





BENDING THE TWIG

*“’Tis education forms the common mind
Just as the twig is bent the tree’s inclined.”*
—Alexander Pope

“Prove all things; hold fast that which is good.”
(1 Thess. 5:21)

BENDING THE TWIG

*THE REVOLUTION IN EDUCATION
AND ITS EFFECT ON OUR CHILDREN*

By

AUGUSTIN G. RUDD

*Chairman, Educational Committee, National Society,
Sons of the American Revolution*



THE HERITAGE FOUNDATION, INC.

121 WEST WACKER DRIVE, CHICAGO 1, ILL.

COPYRIGHT, 1957, BY
SONS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION—NEW YORK CHAPTER

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS CATALOG CARD NUMBER 57-9376

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
AMERICAN BOOK-STRATFORD PRESS, INC., NEW YORK

TO THE
MANY VALIANT EDUCATORS

who have fought vigorously to preserve in our schools and colleges the fundamentals of sound education and the ideals and principles on which our Republic was founded. Conceived by brilliant men, this priceless heritage has bestowed upon the people of all nations who have come to our shores the gifts of freedom and opportunity, and the greatest spiritual and material blessings in the history of mankind.

Foreword

OUR PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM has been one of our most respected institutions for generations. Its integrity, efficiency and steadfast adherence to the task of imparting basic education and sound training in the development of worthy American citizens have caused it to be regarded as a great bulwark of our liberties. It was disturbing to learn, therefore, as I did in the spring of 1938, that some of its most important concepts and objectives had been uprooted. So deep-seated were these changes that they constituted a veritable revolution in the educative process. The results at hand were definitely alarming.

In a study of the history of our public schools, the author has been impressed by the masterful job they have done, be they large or small, in preparing pupils for useful and successful adult lives. I am equally convinced that our Republic cannot long survive the time when a majority of our youth reaches maturity without an adequate appreciation of its great American heritage. During the past eighteen years my interest in this subject has continued unabated. I have heard from thousands of citizens who have poured out their misgivings. Most of them have pleaded for help in arresting a condition in their schools which they knew to be wrong. In fact, these distressed but unorganized parents in all parts of our country are really the inspiration of this book.

Bending the Twig makes no pretense of being a treatise on

education. One need not be a mechanical engineer to judge the *performance* of his automobile. It is judged by the practical results. By the same reasoning, a parent does not have to be a professional educator to evaluate the *results* of the public education of his children. The primary responsibility for a child's education rests with the parent. This right cannot be usurped by the educator or by the state.

Parents are puzzled and confused today. The main purpose of this book, therefore, is to provide answers to these timely questions: (1) What is the New Education? (2) How has it worked? (3) What should we expect of our public schools? These pages embody the research, the facts and the arguments not readily available to our people. I have drawn freely on the studies and background documentation of many authorities, of both the past and the present, whose statements contribute to an understanding of the issues. References are made throughout the text to their books and public pronouncements, and this assistance is gratefully acknowledged.

A confusing issue—academic freedom—has caused bitter controversy in recent years. Because of its importance and relationship to the whole problem, it is discussed at length in Chapter IX.

Many patriotic groups and individuals have aided in this work, particularly the Sons of the American Revolution. The unfailing encouragement and assistance of Mr. Gardner Osborn, Secretary of the New York Chapter, Empire State Society, and Mrs. Osborn have aided materially in the publication of this book.

The author has given all rights, title and royalties in *Bending the Twig* to the New York Chapter, Sons of the American Revolution, under whose auspices it is being published.

It is hoped that this volume will be practically useful to all public-spirited citizens, and that it will furnish the basis of an intelligent review and appraisal of the quality of the New Education. Also, that it will provide a reasonable estimate of what we have a right to expect from our public schools.

