken in the election controversy than the one he had followed. At the same time he had been drawn into politics, an event in the earlier years of the struggle he feared might possibly happen but which he had consistently opposed and fought against. It was evident to him later, it seems, that the politicians had maneuvered him into an insupportable position. It was wrong to divorce the public schools almost entirely from all religious values. He later said it was apparent that the Catholics, as soon as they were financially able to do so, must establish schools of their own.

When the Legislature convened in January 1843 the plan of the Secretary of State was adopted and ward schools took the place of those formerly controlled by the Public School Society. The Society, a few years later, deeded over all its possessions to the city and quietly went out of existence.

We have outlined in detail the whole question of public education in Massachusetts and in the City of New York during the years 1840-42 because the issues debated so vehemently then are still with us and in magnified form as we shall see later in our discussion of the "new" education. Secularism in education has led to the prevalence of atheistic influences in the public school systems of this country.

Secularism

Secularism had gained a foothold in the public school systems of all the states at the time of the Civil War. Throughout the country the term public school system simply signified that public funds were used for the support of schools in the systems. These were the tax-supported schools. There were other schools supported by private endowments and by the payments of tuition. The public schools were concerned with elementary education. Government of public education by a local Boards of Education, such as was established by the Spencer plan in the City of New York in 1842, became a general practice in the period after the Civil War and is still the prevalent practice. In this period, too, grew sustained interest in the establishment of public high schools. In the earlier days such schools had been established in Massachusetts. It is interesting to note that one of the public high schools, that established in New York State, in the City of Brooklyn, was called the Central Grammar School to overcome the opposition of the Common Council which was opposed to using public funds for free secondary schools. It was the belief of the Brooklyn Common Council that people who wished to send their children to such schools should meet all expenses incurred by such action. This was in 1879. How times have changed. It is unfortunate that of late years a retrogressive movement, though called Progressive, has been substituted for genuine progress. This backward movement, this reversion to poorer concepts of education along with better school buildings, is the outstanding characteristic of the twentieth century. This characteristic we shall discuss later.

At this time we simply wish to add, and so bring to an end our discussion of what we have called the old American education, the thought that as we approached the nineties American education had become almost entirely secular. It is true that in Massachusetts and in New York, both of which States had secularized their schools, and had provided by law that schools which included instruction in any religious sectarian doctrine should not be entitled to the use of public funds, the daily reading at the Bible without comment was continued. The singing of the Lord's Prayer was also continued and in some public schools still prevails. These practices have never been considered as constituting violation of State law since no instruction is involved. The practices have, however, been languishing because of tacit opposition in large urban centers, which now and then becomes

articulate and at times constitutes the basis of letters to the press. The secularization of the public school systems of America, however, was practically complete at about the time the twentieth century began.

It should be observed that throughout the West, in the region of our country that is made up of States that have entered the Union since the Civil War, public education has always been secularized. The struggle that centered around the problem of retaining religious values in public education was an Eastern problem. It was a struggle that had, to the minds of many people, an unfortunate ending. It could have been settled differently but the fact remains that it was not. Perhaps so far as Catholics are concerned it could not have been settled differently for after all the fact that the early settlers in practically all the colonial divisions of North America were English Protestants and that the settlements followed closely the age of the Reformation determined the school pattern. So the necessity for the Catholic parochial school system and the Lutheran parochial school system as well, is a logical conclusion of the conditions of the seventeenth century. What is not logical and what is more inexplicable is the fact that in this, the twentieth century, we have prevalent in the public school systems in the United States a condition that is not really non-religious but actually atheistic. This condition under the guise of introducing the "new" education and under the slogan of "academic freedom" is introducing an anti-religious atmosphere into education and an atheistic curriculum into our schools which is far removed from the purposes for which the United States of America was established and altogether dissimilar to the practices we have always understood to be the distinguishing characteristics of Western Christian civilization.

We do not, however, wish to get ahead of our story, so we shall turn now to what we have termed the period of modern education in America. We shall trace its origins in Europe and pay brief attention to those reformers who helped to shape not only our modern education but also the beginning of that movement which has culminated in our "new" education of "Progressive" design which threatens us and promises to destroy our nation and the confidence many have vested in it as "the last hope of Western Christian civilization."

The Modern American Education

The period between 1875 and 1900 represents roughly the time during which American education may be said to have been modernized. It was throughout the years comprising the last quarter of the nineteenth century that the educational theories of Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi (1746-1827), Johann Friedrich Herbart (1776-1841) and Friedrich Wilhelm Froebel (1782-1852) found their way into the practices of our American schools. The European influences upon American education which came from the work of Pestalozzi, Herbart and Froebel are most interesting to follow in their European origins and in the effects which they produced in the United States of America.

Rousseau and Pestalozzi

The first of the European educators to influence our American schools was Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi. Pestalozzi was a German having been born in the old city of Zurich. His interest in education came from his study of one of the most provocative books of the eighteenth century, the "Emile" of Jean Jacques Rousseau. "Emile" was written in 1726. In that same year Rousseau published another book which also had a profound influence — "The Social Contract". This most impractical and unreliable French theorist produced two books from which revolutions stemmed. "Emile" is basically responsible for the major revolutionary changes that took place at first in Europe and later to a greater extent in the United States of America in the field of educational theory and practice. "The Social Contract," with its emphasis upon the necessity for the establishment of a democratic government based upon the "liberty, fraternity and equality" of men and the destruction of tyranny on the part of both churchmen and politicians, became the basis and the guide of the French Revolution.

While Rousseau was most persuasive in his writing both in the field of education and in that of government, his personal life was a denial of everything he wrote. Still his influence was most fundamental. It affected not only his own time, but still is basic to the thinking of many people even in this twentieth century, in both the fields of education and of

politics. It affects the thinking of many who have studied him and his writings, and of millions more who, in all probability, have never heard of him or of his books.

Pestalozzi lived through the period when Rousseau's influence predominated. It determined his life. Pestalozzi's experiments in the field of education were initiated at a school for abandoned children which he established on his farm at Neuhof. This school failed after two years of weary effort. Pestalozzi's idea at Neuhof was to direct children, the children of the poorest of the poor, toward a moral life based upon a desire to be economically independent. It was his thought that in the "natural" life that Rousseau stressed, the desire "to do" on the part of children was evident. Pestalozzi had a vision of the amelioration of bad living conditions through the application of the creative energies of youth to the varying pursuits radiating from farm experiences. He sought to unite the educational theories of Rousseau as outlined so enticingly in "Emile" with the results so charmingly portrayed by the inspirationalists of the French Revolution to be achieved by society in general if it were but to follow the counsels given in "The Social Contract". That Rousseau was but a clever intriguer who could write most persuasively and perform most disappointingly poor Pestalozzi did not realize. For Pestalozzi was poor not only as to worldly goods but also as to his knowledge of worldly affairs, particularly in their financial aspects. Pestalozzi had, however, a quality which Rousseau lacked, the quality of sincerity of purpose. After the failure of his farm school he wrote "Leonard and Gertrude", which was most successful and later his book called "How Gertrude Teaches Her Children" portrayed a secondary phase of his work: his efforts to train prospective teachers to carry into practice the methods of instruction he believed should govern all classroom work. These educational methods were, as we have indicated, based upon the "return to nature" principles of "Emile" and the purpose was to realize throughout all society the revolutionary order which "The Social Contract" indicated and the French Revolution had, to his trusting soul, achieved.

As an educational reformer Pestalozzi was, throughout the major part of his life, a failure. It was not until the latter part of his life that he was able to accomplish much in his efforts to reform European education. This he brought to pass through his Institute at Yverdon. It was here that the modern secular elementary school idea with its rejec-

tion of all religious aims and purposes was initiated and it was here that he made his first great impression in his efforts to change the prevalent methods of teaching.

Prior to his work at Yverdon attention had been directed to Pestalozzi largely because of his writings in the field of educational theories. By reason of the wide acclaim with which "Leonard and Gertrude" had been received he was with George Washington and Thomas Paine made a "citizen" of the French Republic. In reality this gives evidence of the great influence of Rousseau upon the thought of his times, for Pestalozzi was after all but the more or less inexpert practitioner of the ideas initially proposed in "Emile". These ideas were, as we now can vividly see, the forerunners of present day communistic and socialistic influences in the field of education. Among the ideas which Pestalozzi attempted to realize in practice was the inauguration of a program of learning based upon a study of the "whole child" and the natural development of his instinctive responses to his immediate environment. He endeavored to carry out in his school practices what he had emphasized in "How Gertrude Teaches Her Children"; namely, that "the recognition of sense impression is the absolute foundation of all attempts to impart knowledge". As a result of Pestalozzi's work, object study became essential to all good teaching.