AUGUSTIN G. RUDD

Contents

Foreword

vii

PART I

I. What Is Happening in Our Public Schools?	3
II. The American Public School Tradition	10
III. Progressive Education	17
IV. The Rise of the Frontier Thinkers	39
V. An Unvarying Program	61
VI. Rugg—Frontier Thinker	65
VII. Into the Classrooms	74
VIII. The Harvest	91
IX. Academic Freedom	114

PART II

X. The Battle of Ideas	129
XI. Design of the "New Social Order"	132
XII. The Tripod of Liberty	138
—Religious	
—Political	
—Economic	
XIII. The New Economics	154
XIV. Morals and Ethics	165
XV. Emotion or Reason	171
XVI. Discipline or Self-Expression	175

xvii. History or Contemporary Life	181
xviii. Individualism or Group Conformity	188
xix. Educated or Socialized	193
xx. Ancestry of the New Education	199

PART III

xxi. Socialism and Communism	209
xxii. The Menace of Marxism	216
xxiii. Education or Indoctrination	228
xxiv. Teaching the Teachers	233
xxv. Leadership of the New Education	241
xxvi. The Influence of Foundations	255
xxvii. Parents and Teachers	264
xxviii. Over the Horizon	274
<i>Index</i>	293



PART I



CHAPTER I

What Is Happening in Our Public Schools?

THIS IS A BOOK which grew out of the anguished concern of a typical American parent over the disturbing trends of American contemporary public school education. Because millions of other parents are sharing that concern, there is a widespread need for a review of the situation which will supply answers to some of the questions in parents' minds. What is wrong in our public schools?

Some eighteen years ago, in a suburban community, the author of this book was amazed to learn that our children were not being taught many of the fundamentals of knowledge which had been the backbone of public school education for generations. When he looked further, he discovered that the traditional school courses which had shaped the minds of generations of our citizens had been drastically altered or omitted. For instance, history, geography and civics had disappeared as separate subjects. In their place was a new and confusing omnibus course styled *social science*, which was to become the "core of the whole program." The more the author examined the texts and the day-to-day lessons of this course, the more he realized that a whole set of new concepts and doctrines had been bootlegged into the school curriculum. Some of these concepts contradicted and condemned ideas which were held by the overwhelming

majority of the American people. Even the main purpose of the public school had been changed. Obviously, something was wrong. Who had done this to the tax-supported public school curriculum? He began to make inquiries.

The answers he received were even more disturbing. His local high school, he learned, had built its social science instruction around textbooks by Dr. Harold Rugg, of Teachers College, Columbia University, a leading New Educationist, who had loaded them with arguments supporting statism, and upholding collectivist doctrines as superior to sound American principles. These statements constituted a severe indictment of our way of life. Now, although no one questioned the right of Rugg as a private citizen to write and publish debatable books and ones at such variance with our accepted beliefs, the problem here was something different. This slanted, partisan course was being used by the public schools. It was presenting its off-center economic and political theories to plastic minds as "social science." Somebody had approved these texts for use by our children. Further inquiries revealed that these books had been approved by the New York State Board of Education. Furthermore, there were many others of like nature on the approved list. Obviously, the problem was not local, it was general. It existed in public schools throughout the state and the nation. What was going on in American education, anyhow?

As he proceeded with his inquiry, the author discovered that many other parents were sharing his apprehension. Fathers and mothers all over the United States were awakening to the realization that corrosive forces were at work in the educational process. Some of these parents banded together with the author to study this school problem. Later, other influential organizations and individuals took up the issue. Their findings are summarized in the following chapters. The time has come when this astonishing story can be told. It is an eye-opening and a saddening chronicle.

It was disclosed that a comparatively small number of edu-

cators in strategic positions, by moving skillfully into the axial centers of education, has welded their leftist-liberal, economic, social and political philosophies into an educational philosophy which has caused a veritable revolution in our public school system. So complete and sweeping has been their victory that today most of the leaders of the dominant teachers' organizations and teacher-training colleges and institutions, which screen new teachers into the schools, have accepted or conformed to this new curriculum and its educational philosophies. The New Educationists, as we shall call them in this volume, now dominate most of the present-day public schools. Many outstanding educators, however, have kept their schools out of the maelstrom.

The story of how this change has been effected is a shocking commentary on the apathy and political immaturity of the majority of our people. Let there be no mistake about it. The New Education has come, not because there has been any public and widespread demand for such changes in our schools, but because a self-constituted group of educators decided it should come. As we shall see later in this book, repeated pollings of public opinion have shown that an unmistakable majority of parents disapproves of Progressivism and other features of the New Education when the issue is presented to it directly. Unfortunately, the issue seldom has been presented democratically to our people. A special referendum in Pasadena and a newspaper poll by the *New York Daily News*, discussed in this book, are exceptional. The New Education has been imposed on the nation by a small minority of willful educators. They have sneaked it into our schools while the overwhelming majority of parents, busy with the task of making a living, has not been aware of what was going on.