The influence of Pestalozzi upon American education was strong, for a short period of time at least, as we shall later see. At length, however, his theories and methods gave way before the wider influence exerted upon the schools of the United States of America by two other European educational reformers. Before we leave Pestalozzi we should say that we shall have occasion to refer to him again because of the fact, that the influence of Rousseau through Pestalozzi's work has become basic to many of the practices and much of the content of the study of education in the schools and colleges of this country today. How communism and socialism have become in this twentieth century connected with the scholastic atmosphere of the United States is not an inexplicable riddle. The problem stems from the revolutionary theories of Rousseau which were carried into the schools by Pestalozzi. Our schools and colleges are returning to these principles and practices. That they are doing so is not an accident but rather by reason of the well-planned and cleverly executed designs of present day educational reformers, who are relying upon the schools to build a new social order

along the lines suggested by Jean Jacques Rousseau in the years immediately preceding the French Revolution.

Herbart

Herbart had only one fact of his life in common with Pestalozzi. Both were native Germans. In all other respects they differed markedly. Herbart was a student, a psychologist and a philosopher. His interest was not in the regeneration of society through education but rather in the part that formal education could play in the development of personal character. The method and the content of instruction interested him greatly. As a result of his work there eventually came to pass a heightened interest in the development of normal schools for the better education of prospective teachers in the formal process of instruction.

Education should be regarded, so thought Herbart, as a formal process. To the formal process of each lesson there should be four well indicated and definitely separated steps:

1. Preparation
2. Presentation
3. Generalization
4. Application

To these four formal steps his most noted disciple, Tuisikon Ziller, added another step, that of assimilation. This he presented between the second and the third steps of Herbart's original plan. As the teaching plan finally came into use, modified by Ziller's addition, the five formal steps of Herbart as they were generally known were:

1. Preparation — the recalling to mind by the learner of known facts related to the new subject matter to be presented.
2. Presentation — the introduction of the new unit of instruction.
3. Assimilation — the establishment in the mind of the learner of the relationship between the new and the old.
4. Generalization — the wording by the learner of the general principle or rule of thought and conduct derived as a result of the particular lesson.

5. Application — the use by the learner of the results achieved by the instructional unit of the lesson.

From the mere study of the five formal steps of instruction can be gleaned an appreciation of the systematic, logical mind that Herbart possessed and its great contrast to the poorly organized but sympathetic approach presented by Pestalozzi in his effort to effect a change in educational procedure. It must be understood, however, that Herbart thoroughly believed in the many-sidedness of interest that the learner should be enticed to exhibit. To him, however, interest was not so much a physical manifestation as an intellectual one. He did not believe in what he regarded as the more or less haphazard "doing activities" of Pestalozzi, or recognize them as interest. Interest to Herbart was a matter of mental activity more than that of the activity of the body. He did not subscribe to the notion that abstract ideas connected with duty and with the achievement of good personal character, which to him seemed the prime purpose of instruction, could be learned and utilized by "doing" or by "following nature" as Pestalozzi had inculcated. He visited Pestalozzi's school and had great admiration for the sympathetic approach of the master but rebelled at the lack of orderliness and system in the teaching. While both the older and the younger man agreed that interest was a necessary factor in the learning process, they disagreed on the basic meaning of the term both used. To Pestalozzi interest meant "self-expression" as manifested by bodily activity; to Herbart interest meant the enjoyment of the awareness of an intellectual relationship of ideas.

We have indicated the great popularity enjoyed by Pestalozzi as a result of the publication of his educational theories. Herbart spent the latter years of his life as the successor to Kant at the University of Göttingen where he occupied the chair of philosophy. His thoughts on education awakened little interest or attention during his lifetime. It was not until 1865 that such interest arose. Tuiskon Ziller, a professor at Leipzig University, in that year published a book attempting to show the direct relationship between Herbart's formal approach to instruction and good character building. By his book Ziller awakened interest in the work the late Dr. Herbart of Göttingen University had done in the field of education and who, by reason of his interest in children and their moral development, established what we might properly call the Herbartian school of educational thought. It was Ziller who actually

presented the five formal steps of instruction as we have described them. Herbart in his presentation had included only four steps as we have previously indicated. He had not provided the third step which Ziller thought should be definitely indicated. It was also Ziller, who by reason of his belief in the Herbartian psychological principles, evolved the Culture Epoch Theory. This theory, based upon an exaggeration of a study of the "whole child", endeavored to show that the human being in his life span or at least in that period of it including infancy, childhood, pubescence and adolescence, repeated in his development the cycles through which the human race had passed in the evolutionary process. The exaggeration and distortion of Herbart's thought were as marked characteristics of his followers in the Herbartian school as are the thought processes of the followers of Froebel, an educational reformer whom we shall now consider. These exaggerations and distortions have been especially prominent in the United States of America as we later on shall attempt to indicate.

Froebel

Froebel had a most unhappy childhood and youth. He was a strange boy, by nature the very opposite of the type of youth he hoped, by the character of education he eventually outlined in his greatest book "The Education of Man", to be helpful in developing. As a young man he was somewhat morbid, exceedingly shy and markedly effeminate. At the age of twenty-three he decided to become a teacher. He went to Pestalozzi's school at Yverdon and stayed there for two years, part of the time as a student and during the second year as a teacher.

It was as a result of his experience at Yverdon that he came to believe that the child is essentially craving action not learning. It became his thought to make play the center of the school unit. With this thought in mind he established a small school. In this, the education of the few children he had attracted centered around their self-activity as expressed in games, music and simple manual tasks. The school survived for about ten years; but finally, the financial problems the conduct of the school entailed proved insurmountable to Froebel and he gave up the struggle.

After the failure of his school Froebel taught for a time in Switzerland. He then returned to Germany where, in 1840, he established the first kindergarten.

In this new type of school for young children, and Froebel was essentially interested in the education of young children, the activity of the learner through play and simple occupations was basic. Through his activity the child was to become self-expressive. Self-expression was the ideal that Froebel sought. It was the goal of the activities he provided. The games were, in Froebel's thought, to provide more than mere absorption of the child's animal restlessness. They and the occupations that characterized his kindergarten were centered around a thought which to Froebel was most important though it left little impress upon the practices of his own time and has been eliminated entirely from the kindergartens of today.

To Froebel the kindergarten was to serve a great religious purpose. As we have indicated Froebel was exceedingly introspective. There was in his thought that which led to the establishment of the first kindergarten: a close relationship to mysticism, to symbolism. The games were played in a circle. The children sat in a circle. The first plaything used was a ball. The simple paper chains the children made, and still make in our present day kindergartens, were and are constituted of rings of paper. To Froebel all the circles indicated one fact — eternity. For him the symbolism manifested God as did the circle, "without beginning and without end". His generation did not become enthusiastic over the idea and it is doubtful whether any children after exposure to the kindergarten idea through their games, plays, songs and occupations, ever appreciated the idea latent in the circle in which they sat or the endless chains they made.

Though the symbolism in Froebel's kindergarten idea never seemed to be understood, it was and is still there. In Germany there was little interest in his work. He was regarded as a fanatic. It was not until almost the very close of his life that any recognition at all was accorded him. This recognition came to him not through his own efforts but rather through the work of Baroness von Marenholtz who publicized his ideas in a far better manner than he himself was ever able to do. Her work, superior in its excellence of detail, while it made Froebel better known than he had ever been before, brought down upon him the wrath of the Prussian Government and its edict forbidding kindergartens in Prussia.

As a result of the expulsion of the kindergarten from the military state of Prussia, Baroness von Marenholtz went to England where she

and the Froebelian educational ideas she expounded in lecture tours were well received. Several kindergartens were established in England but it is interesting to observe that they came into existence not so much as a piece of educational experimentation but rather as a sociological force, which it was thought might be of considerable help in poorer sections, particularly in crowded sections of cities, in caring for children at an earlier age than did the ordinary schools. However, the Froebelian ideas did not really make much headway in Europe until the time of the First World War. Even in the United States when the kindergarten was first accepted as part of the public school system it was largely on the basis of its sociological value that it won recognition. This initial introduction came in the city of St. Louis where a Miss Susan Blow accepted the invitation of Superintendent of Schools William T. Harris, to come to that city for the purpose of establishing the first public kindergarten in the United States. This was in 1873. There were a few private kindergartens in the country before that time and in addition there were a few schools in existence for the training of prospective kindergarten teachers. One of these training schools had been opened in the City of New York in 1872. It was at this school, conducted by Miss Marie Boelte, that the first public school kindergartner had been trained.

The Froebelian idea: the importance of creative self-activity to the education of the child and the employment of this self-activity, which Froebel identified with interest, through play and simple problems in manual training, in the process of directing him toward the great symbolism of life, was not and is not today, though kindergartens have spread throughout the world, generally appreciated or even understood. The Froebelian idea is basic to the whole thought of the "new" education as we shall endeavor to explain, in detail, in our consideration of the forces which starting to operate in this country in the last decade of the nineteenth century and continuing even until today have tried and are still trying, by an exaggeration and a distortion of the Froebel thought of self-activity, with its accent upon the freedom of self-expression, to use the schools of the United States to convert our Representative Republic into a Socialistic State. Through the extension of the kindergarten idea into our elementary schools, high schools and colleges the pragmatic educational reformers of the United States would use the essentially religious Froebel, by means of their atheistic socialism to

direct the youth of America along a road of unlimited self-expression leading toward the new social order which they would have him and his teachers dare to build in this country. They did it in Russia and they would do it in the United States. The immediate result in Russia has not pleased them too well but they would try again here.

Froebel's thought is the foundation of the work of the "Progressives" and the "Social Frontiersmen" of today. In a very logical manner his basic ideas led to the development of our manual training courses and schools. In a very illogical manner his ideas have been distorted to mean something far different from anything he ever had in mind. This we shall present hereafter.

There are two men whom we should consider at this time because they have been of influence in shaping our world along the lines which made it possible for the educational reformers, rampant in the United States today, to bend our educational systems, by means of the atheistic socialism they profess combined with the self-expressionism to which Froebel gave emphasis, away from their true reasons for being. Neither of these men was an educator though one, the first of the two we shall name, it is interesting to observe, served for a brief time along with Froebel at Pestalozzi's school at Yverdon. They are Georg Wilhelm Hegel (1770-1831) and Karl Marx (1818-1883).

Hegel

Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel was born at Stuttgart, Germany, in 1770. At the theological seminary at Tübingen, which he entered in 1788, he devoted himself to a study of the philosophy of Immanuel Kant. Later, in 1801, he entered the University of Jena where he formulated the philosophy which has done so much to change our Western civilization and to alienate it from the Christian principles with which it had been previously identified.

To Hegel "the rational alone is real". From this basic idea Hegel reached the fundamental thesis of his thought, that there is no reality beyond the evolutionary process from which our modern world developed. There is, in his thought, no room for God or the Absolute except as it exists in the activity which man sees all around him and which is the only reality he can genuinely understand. That which he

can understand is for man the only genuine reality that for him exists. Man can experience and make an effort to understand the variety of changes in life with which he is confronted. He can understand these changes, thought Hegel, and he can understand nothing else. For him these changes, or "this evolutionary process" as he expressed it, constitute not only reality but the only reality there genuinely is. This process of evolution, this daily experience which we have by reason of our contacts with reality, constitutes the Absolute. For Hegel it constitutes the essence of what men call God.

This concept of God makes Hegel at heart an atheist and explains the anti-Christian trend of thought which has stemmed from him and from Heidelberg University where he served as professor of philosophy from 1816 until his death in 1831. It explains the reason for the emphasis upon the social and the economic conditions of life which has existed from his day until the present. It explains the rise of communism under the leadership of one of his better known disciples, Karl Marx. It explains the rise of the autocratic concept and rule of government so common in Europe and even in our own America today. If the concepts of democracy as realized by the United States eventually decay and fall into ruin it will in large measure be attributable to the thought of Georg Hegel and his followers. It will in addition be attributable to an apathy, to a loss of appreciation of the essential worth of the fundamental principles upon which our government was founded and to too strong a devotion to the golden calf of "American Prosperity and 'Know How'".

Hegel made definite application of his philosophic thought to social conditions. He explicitly taught that the State exists for the realization of an idea and to the realization of that idea all private interests must be sacrificed. The State exists, Hegel taught, for the realization of the best possible economic development that its autocratic government can devise. The State must not be conceived as existing for the purpose of assuring to its citizens life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. The State does not exist for the benefit of its individual citizens. The citizens exist for the State. Family and individual benefits must yield to State interests.

The paramount interests of the State are aptly illustrated in times of war for war is, according to Hegel, the only means by which genuine social progress can be attained. War is the Absolute in process of devel-

opment, for ideas resound in the roar of cannons. It is true, says Hegel, that both individuals and families suffer in war time but right has through war the only real opportunity to establish itself. The victor is, according to Hegel, always right. The nation that survives is the nation that should survive and it, for the time being at least, constitutes the chosen people and by it progress is assured and by it the world's evolution is given hope of achievement. War therefore, says Hegel, is good. It is to be approved and fostered, not condemned.

Hegel prepared the way for communism and for the establishment of autocratic government as a means of achieving it. He prepared the way for "progressive" education with its emphasis upon activity and "activity programs". He prepared the way for the attempt to establish in the United States of America an overlordship in education such as the National Education Association has been striving to accomplish since the time of the First World War. Through his disciple Karl Marx and the latter's economic and political followers in general and through education in particular, he is presenting every day to the citizens of this country problems we must solve within the framework of the reasons we came into existence as a nation to achieve or American representative government will cease to be. The issue may be and in all probability will be definitely decided within the next few years.

Marx

Marx was a German of Jewish parentage. He studied at the University of Jena where Hegel taught. It was at Jena, where he received his doctor's degree, that he came under Hegel's influence and where he developed his thoughts on "scientific" socialism or Marxian socialism as his followers termed it. He himself called it by the name under which we now know it, that of communism.

Socialism presented many divisions in Europe during the nineteenth century. There were the "rightists", the "leftists" and the "middle of the roaders" or the centre group of moderate socialism. Under Marx in Germany the "leftists" gained strength chiefly through the influence wielded by a radical Prussian newspaper which he edited. As a result of his attacks on the government he was ordered to leave Prussia. He went to France and soon became in that country the motivating force behind a group of Socialists and Anarchists among whom were Engels,

Blanc on the side of socialism and Proudhon and Bakunin from the ranks of anarchism.

Marx's leadership of the radical French groups was too extreme for the conservative government of his day and in consequence he was soon invited to leave the country. He went to England where he resided until his death. It was in England that he wrote his best known work "Das Kapital". His earlier work the "Communist Manifesto" was in reality produced by the combined effort of himself and of Frederick Engels during his stay in France. It was published at Brussels and its function was to point out to the workmen of that city how an efficient labor union could be brought into being.

Marxian socialism stems from "Das Kapital". It has definite characteristics. These characteristics are:

1. It is essentially atheistic.
2. It is a religion rather than simply an economic plan.
3. It advances the thought that the possession of wealth guarantees power, both social and political, to the possessor.
4. It advances the idea that there is an inevitable class struggle between those who possess wealth, the capitalists, and those who do not, the proletarians.
5. The thought that there must be revolution, that the proletariat must overcome the capitalistic class and establish itself as the sole possessor of both all wealth and all power, is basic.

Though, as we have indicated, Marxian socialism is all included in his large, four-volumed work — "Das Kapital", it is interesting to observe that the call to action by the proletariat appears in the final paragraph of the "Communist Manifesto" written in collaboration with Frederick Engels in 1848. It is this: "The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win. Workmen of all countries unite."

Socialism

There are those who tell us fanciful tales of socialism. Among these are the following:

1. Socialism is not necessarily atheistic. There are in the world God-fearing, religious Socialists.
2. Socialism is very difficult to understand. There are many varieties of it. There are evolutionary Socialists as well as Marxian Socialists.
3. Socialism by revolution does not mean war or violence of any kind. The word revolution to the Socialist means simply the change from private to collective ownership of the means of production. This change may be brought about by processes of law resulting from logical social upheavals attributable to discontent and prevalent conditions.

To provide a means of fanning the fires of discontent Marx organized the International Workingman's Association. It failed in 1873 because of opposition to it by the people of several countries. In 1889, six years after the death of Karl Marx, the Second International Workingman's Association was formed. The Second International was never a very strong federation of Socialists and with the advent of the First World War national loyalties overcame it. In 1919, however, at Moscow, militant socialism, under the leadership of Lenin, established the Third International. It was at Moscow that Russian domination of the movement for a world revolution was initiated. It is this movement that presents the great challenge to Western Christian civilization today. It is this movement which is seeking disciples of Marx, of Lenin and of Stalin in the United States of America, in the fields of government service, of laboratory research, of labor unionism and of education. It is deplorable that we must admit that Russia is not only seeking disciples but that she is being notoriously successful in her search.

Russia's success in winning to her cause American citizens who would destroy the basic principles which have made and still make this country the last hope in the world of Christian civilization, from which the true meaning of Western Democracy stems, is strongly evident in the field of education. It is evident in our schools and colleges, under both public and private control. It is evident in the country-wide prevalence of the "New" Education. The "new" education is the Third International in operation. To set forth the facts pertinent to the establishment of atheistic socialism as the motivating force in American education is the chief purpose of this book.

A Summary

Modern education in the United States stems from the men upon whose work we have dwelt. Upon the educational theories of Rousseau and from the educational experimentation of Pestalozzi, Herbart and Froebel American education, as it developed during the last decade of the nineteenth century, and extended itself throughout the country, was essentially based. During the early part of its experience in the United States modern education in reality meant the dominance of the Herbartian school of thought. Later the influence of Froebel became markedly evident. Still later the power that Hegel exerted upon world thought and the increasing interest in the attempt by world leaders such as Hitler, Mussolini and Lenin to nationalize their struggles for power through the atheistic socialism of Karl Marx and his false claim of being the preserver of human rights affected American education and in fact brought about the tragic situation with which our present day educational institutions, both public and private, are faced by reason of the presence within them of "new educators" and by the encouragement which such educators are receiving throughout the country from so-called parents associations. Many of these parents associations, especially those in large urban centers, are led by those whose strong interest is not in education but rather in political intrigue particularly as such intrigue can be used to further the cause of Marxian socialism. This situation is strongly evident in the City of New York, which from many considerations but largely from the prevalence of crime, corruption in public office, low politics leading to the selection of even judges in an atmosphere which offends the nostrils and which a prominent justice of the federal bench recently used a strong word to describe and from Socialists who misuse labor organizations in the field of education, is today the No. 1 problem of the United States of America.