It is not the intention of the author to label any of the persons referred to in this book as being Communist, nor does he do so even by inference. It is the socialistic beliefs and doctrines of an educator, inevitably reflected in his teachings, which have been stressed, since we regard this form of Marxism as the more

immediate threat to our institutions. For that reason the activities of known Communist educators have been omitted.

The New Educationists frankly proclaim that their aim is not to turn out better citizens to live under the present social order; their sights are set upon the building of a new social order and the schools under their direction are to spearhead the job. For generations the goal was to teach youth fundamental knowledge and how to use it as a valuable tool. In short, *how* to think and to reason. The New Educators are more concerned with *what* they should think. In the process, they have perverted the very purpose of a great American institution. They have introduced into our schools a system of indoctrination in which teachers are expected to crusade for social aims as the primary purpose of education.

How have these pedagogues accomplished this incredible feat? The remorseless steps by which they have first infiltrated and then seized the leadership of our educational profession are told in the following chapters. It is not a happy story for Americans. It carries overtones of amazing unconcern on the part of those who should be guarding the portals of our schools. It presents a picture of average patriotic, intelligent teachers and parents who have been outmaneuvered again and again in the fight for the minds of our children. In this book we shall call them the Essentialists because they insist that the acquisition of fundamental knowledge is essential to a sound education and good citizenship.

Probably the most blasting indictment of those who have weakly gone along with this indefensible, anti-intellectual and often un-American program is that they have cared not as much about saving the schools as the radicals have cared about capturing them. It has been the sad old *Pilgrim's Progress* story of a nation of men of little faith.

Fortunately, an increasing number of Americans are awakening. For instance, Senator Ralph E. Flanders of Vermont, champion of many liberal causes, recently declared that "our educa-

tional system is a shambles." In the St. Paul (Minn.) *Wanderer*, December 20, 1956, he blamed Progressive Education and "professors of a pseudo-science of education" for this nationwide condition wherein "schooling must be 'student-based' rather than 'subject based.' . . . In other words, our children are being trained to live in ant hills." The pitiful fruits of the New Education now are apparent—including elementary school children who cannot read, high school graduates who cannot spell, maturing upper-class pupils who cannot perform simple operations of arithmetic. Parents now recognize that something evil has happened to their schools. They realize that nothing can stop this evil except themselves and their aroused interest. In hundreds of communities, which were once submissive to the New Education, school boards, parents and sound, dedicated schoolmen are counterattacking.

Recently a scheduled address by an aggressive leftist educator was cancelled by a school board in New Jersey because of public protests. The educator retorted: "This is just another one of a thousand instances of pressure groups acting hastily, reflecting the present mood of hysteria in the country."

But *why* are a thousand or more of our best communities so concerned? For generations our public schools have been one of our most valued institutions. No one worried about their soundness and dedication to fundamental American principles. Parents have been only too happy to take this long-merited reputation for granted, for few persons really enjoy controversy. Surely, no trivial nor superficial issues could so alarm our best and most thoughtful citizens, including a large segment of the teaching profession. Millions of parents are seeking the answers to these questions, but the quest leads them into new and untried fields.

It is the purpose of this volume to explain what has happened in the public schools dominated by the New Education. The task is far from simple because the surface controversies

have their roots in deep-seated differences in economic, social and political philosophy, and "a debate over abolition of report cards stems from fundamental views about competition, incentives and rewards, not only in school but in life," writes Howard Whitman in *Collier's* magazine, February 5, 1954. "Wrapped up in arguments over laxity of discipline are the most pointed divergencies in philosophy and morals."

It is characteristic of these crusading New Educationists that they often fight foul. Brave and patriotic teachers in scores of our communities, who have had the stamina to stand up against them, have suffered loss of job or loss of promotion as the price. They have had no American Civil Liberties Union to leap to their defense with the cry of "academic freedom." Most of them have been unpublicized and unknown. Parents and laymen who have challenged the New Education also have been smeared and misrepresented. Some of the major magazines and newspapers have been among the smearers. Despite the brickbats, the defenders of the American public school—the Essentialists—maintained their fight.

They have been buoyed up in their determination by the realization that the heart of this great institution still is sound; it is only the head which has been infected. The majority of our teachers and school administrators are patriotic men and women, dedicated to their life work of imparting to our youth a sound basic education. Many of them have been powerless to act under the compulsions of the educational hierarchy. With most of the leaders of teachers' associations and big names in the teachers' colleges and the foundations lined up behind the New Educationists, the individual teacher has been virtually immobilized. Thousands have become unwilling conformists.