The ideas that have influenced the trend of education in the modern era and the sources from which they have emanated we present below in outline form. We hope these sources of many of the good and several of the not only erroneous but also dangerous concepts now prevalent throughout the field of education in this country will be consulted as we study the "new" education of the "Progressive" reformers. The innovators and the ideas they advanced follow.

- Rousseau — Education of the immature should follow nature.
We learn by doing.
Religion should have no part in the educational process.
- Pestalozzi — The “whole child” and not his mind alone should be educated.
Religion should be definitely rejected as a guiding principle in education.
We learn by doing.
We learn through our senses and in consequence the study of objects in the world around us should constitute a major part of the educational process.
- Herbart — Psychology should determine the formal educational process. The many-sided interests of the learner should be emphasized and used.
Education in schools should be a formal not an informal process. To this process there are definite steps.
We advance in learning through what we already know, not through object study.
The acquisition of ideas constitutes education.
Education should be concerned not with the reconstruction and the regeneration of society but with the acquisition of good character by the learner.
Learning comes through instruction not through “doing” activities, many of which are haphazard and meaningless.
The teacher is the important element in the educational process. He is to lead the learner not follow him.
- Froebel — “Doing” as exemplified in the freedom of play should characterize education.
Self-expression should be fostered. Interest is to be identified with self-activity.
Education should portray a religious symbolism.
The kindergarten exemplifies a new educational concept.
A social, co-operative atmosphere should prevail there and throughout the whole educational process.
We learn by doing and therefore construction exercises and later trade training should constitute a vital part of the educational process in our guidance of the “whole child”.

- Hegel — A philosopher not essentially an educator.
Interested in social problems not in those especially related to education.
Stressed the vital need and worth of an autocratic state.
Emphasized the value of war.
Prepared the way for many events of the twentieth century not only in the field of government but also in that of education.
- Marx — Revolution is necessary.
"The proletariat must overcome the capitalistic class."
Developed the idea of International Labor Unionism.
Father of modern socialism.
Not an educator but in reality one of the most important influences in shaping the "new" education from whose effects we are now suffering.

Pestalozzi was the first of the European educational reformers to affect changes in American education. In 1871 William T. Harris, superintendent of the public schools of St. Louis, influenced changes in the courses of study affecting the schools under his jurisdiction. These changes included the introduction of a course in elementary science.

This innovation was definitely a reflection of the insistence of Pestalozzi upon the beneficial effects of object study and of a study by the child of the immediate environment in which he lived. To some extent, however, the introduction of elementary science into the curriculum of the schools of St. Louis by Superintendent Harris was the effect of the reaction exhibited throughout America to the writings of Herbert Spencer, one of England's most noted scholars.

Spencer

Herbert Spencer was not essentially an educational reformer nor can he be said to have been the initial cause of the changes that were made in the public schools of the United States in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. He did intensify the work of those European innovators whom we have previously mentioned. His essay on "What Knowledge Is of Most Worth?", originally published in 1859, challenged the value of the traditional classical educational program being univer-

sally followed in the English schools. In other essays he reviewed the work of the educational reformers of earlier days. He answered the question asked in his initial educational essay by announcing that to him it seemed that science, not the classical studies, was of greater value in the education of youth. Spencer was both a noted scholar and brilliant essayist. While the results of his proposals were not immediate, one of them, a strong interest in the ideas and work of Pestalozzi, did affect our American schools. The introduction of a course in elementary science into the schools of St. Louis may be said to be the first indication of what we have termed Modern Education in the schools of this country. It is true that there are to be found instances of the introduction of earlier reforms in education, here and there, in American schools conducted under private controls. The work of Superintendent Harris is the first instance of major effort in a public school system to adopt the ideas of any of the European reformers and make them part of our American system of education. In 1873, only two years after his introduction of elementary science into the schools of St. Louis, Superintendent Harris invited Miss Susan Blow, a young kindergartner, to introduce Froebelian ideas into the public educational system of St. Louis. We have referred to this action of Superintendent Harris in our consideration of Froebel's work.

Harris and Parker

In consequence of the leadership of William T. Harris the counsels of Pestalozzi became operative in American education during the last quarter of the nineteenth century. From this time on we have an educational interest in the "whole child" and not simply in his mind. We have an interest in sense training, in manual activities, in trade schools and in learning by doing. It must be borne in mind that these changes reflect the thought of Rousseau as well as that of Pestalozzi. Indeed Pestalozzi followed Rousseau in his educational theorizing and in his impractical conduct of the practical work of schools. Rousseau's revolutionary thought was finding its way into our American schools. It is important to keep this in mind for the complete secularization of education and its divorce from religious influence, a consideration upon which Rousseau insisted and which Pestalozzi echoed, had already become a major issue in American education and still remains a major issue. To this issue

we shall return in our discussion of the "new" practices of American education.

It is interesting to learn how restrictive and how old the newest cliché of the "new" educators — "the whole child" — actually is. They parade it often in their speech as a mask of their "progressive" tendencies. What they do not parade is that the term stems from the atheistic concepts of Rousseau and Pestalozzi. What they do not emphasize is that their concept of "the whole child" as a creature of both body and mind, omits a very vital component part of the actual whole child, his soul. For the soul they have no consideration, neither did Rousseau nor Pestalozzi. Is it any wonder that their ideas of character training produce "characters" among the student body of some of our "new" high schools, who sell narcotics in the halls of their schools as the recent report of Attorney General Goldstein of the State of New York indicated?

The influence of Pestalozzi upon American schools was also reflected in the work of Colonel Francis W. Parker who became a leader in the movement to encourage the establishment of teacher training schools in the city of Chicago. Colonel Parker was a follower of Pestalozzian ideas and these ideas are reflected in a book he published in 1889 called "How To Teach Geography." This book exerted a strong influence upon the content of education and gave to geography a leading place, though unfortunately for only a relatively brief time, in the courses of study adopted throughout the country for use in elementary schools.

During the period we usually refer to as "the gay nineties" object teaching became a fetish in the schools. Based upon Pestalozzian ideas concerning object study there developed a method of teaching arithmetic which became, for a time, most fashionable and almost universal. This was called "The Grube Method." The method in reality was a distortion of objective illustration, that is of the concrete in the representation of abstract ideas in the field of mathematical reasoning. In 1900 Dr. David Eugene Smith called attention to the exaggerations and errors of the Grube method. He issued a series of textbooks, for use in elementary schools, which became very popular throughout this period and which did a very effective job in helping to restore a better appreciation of the thoughts of Pestalozzi as they concerned object study. Yet the degeneration of the Pestalozzian ideas was after all but a logical consequence of the lack of system and method in the work at Yverdon. To this defect we have previously called attention.

Dewey

The attack upon the contributions of Pestalozzi, particularly as they concerned the use of objects, that is of the concrete in the teaching of abstract mathematical concepts to young children, brought fruit in another quarter. It occasioned the initial entrance upon the American educational scene of a young psychologist from Vermont but at this time a resident in Chicago. In 1887 Dr. John Dewey published a psychology. There was nothing particularly novel about this work, a textbook for use in schools and colleges. It followed traditional lines and bore no evidence of the exaggerated pragmatism with which Dr. Dewey has since become identified. In 1895 in collaboration with another student of psychology, a Dr. McClellan, Dr. Dewey published a book called "The Psychology of Number." This book showed in excellent manner the absurdities of the Grube method and emphasized the true meaning of mathematics and of mathematical relationships. It had, however, little effect upon the schools at the time it was written and directly has never had any marked effect on a nationwide scale upon teaching methods in the subject of arithmetic. It is true, however, that the ideas advanced in "The Psychology of Number" in 1895 are now in 1952 having an effect upon the teaching of arithmetic in the elementary schools located in the City of New York, where Dr. Dewey's influence is at the present time, in the fields of both education and social reform, exceedingly strong. We shall refer to this situation at greater length in our consideration of the "New" American education.

In the nineties another influence arose which outweighed all others in the field of educational method and that was the influence of Herbart. The theories of Herbart we have previously outlined in some detail. We have emphasized his belief in the formalism of education and outlined his concept of the necessary steps in instruction, if education were to result in worthwhile knowledge, in the integration of personality and in good character. We have also noted his thoughts concerning the many-sidedness of interest and the part that the appeal to the learner's interests should bear in the teaching process.

In the United States during the latter part of the last decade of the nineteenth century, the influence of Herbart upon the educational theories and practices of the schools became dominant. Among teachers, as among physicians, clichés become established at times. The closing days of the nineteenth century owing to the influence of Herbart fostered the

growth in educational circles, in teachers colleges and in normal schools, of the stereotyped expressions "the apperceptive basis" and "the apperceptive system." These expressions indicated simply the first step in the formal process which, according to Herbart, should be followed in teaching. They indicated in "school language" the rather familiar notion that the individual acquires new knowledge in terms of knowledge he already possesses.

Herbart, as we have said, was a student of psychology. By reason of his work in this field grew his doctrine of the many-sidedness of interest and the use that should be made of it in teaching. The child came to class, so Herbart taught, by reason of his natural inclinations, his prior teaching and his experiences outside the classroom, with interests in many things. His interests were comparable to what in more mature people we refer to as "hobbies." These interests should, said Herbart, be captivated by the teacher and an apperceptive basis established before new knowledge was presented in the classroom. In the child there should be established a systematic method of apprehending and comprehending new knowledge. In consequence of the popularity of Herbart's thought, which popularity was in large measure attributable to the teachings of the McMurry brothers, there grew up a strong, Herbartian influence at Teachers College, Columbia University. Hence the appearance of the clichés "apperceptive basis" and "apperceptive systems" which we have noted as strongly evident in school circles throughout the period of which we write.

In this same period, the closing years of the nineteenth century, Dr. John Dewey, to whom we have previously referred in connection with the opposition that became evident in Chicago to Pestalozzian methods in the teaching of arithmetic, arose to prominence in the work of educational experimentation. In 1896, in an appearance before the National Herbart Society, he made a strong attack upon the doctrine of interest and its many-sided aspect as conceived by Herbart and as promulgated by his followers who constituted in large measure the group to whom he spoke.

Theories of Interest

Dewey, in his elaboration of the doctrine of interest, supported the principles Froebel had advanced and rejected the psychological ap-

proaches to classroom procedures of Herbart. In his paper before the Herbart Society, Dewey identified interest with self-activity. In his delineation he described interest in words which he used to define it in a pamphlet he wrote some time later and which he called "Interest As Related To Will." In this pamphlet he wrote: "Interest is the identification of the self with some object or with some idea because of the necessity of that object or that idea to the maintenance of self-expression."

In this definition there is not only resident the rejection of the many-sidedness of interest theory of Herbart but there is, in addition, the whole kernel of the "new education" which is of such great importance to the people of the United States and of their children at the present time. In this revelation of Dewey's concept of identification between interest and self-activity, we have his acceptance of Froebel and his rejection of Herbart. This, at the time, may have been all there was in the relatively young psychologist's mind. There may have been nothing there of the application of the exaggerated pragmatic philosophy, which he later developed into a method of interpretation of social and industrial life. At the moment, in all probability, there was but the thought of the application of his doctrine of interest to teaching processes. This, most certainly, was all that Colonel Francis W. Parker saw in it and which attracted him to John Dewey.

As a result Dr. Dewey was invited to conduct an experimental school at the University of Chicago and from 1896 until 1903 he was engaged in this work. The introduction of Dewey's notions of school procedures into the curriculum and administration of the University High School were not very successful but the association of his name with the project provoked considerable publicity, as a result of which he was offered an opportunity to join the faculty of Teachers College, Columbia University, where the Herbartian current was, at the time, steadily strong. Dewey came to New York in 1904 and steadily since there has emanated from his shrine at Teachers College, for there are those who worship him as "America's foremost philosopher," all the developments which we shall now consider under the general title of the "New" American Education.

The "New" American Education

The first indication of the appearance of what has since been called "the activity program" or the root system of the "new" education is found in the work Dr. John Dewey attempted to do in the high school of the University of Chicago. In the classrooms he attempted to apply to secondary school work the principles which Froebel had outlined as those which govern the kindergarten. Dewey attempted to use Froebel's ideas as a substitute for the Herbartian principles which had formerly governed the experimental work the University was conducting in the field of high school teaching methods. He used the principle of self-expression, of freedom of discipline and of the choice by the pupil of the content of instruction. He even substituted for the orderly, though fixed arrangement of desks in the classrooms, the kindergarten arrangement of moveable furniture. The experiment could not be called truly successful, in fact the word unsuccessful would ordinarily be used and actually was used to describe the results attained. Dr. Parker, who had suggested the experiment, after Dr. Dewey had read his paper before the Herbartian Society, cannot in honesty be called the "father of 'progressive' education." In fact Dr. Parker was primarily interested in experimentation in the field of educational inquiry. He cannot, however, be given credit or blame for the immediate results of the experiment at the University of Chicago's high school. Credit or blame must rest on Dr. Dewey's shoulders. By reason of the work attempted he was the subject of much criticism, both adverse and kindly, in educational circles of the time. He received considerable publicity and in consequence was invited to come to Teachers College of Columbia University. He accepted the invitation and remained at the University until his retirement from active service many years later.

Teachers College

From Teachers College has come the "new" education. From that institution came, throughout the years of Dr. Dewey's active work in the field of teaching, many suggestions for changing the American social order by means of the manipulation of educational forces. Suggestions still come. Though Dr. Dewey has aged considerably he is still the foremost educational reformer in the thought of many. In fact in the thought of some he is "America's foremost philosopher." To our mind there is no doubt that Dr. Dewey is a most interesting educational

thinker. We cannot see in him, however, a philosopher of any merit but we do acknowledge the fact that he has made many worthwhile contributions to educational endeavor. We do not believe he should be held responsible for all the ideas advanced and practices followed by some of those who call themselves his disciples. In fact, not so long ago, he rebuked his so called followers for advancing ideas in the name of progressive education, ideas which he had never advocated.

The work that has been done in this, the first half of the twentieth century, in the name of education and the relationship of that work to the attempt to build in this country a new social order of socialistic design is the work of those who have been closely associated with Dr. Dewey at Teachers College. The work of "Social Frontiersmen," as his close associates have been called, is definitely the logical outgrowth of his prior work. The degeneration of the schools of the United States of America throughout the past fifteen years is directly related to his instrumentalistic philosophy, to his theories of the relativity of ideas, to his exaggerated pragmatism and to his influence and that of his associates at Teachers College in directing American education toward the values which atheistic socialism approves.

At the beginning of the twentieth century, at the time Dr. Dewey came to Teachers College, the influence of the McMurry brothers and the principles of the Herbartian school of thought in the methodology of teaching were strong. Dr. Dewey was on record as an opponent of Herbart's psychology, which had outlined the formal approach to education and which we have described. Dewey advocated the Froebelian approach to learning through play. He favored and taught the desirability of extending the kindergarten idea to the elementary school and to the high school as well. He advocated the theory of the freedom of untrammelled self-expression to be granted the learner; he favored the dominance of "the whole child" in the classroom. Dewey conceived of education as an informal process of learning from which all restraint was to disappear, and not as a formal process directed by a trained teacher leading the learner toward good personal character. According to Herbart the teacher was to point the way; according to Dewey the teacher was to follow the child who, by reason of his natural inclination, would be directed toward the personal goals he should achieve by co-operation with others in the efforts of humanity to achieve an ideal social democracy.

We have said that Dr. Dewey's ideas were based upon the fundamentals of Froebel's notions of what constituted good teaching. In essence they were. We must not blame the shy, essentially religious Froebel, however, for all the ideas Dewey advanced. At Teachers College Dr. Dewey added many non-sequiturs to the kindergarten idea of the freedom of self-expression through play. These non-sequiturs constitute Dewey's contributions to educational procedures. They are essentially his thoughts and the thoughts of the men he gathered around him and who formed the core of the John Dewey Society. The responsibility for the degeneration of American education through the "progressive" methods of the "new" education, which is leading the United States, by means of her schools, to collectivism rests upon John Dewey and his followers. They are truly the enemies of genuine American education.

The initial division between the two schools of thought at Teachers College, after the addition of Dr. Dewey's name to the faculty roster, was a psychological one. Herbart had been a psychologist; Dewey was one. It was inevitable that they should differ. In my experience it takes only two psychologists to make a world of differences. The difference in this case, as we have indicated, concerned the doctrine of interest. To Herbart interest signified the intellectual concern of an individual over an idea which came before his mind. It represented a condition of mind the teacher should try to captivate if it existed or create if it did not. Interest to Herbart might, therefore, be factitious or genuine. For classroom purposes it did not matter. The art of the teacher could make the "make believe" as vital as the real. To Dewey interest was self-activity. It might be intellectual or it might be physical. It was the identification of the learner, any learner, young or old, with some object or some idea in a way that made the object or the idea of vital importance to him. It was natural. The teacher should not seek to produce it. The teacher, on the other hand, should make it his guide. He should follow it, not seek to direct it. His aim should be through natural interest, natural self-activity, to aid the learner in the co-operation necessary, to the building of a better social world.