An informed public opinion will break up this educational deep freeze. It will give courage to the real schoolmen to speak out against the current excesses. It is the objective of this book to place the irrefutable facts of this condition in the hands of

school boards, school administrators, teachers, and all citizens who can use them with effect. With the truth out in the open, there can be no question as to the ultimate outcome of this fight.

CHAPTER II

The American Public School Tradition

WHEN THE STORM-TOSSED *Mayflower* dropped anchor in Plymouth Harbor in November, 1620, followed a decade later by the *Arbella*, heralding the great Puritan migration, these pioneers little realized that their intense love of religious freedom would lead to one of the greatest of our American institutions—the public school.

In the *Mayflower* pilgrimage, faith was the sustaining force. The Pilgrims came to America after unmerciful persecution in their native England for the crime of seceding from the Church of England. Known as Separatists, these dissenters were determined to worship God simply and without formality, as did the early Christians. They met secretly in small groups and were constantly hounded by officers of the law. However, they remained a profoundly religious people with a faith based on love of Christ and the Bible which, they were convinced, would provide the basic standards and principles for their government.

The Puritans did not go as far as the Separatists in their break with the Church. They sought to work out their reforms inside and not outside the Church—to purify it. Hence their name “Puritans.” But the Separatists had suffered so grievously

that they had come to regard reform of the Church of James I as impossible.

Leonard Bacon, in the *Genesis of the New England Churches*, tells how "their leaders, John Copping, Elias Thacker, Henry Barrowe, John Greenwood and John Penry, men of the highest learning and character, were executed. Officers of the law broke into the houses of the Separatists at all hours of the day and night, searching for unlawful books and dragging the Separatists away to prison where they often remained for years without trials. Old people, men and women of all ages with their children, guilty only of worshipping God according to their own consciences, were placed in loathsome dungeons where many died of the jail fever common at that time in the English prisons. Some had their tongues pierced or were burned with hot irons. Persecution might break their bodies but not their spirits."¹

Their break with the Church being complete, they were forced to flee for their lives to Holland in 1607-1608, where they lived in exile for thirteen years. In 1620, they decided to embark for America where they could establish their own way of life. As their spiritual leader, William Brewster, later elected Elder of the *Mayflower*, was with them, this religious faith of the Separatists was transplanted in all its vigor to the shores of New England, where it became the faith of the Pilgrims and the dominating influence in shaping our form of government and other vital American institutions.

The establishment of the principle that each individual had the right to worship God as he saw fit without dictation from state or ecclesiastical authorities was an epochal event in the history of man's search for freedom. And although some intolerance appeared in the Puritan and later colonies, the Plymouth Colony remained remarkably liberal for its time.

In this virgin land, the pioneers found the long-sought opportunity to build a new civilization on their own cherished Biblical ideals. Being very practical men and women in an age

when only a small percentage of people could read and write, they immediately saw that if a civilization was to be based on a Book, it was imperative that all the people be able to read the Book! So they set up a system which gave the rudiments of education for all, at community expense.

After building their homes and churches and providing for civil government, one of the first acts of the Massachusetts Colonists was the creation of schools for their children and a college to provide a learned ministry. In 1635, there appeared in Boston the beginning of an English type of Latin grammar school, regarded as the first public school of America. In 1636, Harvard College was established. About 1647, the Colony established a combined religious and civil school requiring that children should be taught to read, write and be given religious instruction. This was the first time in the English-speaking world that a legislative body of the people made education compulsory. In so doing, these Colonists paved the way for our great system of public education.

Of all the vital American principles, few, if any, have been more important than this principle of affording every child without distinction an opportunity for basic education at community expense. True, the primary purpose was to induce reading of the Bible. The New England colonists believed that Bible reading was necessary to an understanding of their form of self-government.

That public education would not have been launched so early in our history had it not been for this religious background is shown in the experience of other Colonies where it was absent or of minor importance. In Pennsylvania, for instance, no sect was dominant, and schools were established by private interests or by each denomination without the general colonial support as in New England. Under the primitive conditions of the time, education, even religious instruction, was neglected.