We may with reasonableness conclude that Herbart's theories pointed toward the realization of good personal character on the basis of the clarification of ideas. Dewey's ideas, for we should like to repeat that they were his, not Froebel's, point toward the realization of the potential possibilities of an individual through the freedom of self-

expression indicated in play. In one sense, a limited sense, we may conceive of the contest that was in process at Teachers College and, by the contacts which that institution had established with the schools of America, a struggle between the ideas of Herbart and those of Froebel. It was, however, more than that. It bore the germ of a struggle, through the schools, and by reason of the implications of Dewey's addition to Froebel's premises, between our American way of life and atheistic socialism. It is this concept of the struggle that loyal Americans throughout all America are only now, almost fifty years too late, beginning to understand.

The Social Frontiersmen

Associated with Dr. John Dewey have been between 1904 and the present time, a number of men whose names have since become familiar in the effort to effect an educational revolution in this country. The more prominent of these are: William H. Kilpatrick, John L. Childs, George S. Counts, Jesse Newton, Harold Rugg, Goodwin Watson, Charles A. Beard, George W. Hartmann, Boyd Bode, Willard E. Goslin and Ernest O. Melby. In the early activities of this group there arose the Dalton Plan of education. The Dalton plan was an effort to have the child determine the rate of progress he should make in school and the amount of work he should actually do. In accordance with the plan the pupil regularly made contracts covering the assignments of work he agreed to undertake. The plan represented an effort to individualize the school. We need not dwell upon it because it made little effective impression upon education in America. It, however, attracted some attention in England and China.

Another effort made by the Dewey group, which soon became the John Dewey Society, was the "project method." This was an effort to recast the curriculum of the school into units by reason of the problems pupils would undertake, under a system somewhat similar in nature to the Dalton Plan. The interesting point about the "project method" is that it was the forerunner of the "core curriculum" now uppermost as an educational cliché of the moment and as often spoken as its relative, "the whole child" which latter term in reality is not new but dates back, as we have seen, to the days of Pestalozzi.

In the Dalton plan and in the "project method" we see revealed the essence of an earlier thought of John Dewey as expressed by his work

at Teachers College. The thought is that in the education of the child effort, gratuitous effort, work accomplished by dogged determination is as necessary as is interest. The Froebelians at Teachers College in the early part of the century made much of the idea that the child must be made to realize that the school does not exist for the purpose of keeping him happy. There are tasks to be done which he must do, whether they appear to him pleasant or not. He can not drop an assigned task, even though he himself assigned it to himself, at some point where it ceases to interest him, prior to his completion of it. There is such an entity as duty. Interest is, in other words, always to be related to will.

The thought of duty, of responsibility, has given way in the "new" education to self-expression which is never to be thwarted or frustrated. This thought was not an original factor in Dewey's plan when he started his work at Teachers College. The germ of error was however, in Dewey's thought, and it was this germ of error which grew into the doctrine of "progressive" education which has ruined so many American youths and which threatens the continuance of our American way of life. It was this germ of thought which was deliberately given opportunity to grow to proportions which at the beginning of the century were not part of the thinking of the John Dewey Society, later to become the Progressive Education Association and still later the American Education Fellowship and now part of the steering apparatus of the National Education Association. The growth of "progressive" education, under the name of the "activity program" took place in Russia. The seed for its growth was planted in the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics in 1917.

In the year 1917 occurred the Russian revolution and the abdication of the Czar. This revolution was led by Kerensky. He attempted to set up a democratic regime. His attempt was short-lived. The leaders of Bolshevism, who had been exiled from their country during the rule of Czar Nicholas II, returned to Russia. Among those who returned in 1917 were Lenin, Stalin and Trotsky. Czar Nicholas II and his family were murdered by Bolsheviks on October 10, 1918.

Leon Trotsky had been living for some time prior to 1917 in the northern section of the City of New York, not too far removed from Teachers College. He was employed in the garment industry and was a leader in the Garment Workers Union. This union has been throughout its history identified with the educational activities of the city. Its interest continues until the present day in which it has resulted, in collaboration

with the Board of Education of the City of New York in the erection and maintenance of a vocational school building in which is located a high school and a collegiate institute devoted to the promotion of the interests of the garment industry.

In 1917 Trotsky's influence in labor union activities in the City of New York was strong. Dr. John Dewey of Teachers College was a member of the Teachers Union. Union activities interested both. How much Trotsky learned of Dewey's interest theory of education, of his exaggerations of Froebel's ideas, of his subscription to the thought of the relativism of ideas, of his denial of the Absolute, of his belief that religion was but an opiate of the people and of his philosophy of instrumentalism, that concept of distorted pragmatism, which pointed the way toward the realization by man through definite activity on his part to the establishment of a new social order, we do not know. We do know that in Dewey's ideas and in his educational theories advanced both in Chicago in the early days of his career and in the City of New York at Teachers College, Trotsky could have found much comfort. He could have found a plan to revolutionize the Russian educational system and fashion it along the lines of Marxian socialism.

Russia and the Activity Program

Shortly after Trotsky's return to the Soviet Union Dewey's "progressive" educational principles were, under the name of "the activity program" introduced into the Russian schools. Lenin who had become the acknowledged leader of the Bolshevist forces adopted "progressive" education in 1917. At the time he boasted that in four years, by means of the education of the young, he could change old Mother Russia, despite its essentially religious God-fearing people, into a communistic, atheistic state. Though murders, purges and persecutions were numerous he had quite realized his purposes not in four years but by 1924, the year of his death.

After Lenin's death there ensued a struggle for power. Trotsky announced himself as in favor of a world-wide effort, along Marxian lines, in the industrial centres of the world but particularly directed to workmen in England, Germany and the United States, for the supremacy on a global basis of atheistic communism. Stalin, on the other hand, protested that the time was not ripe for such a movement. Marxian Socialists, or Communists as by this time they were commonly

called, should first realize "collectivism" in Russia. Time was necessary to prepare adequately for the world wide inevitable struggle that would annihilate all German, English and American capitalism, so preached Stalin. Stalin won. Trotsky fled Russia and sought asylum in Mexico, where he was subsequently murdered. It is interesting to add the historical note that Dr. John Dewey shortly thereafter went to Mexico. He headed a commission interested in ascertaining the details of Trotsky's murder. He demonstrated his loyalty, if not to a cause, at least to a kindred thinker.

When Stalin in 1927 re-organized the government and provided for the five year plan which was to start in the following year he gave close study to the complaints that had been filed by the Commissar of Education as early as 1920 and every year thereafter against the "activity program". However, though all other departments underwent re-organization it was decided that the Department of Education would remain in status quo and that the "activity program" would continue. We do not know, and in all probability shall never learn what bearing, if any the trip Dr. George S. Counts made to Russia at about this time had on the matter. In fact this was not the only visit George Counts, who with D. William H. Kilpatrick apparently constituted Dr. Dewey's advertising force, paid to the Soviet Union. He went to Russia on two other occasions between 1917 and 1933, the year in which the "activity program" was officially dropped from Russia's educational program. All of his visits were extended. On one of his trips he journeyed six thousand miles by automobile throughout the Soviet and so came into contact with the people and the schools. He knows the Russia of "activity program" days and the Russia of today. He knows the efforts Stalin has made to make the young citizens of the Soviet embrace communism and to hate Western Christian civilization. He could be a masterful force in this country to stem the current that is trying to make young Americans resemble young Russians in their aspirations and desires. He knows the situation as few men do. We hope he will, in time, see the light of truth, desert the group that now represents a dangerous force in our Western civilization, and become a leader in the educational world of America, rather than continue as a follower in the camp of the atheistic Socialists who now constitute the army of genuine enemies of America and her schools, which army Dr. John Dewey despite his years, is still leading.

It is fitting that, at this time, we revert to America and examine the situation that developed here between 1917 and 1932, the period which brought about the great changes which 3,000,000 Communists had been able to effect in Russia with a total population of 200,000,000 people. Russia through her schools and her vast army of ignorant, undisciplined, delinquent, migratory youth which those schools by the "activity program" and the doctrine of the freedom of self-expression had produced, was now in a condition which needed the strong arm of stern rule. Lenin was right in his judgment of the changes that could be wrought through the type of education about which Trotsky had talked and about which he had probably learned in the City of New York. Stalin was right in continuing the "activity program" in Russia until 1933 and not ejecting it, as it had been suggested to him to do, in 1927. Now in 1933 it was evident that his plan of becoming the generalissimo of Russia and her satellites, of becoming the imperialist he always purposed to be, was possible. The need of force was apparent. Force had been used consistently since 1917. There was, however, an undercurrent of opposition. Now to curb the depredations of youth, to control them and compel them to be obedient and respectful to their parents, teachers and official superiors, the use of force was not only necessary but in addition its use would be approved by all citizens of the Soviet who desired law and order to prevail. The dreadful "activity program" which had been imported into Russia from capitalistic America had been proved to be a destructive, poisonous force. A change was mandatory, so read Stalin's propaganda and Stalin was right. What he did not add was the thought that "it had been planned that way."

The National Education Association

In 1914 the First World War began. In 1917 we entered the war. In that same year the Russian Revolution took place and Russia withdrew from the war. In that same year there took place in America an attempt to take away from the several states the control each held over the education of its people and to situate that control in the Federal Government. Feverishly supported by the National Education Association the Smith-Towner bill providing for an appropriation of \$300,000,000 for the support of education in the States was introduced into Congress. This was not the simple, benevolent piece of legislation it appeared to be. The genuine purpose was to grant to the Department of the Interior federal control of education. The framers of the bill knew that "he who

holds the purse strings, holds the power". The plan, however, failed. The Smith-Towner bill was killed but the campaign waged in its behalf proved beneficial to the National Education Association. From 1917 until the present its influence and its power have increased until it now presents itself as a force threatening not only state control of education but the American way of life itself. We shall have occasion to revert to the N. E. A. again in connection with the further development of the "new" education in this country.

In this period there also arose the question of religion in the schools. This issue, most Americans thought, had been definitely settled seventy-five years earlier. The public schools of this country, it was agreed, had been secularized. It was likewise a matter of universal agreement among Americans that citizens who believed religious values should permeate education had the right to erect, support and send their children to such religious schools. There had grown up throughout the country a great number of schools systems, some under Lutheran and some under Catholic church control, since the days of Horace Mann in Massachusetts and Bishop John Hughes in New York. In 1925, however, the state of Oregon questioned this settlement and threw new light, or shall we say new shadows, on the question by enacting legislation providing that all children of school age in the state must attend the public schools. A dispute arose which became a matter of national interest. The matter was taken to the Supreme Court of the United States for a decision. The Court decided that a citizen had the right to send his children to any school of his choice anywhere in the United States, so long as the school met the basic educational requirements of the state in which it was located. So ended the issue. At least we thought so at the time, but recently President James B. Conant of Harvard University revived it. He was supported in his attack upon the parochial schools, by Dr. John K. Norton, of Teachers College and of the National Education Association.

These two questions, one of the federal control over education in the several states, the other of the power that could be exercised by state school authorities over compulsory school attendance, were very important and are still of importance. They are important in themselves and they are important from another consideration, a consideration that came to be and still is the most important consideration of all. This consideration is the matter of how autocratic

and controlling are governments to be. We have seen how controlling and autocratic they became in the name of so-called "Social Democracy," the false democracy of communism in Russia. The question raises the thought of the danger of excessive governmental control and whether it has not become a genuine menace to the representative republic of the United States. The answer to this question can be found, we believe, in a further study of the history of the "new" education in this country. Such study reveals its kinship to the Russian pattern.

City of New York Adopts Activity Program

In a booklet "Progressive Poison in Public Education," which we published recently, we outlined the history of the "new" education or the "activity program" as following the Russian pattern, it was first officially called in The City of New York. We showed the undemocratic methods by which it had been introduced and forced into the public schools against the persistent protests of the teachers. We indicated the degeneration it had wrought in the Russian schools. This portrayal we do not intend to repeat here. It is well known. We do, however, wish to repeat what is also well known, it is true, but which still needs emphasis. It is this: The same forces at Teachers College whose activities were evident in the introduction of the activity program into the Soviet's system of schools in 1917 were behind the pressure that caused it to be adopted by the Board of Education on an experimental basis for the first three years of the elementary school curriculum by the City of New York in 1935. Two years after it had been expelled from Russia the activity program was adopted by The City of New York, despite, or perhaps because of, what its effects had been shown to have been in Russia. Of these effects Commissar Epstein of the Soviet's Department of Education said at the time of the expulsion of the activity program from the schools of the Soviet in 1933, "It gave the children a superficial knowledge of a great many things, but it did not give to them a proper educational foundation. Time was wasted in excursions and visits for experience. They could talk about the railway lines in their towns or about local factories, but they could not talk correctly about anything. Their language and their arithmetic were equally bad."

Yet the activity program was fastened upon the schools of the City of New York in 1935 by the help of those who are now trying, it seems,

to fasten communism upon this country. These protagonists of the "new" education apparently agree with Lenin and Stalin that through the schools and through the "new" education, a breakdown of good character among the youth can be effected and the need for an autocratic government made apparent as it was in Russia. So they hope. So do many Russians still hope but the equality of man and his hold on life, liberty and happiness in Russia is more tenuous now than it was in the days of the Czars. Will it become some day a dream here as it is to day in Russia? Unless we check the progress of the "new" education here before prospective imperialists have an opportunity to fasten their hold upon our country the "new" education may be as successful in the United States, as Joseph Stalin estimates it to have been in the Soviet. The danger is real. Many American communities have risen against the "progressive" elements which have sought to control the education of their children by means of the "new" concepts of freedom of self-expression of youth and "academic freedom" of teachers, which in essence has come to mean, the freedom to introduce atheistic socialism into education. The "new" education is not to be identified with modern education as Dr. William H. Kilpatrick, Dr. Dewey's first convert at Teachers College, thinks it should. It is entirely different. It is an effort to communize America.

Education Before and After 1935

American education reached its zenith in the period between 1912 and 1935. During this period all the better contributions of the leading educational reformers we have mentioned and some of the least noteworthy changes in which their suggestions had resulted, fused into an educational Renaissance which made of the period included between 1912 and 1935 a truly remarkable era in the history of American education. During this period the contributions of Herbart were in the ascendancy but in practice they were modified in actual classroom work by the thoughts of Froebel as reflected in the Teacher Training classes of Dr. John Dewey at Teachers College. These years, 1912 to 1935, gave to Dewey and through him and his followers to Teachers College of Columbia University, unquestioned leadership in the field of educational endeavor. During these years Dewey appeared in better light than he ever appeared before and most certainly in better light than he has appeared since. His philosophy, however, matured during this period. It always had had since the days when he abandoned psychology

and entered into the field of educational experimentation, the element which made it "too strong" for William James. Dewey's philosophy with its exaggerated pragmatism, its atheism, degenerated into an instrumentalism which his disciples, more radical than even he had initially been, by combination of it with the thoughts of Georg Hegel and the economic theories of Karl Marx, developed into a scheme to change the representative republic of the United States into a collectivistic state.

During the period between 1912 and 1935, however, only the better possibility of Dewey's thoughts in the field of education came to fruition. During this period, classroom work was vivified. The first step of Herbart's five formal steps of instruction became a problematic approach, a challenge to the learner. Herbart's tendency to lecturing, which had resulted in the teacher talking too much in the classroom and the learner too little, gave way under the Dewey influence to classroom discussions, to the socialized classroom lesson units. The learner became far more active than he had been under the method of instruction Herbart had recommended and which teachers had heretofore followed. Classroom work was still formal, but not as rigidly formal as it was under Herbart's pure influence upon our American schools. Moreover the fifth step of the five formal steps, that of application, was characterized not only by a proof that what had been taught had been both apprehended and comprehended but also by challenges to the learner to go beyond the mere use of what he had learned by applying the new knowledge not only to old but also to new situations. The encouragement to initiative became marked. It was Dewey's influence which gave us five steps in learning, not formal ones, at least not so strictly formal and absolute as Herbart's had been but rather informal. These steps, which by no means informalized the curriculum nor encouraged the learner to make it, may be said to have been these:

1. Establishment of need for lesson (The problematic approach)
2. Statement of the lesson's aim by pupil (The evidence of self-activity)
3. Vitalization of lesson (Socialized recitation)
4. Verification (Proof of acquisition of learning by self-activity of learner)
5. Initiative (Encouragement given to pupil to ask questions of teacher and of other pupils)

The emphasis upon self-activity in the leaning process is evident. It is evident, too, that the Froebelian influence is strong. It is, however, not the pure kindergarten idea applied to classroom work. It is Dewey's influence upon formal instruction by means of an approach to it through Froebel. It is the notion of self-activity which Dewey identified with interest. Dewey defined interest as "The identification of the self with some object or idea because of the necessity of that object on that idea to the maintenance of self-expression". This he had indicated in a pamphlet he had written called "Interest as Related to Will", to which we previously have made reference. It was startlingly significant. It embodied the essence of his strong influence upon education in the period we are discussing. To Dr. John Dewey a great debt of gratitude is owed for the path he blazed. We shall most certainly some day return to it.

Dewey's influence in education helped not only to bring about better classroom work in the elementary schools but to do what had not been done before: revolutionize secondary school procedures, both in the field of instruction and of administration. The growth of the cosmopolitan or composite high school idea should be, in great measure, attributed to Dewey's influence. The increase of vocational training, of commercial work, as well as the retention of the classical and of the general, as the word was then understood, courses of study all given under one roof, in one high school building, by reason of the flexibility which better secondary school administration provided, so that pupils could transfer, on demonstrated need, from one course to another, were all brought about, directly or indirectly, by John Dewey's influence.