The Virginia Colony had been founded mostly by English settlers, generally motivated by economic hopes and considera-

tions rather than the desire for religious freedom, as in Massachusetts. This naturally led to a transplantation of the type of schools then existent in England—tutoring, education in small and expensive private schools for the wealthy, with apprentice training and a few pauper schools for the majority of the citizens. Education was not considered the responsibility of the state, nor did the Church wish to undertake the task for all. In Virginia, as a consequence, public education lagged far behind the New England Colony.

By 1759 it was evident that the European educational traditions and types of schools no longer seriously influenced our American schools. In New England the emphasis upon religion had begun to recede and the Church-centered community started to disintegrate. Soon a purely American type of community or district school became popular. There also developed a strong tendency to identify all educational institutions more closely with American thinking. In the South, however, the trend was toward eliminating many schools, since the religious sponsorship was lacking and there was no other motivation. During the War of Independence, the cause of public education suffered severely. Most of the schools closed for the want of pupils and resources, since both were sorely needed in the fight for liberty. Meager as were the opportunities before 1775, by 1790 they had almost completely disappeared and illiteracy rapidly increased.

The period from 1800 to 1825 may be regarded as the turning point from the church-control policy to a state-control or support policy. The great tide of immigration to the United States posed a serious problem of assimilation, increasing the demand for public education and compulsory school attendance. A number of new forces—economic, political and social—in a rapidly developing national government, based on political equality and religious freedom, combined to make these policies desirable:

1. Give all an opportunity for a free education.
2. Vest control and responsibility for public education in the states, while according freedom to private and church schools.

Since the Bible furnished the moral and ethical codes for the way of life, it was inevitable that a system of public education based on their religion would stress the character training and development of American youth. Despite the absence of sectarianism in the schools and the rise of the secular movement, this function of public education remained influential through the nineteenth century and to the early 1920's, when the Experimentalists began to take over. Prior to this time the primary aim of the school was to develop literacy and good moral character. Use of the schools for social reconstruction of society was unheard of.

In the bitter struggle for the American ideal of secular schools, Horace Mann of Massachusetts was an important leader for state support of education. He successfully fought for a state board of education in 1837; and, as secretary of this board for more than a decade, he vigorously championed the leadership of Massachusetts toward a public school system at community expense.

It should not be assumed, however, that Horace Mann minimized the importance of the spiritual values in education. On the contrary, in an address delivered July 4, 1839, he declared: "I hold it to be one of the laws of God that the talents of man can be developed in the best way and can produce the most beneficial results only when they are in full conscience with all the precepts and principles of religion. The pursuit of knowledge or science is the pursuit of truth."

By 1850, the free public school was an actuality in nearly all Northern states after bitter controversies with many church and private schools. It took a generation to convince the general public that the system of state schools was desirable.

In the second half of the nineteenth century, Frederick Froebel's kindergarten made its appearance in America. It quickly

began to influence profoundly the teaching of younger children. From a beginning in 1856 in Watertown, New York, kindergartens spread rapidly. By 1888, they were in thirty states; and "by 1900 there were some 4,500 kindergartens in the United States, more than two-thirds of which were privately operated." ²

During the early twentieth century, the cause of the non-sectarian public schools gained widespread approval in all states and greater public support came to the secondary schools which were rapidly replacing the academies. State-supported universities were also on the increase.

Throughout all this period of more than two centuries prior to the rise of the Experimentalists or New Educationists, this respected American institution did an admirable job. The public school enjoyed almost universal public confidence.

Why has the public school held such a high place in our national life? The primary reason has been its freedom from politics and propaganda. It has given its pupils a factual knowledge while training them in the homely virtues and developing mental discipline. Its textbooks have provided reliable information and encouraged sound thinking. No one has doubted that the teacher's main purpose was to educate the child. Both teachers and textbooks have truly reflected our faith and belief in the basic principles on which our liberties were founded.

In recent decades, parents and teachers have become uneasily aware that educational methods and techniques were undergoing change. However, since many of the changes were being made under the reassuring name of Progressive Education, it has been assumed by many that our schools were merely being modernized and the machinery brought up-to-date. Few parents have had time to investigate what is actually going on.

Our study reveals that during the past thirty years there has taken place a revolution in education, without the knowledge or consent of the great majority of our people. This upheaval has not only drastically altered our methods and techniques of

instruction, but has changed the primary purpose of public education. Basic skills and knowledge have been subordinated to the political objective of the reconstruction of society.

NOTES

1. Francis R. Steppard, *The Truth About the Pilgrims* (New York: Society of Mayflower Descendants, 1952), p. 5.
2. R. Freeman Butts, *A Cultural History of Education* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1947), p. 502.