We honor Dr. Dewey for the good work he has done. At the same time we deplore his philosophy. We do not think it fair to call him a philosopher at all. We think it a gross error, a complete lack of understanding, to attach to him the title "America's foremost philosopher". In philosophy Dewey is but a mis-shapen pragmatist. He is atheistic in his fundamental concepts and his notions of the relativity of ideas make any discussion of the ultimate demonstrable truth of any thought, in fact make any genuine progress in thought, impossible. To Dewey only that is true which works out to your advantage. In following his thought you come inevitably to the conclusion that man, who to Dewey is the measure of all things, for whom there is no Absolute and for whom belief in One is but a straw at which he grasps, should designedly by any means bring about a condition that will enable him, the conqueror, to have the advantage. Dewey's philosophy, in its atheism, its

instrumentalism and its relativity points down the road along which his followers are leading him, the road blazed by Georg Hegel and his pupil Karl Marx, the road paved with murder, rape and ineffable tragedy, the road of Stalinism. Dewey's philosophy is as anti-American as was that of Benedict Arnold. It has no place in a country which stamps on its coins "In God We Trust".

We honor Dewey as a reformer who, by reason of his better thinking about purely educational procedures, brought about the better conditions which prevailed in American school practices in the period between 1912 and 1935. What he accomplished is a permanent contribution. As we have said we believe we shall, in time, return to it. We deplore the fact that America could produce so atheistic a thinker as Dr. Dewey, along philosophical lines, is. We believe that were it not for Dr. Dewey and the work accomplished by his disciple, Dr. George Counts, in the philosophy of education as expressed by the work done in the Soviet Union between 1917 and 1933, the world would be a happier place than it is today. When you add Hegel's notion of the validity of war and Marx's ideas of economic revolution of the proletariat to Dewey's concepts of philosophy you produce a condition that threatens the enslavement of man, the end of human liberty and the destruction of all proper prospects of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness for each human being in a country such as ours which guarantees to each of its citizens these endowments made ours in humanity's name by the Creator.

It is Dewey's philosophy of atheistic instrumentalism which when supported by Hegel's thoughts on the sublimity of power, of force, of war itself and fortified by Marx's doctrines of collectivism and of the inevitable supremacy of the proletariat over capitalistic classes that make a frightening total. It is this prospect we have before us in America today. It is this flower that was resident in the bud of Dewey's educational reforms. Greatly as we may honor him for his efforts to improve the practical art of teaching, we can not fail to see the malpractices that have come to pass by reason of his thought.

These malpractices we see not only in his distortions of Froebel's thought but also in the educational associations that have been brought into existence by those who became his disciples when he joined the staff of Teachers College, at the turn of the century, and the many others, known and unknown, in thousands of classrooms throughout the United States who have consistently supported Dewey and his disciples from 1904 until the present day.

The full impact of Dewey's thought upon American education was realized in 1935 when the Board of Education of the City of New York adopted on an experimental basis, the "activity program". It was put into operation supposedly on a limited basis in only a few schools, with "control schools" proceeding on the traditional curriculum and following the legal courses of study to be used as a balance check against the "new" education which had but recently been ejected from Russia. The deceit and the misrepresentation that accompanied the movement to gild the ex-Russian "old" education, as it was now described in the Soviet, were soon crystal clear. The extension of the "activity program" to over fifty schools was so rapid as to appear to be the work of a magic influence. It spread throughout the elementary schools and even to the high school system. Duplicity and compulsion accompanied its progress. Teachers were terrorized into a condition which tied their tongues. Those who were inclined to be fearful or "wiser in their own conceit than are the children of light" became, in public, protagonists for the "new" education though, in private conversation, they deplored it. As a consequence not only has education, but school morale among the professional corps as well, suffered irreparable damage. Strikes among pupils and suspension of participation in all extra-curricular activities by teachers have become the accepted pattern. The forces of modern unionism worked feverishly to cause a break down in school controls and unfortunately, owing to the cowardice of far too many teachers, supposedly professional people, succeeded. The blow was fatal. School morale is dead in the City of New York and the "activity program" is now almost universally prevalent in the schools of the largest city in the world. The City of New York is following the footsteps of the Soviet on an educational path that is leading toward the eventual supremacy of some one who thinks like Joe Stalin and who will establish here in the United States of America by the power of force, a socialistic state. The issue is clear and its origin is traceable. The help that John Dewey and his "Social Frontiesmen" have rendered is apparent. The co-operation that the most humble school teacher, by acquiescence in policies, stratagems, devices, plans and practices that she in her heart knows and has known for the past fifteen years to be against fundamental morality and truth has given, is pitiable. With it we have no sympathy.

It has been not only through pressure exerted on the Board of Education of the City of New York that the plan of the "Progressives" in the field of education has been made clear. It has been made clear in

the pressures exerted throughout the United States by those who have brought into existence a militant army whose aim is the control of education so that they may gain influence over the thoughts of the youth of our land and the power to establish in this country a condition analogous to the one that now exists in the Soviet. The organization of their forces is a tribute to the radicals in the profession of teaching as well as to the "educational experts" at Washington. We admire them in the same spirit that we admire efficient gangsters.

We have traced the growth of Dewey's disciples to the establishment of the John Dewey Society. We have shown how these "Social Frontiersmen" became the Progressive Education Association and still later the American Education Fellowship. Another group, the National Education Association received its charter from Congress in 1906.* By reason of the activity of this group the matter of federal aid to education in the the several states was brought to a focus in 1918, by the introduction of the Smith-Towner bill into Congress. This bill, as we have indicated, failed of enactment. Into every Congress since a similar bill providing for the apportionment of \$300,000,000 by the federal government to aid the several states in their support of public schools has been introduced, though studies have shown that only two states, North Carolina and New Mexico, have any real problem in the matter of providing proper support for local public schools. The N. E. A., as it is popularly known throughout the country, is eager, however, to have the Bureau of Edu-

*The National Education Association has endeavored over many years to build in the United States of America the idea that it is representative of all the teachers in the country and of their thoughts on education. By combination with other groups it has endeavored to create for itself a monopolistic control of education. Recently there appeared in American Unity, Vol. X. No. 3 - January-February 1952, an article headed

Danger! They're After Our Schools.

The article in question is distorted and libelous in its attack on those who have opposed the "new" education. In style it is closely akin to well known Russian propaganda. Neither the article in question nor the magazine in which it appears, which styles itself "A Monthly Educational Guide" is scholastically important. What is important is this announcement on page 12 of the issue in question:

Sponsors of this Publication
 National Association of Secondary School Principals
 Department of Classroom Teachers of the National Education Association
 American Association of Colleges for Teachers Education
 Commission for the Defense of Democracy through Education, N.E.A.
 American Jewish Committee
 John Dewey Society
 Committee of Tenure and Academic Freedom, N.E.A.
 Department of Higher Education, N.E.A.

cation of the Department of the Interior raised to the dignity of a separate department of government with a cabinet officer as its head. So it continues its efforts and even tries to disguise them by adding the question of teachers salaries to its campaigns.

Of late years, however, there has been a coalescence of the work of the American Education Fellowship, whose origins we have traced, with the work of the N. E. A. The latter organization has become extremely active in its promotion of "progressive" education. During the past year there have appeared in magazines throughout the country articles written by members of the original John Dewey Society and of the Progressive Education Association assailing all those who have had the courage to oppose them and the "progressive" educational policies of which they are the proponents. All these, inclusive of the writer, have been called the enemies of public education. The purpose of the united front presented by the coalescence of the Social Frontiersmen of the American Education Fellowship with the National Education Association has been tersely expressed by some of the present day leadership of the movement to fasten "progressive" education and its purpose of building a new social order upon this country.

We could make quotations from the "Progressives" to prove who, in this day and hour, are really the enemies not only of our American schools but also of our American way of life. In the House of Representatives on March 21, 1952 Hon. Paul W. Shafer of Michigan presented a most complete documentation of the work of the Social Frontiersmen. We submit, in conclusion, that we have proved our case and have shown who is weakening the United States of America and thereby destroying the last hope of Western Christian civilization.

“Progressive” Poison in Public Education

published by the

AMERICAN EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

545 Fifth Avenue

New York 17, N. Y.

Has met with such a warm welcome and we have received so many congratulations upon it that we invite all who have not read it, to do so.

FIFTY CENTS A COPY

It explains the pernicious nature of “progressive” education and shows what is happening inside our American schools.

The present booklet

American Education: The Old, The Modern and The "New"

we hope you have read and enjoyed.

It shows how public education in the United States of America has been distorted by the Socialists in our schools who would lead the youth of the United States away from the principles upon which our country was founded.

SEVENTY-FIVE CENTS A COPY

Order both books — Give copies to your friends

We invite all patriotic Americans to join the A. E. A.

All members receive a 20% discount on all extra orders they may place for copies of our publications they may wish to give to their friends.

The Educational Signpost, the official organ of the A. E. A. is published during the year. It is sent to all members. We also send to members additional literature pertinent to vital educational issues as these issues arise.

We are supported by dues of members, by donations and by the revenues our publications yield.

TYPES OF MEMBERSHIP

Sustaining	\$10 a calendar year
Associate	5 a calendar year
General	2 a calendar year

AMERICAN EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

545 FIFTH AVENUE

NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