CHAPTER III

Progressive Education

IT HAS BEEN SAID that Americans live by slogans and are fascinated by the lure of the printed appeal. If this be true, we see the full flower of this national weakness in the acceptance, by so many Americans, of the half-truths and fallacies of Progressive Education. Few parents have any actual concept of what Progressive Education is all about.

"The progressivists began by assuming that the older education had been a general failure," wrote Neil G. McCluskey, in *America*, December 1, 1956. "They told the world that earlier teachers were a breed of ill-equipped, overly bookish tyrants. Hence, they argued for progressive teachers colleges, life-adjustment programs and the child-centered classroom." And then they abandoned good, crisp English for a "mess of emotive pedagoguese," by which they flatteringly described their program as "life-related," "gripping," "dynamic," "forward-looking," "growth-oriented," and, of course, "new." If this warmed the hearts of the pedagogues, it left the parents cold and confused.

To some, Progressive Education means new methods of instruction, including anything from movable desks to the use of audio-visual aids. Such physical aids are to be welcomed. Since the end of World War I, many important advances have been made in the organization and administration of education, tak-

ing the form of better financial support and improved tools and facilities. Most innovations have been misleadingly claimed by Progressivists as a product of the New Education.

To others Progressive Education connotes "new" concepts or philosophies, although, as we shall see, most of them are as old as Plato and Democritus. To many, it stands for a revolutionary change in the very purpose of public education—a shift from the educational objective of imparting factual knowledge to the political objective of indoctrinating the child for the remaking of society—to bring about a new social order. It is probable, however, that the average person, absorbed in his own affairs and susceptible to slogans, thinks of Progressive Education as a new method whereby a child "learns by doing" or the "whole child" is educated. These and other Dewey theories are implemented in the Activity Program which is the center of the Progressive system. Later we shall examine some of these philosophies which conflict with time-tested social, political and economic standards.

Actually, the Progressivists have little to warrant title to the words "new" or "progressive." As a matter of fact, the very term *Progressive Education* is deceptive and misleading. In the history of semantics it is doubtful if there has been a more successful accomplishment than the implanting of the word "progressive" by leftist educators to advance aims and objectives. Of course, all Americans favor education and all pride themselves on being progressive. If one criticizes the inanities in Progressive courses, he is at once subject to attack on two counts: (a) that he is opposed to progress and thus a hopeless reactionary; (b) that he is an "enemy of public education."

The clever use of what he called "question-begging words and phrases" is ably explained in *The Southern Review*, Vol. V, No. 2 (1939), by a learned educator, Dr. Howard D. Roelefs, in his review of the third John Dewey yearbook *Democracy and the Curriculum*:

These are terms which, having the form of knowledge, function primarily to arouse a desired emotion, while judgement is deluded or befuddled. Of such terms the most notable is, of course, the name Progressive Education itself, which has these many years done so much to confuse all discussions of new educational ideas. The term "progressive" connotes "progress." The adroit leaders of Progressive Education, by the use of that title alone, have placed all their opponents and critics in the discomfiting position of being apparently opposed to progress, because they are opposed to Progressive Education.

Origin and Early Days

John Dewey is generally recognized as the father of this movement, although, as we shall see, many of the philosophies on which it is based are old if not ancient. In the early twentieth century, Dewey was teaching at the University of Chicago where he was experimenting with the Froebelian principles of learning through play. He was endeavoring to introduce these principles into secondary schools. Among his teaching methods, Dewey initiated freedom of discipline, self-expression and pupil selection of courses of instruction. The experiments attracted little attention and were regarded as unsuccessful.

In 1904, Dewey joined the Department of Philosophy at Columbia University, where his influence soon spread from pedagogy to the philosophical and social thinking of that period, thus broadening the concept of the New Education into the "new" school and eventually to the new social order. During the years 1904-1918, Dewey's influence grew as he developed his instrumentalistic philosophy, his particular form of pragmatism and other materialistic doctrines. He became the undisputed leader of Progressive Education, admired by leftist-liberal teachers.

Dr. Milo F. McDonald, a noted educator, tells of its growth at Teachers College, Columbia University: ¹

Dewey favored and taught the desirability of extending the kindergarten (Froebelian) 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.

Basic Philosophies and Doctrines

Progressive Education owes much of its inspiration to two philosophies which gained rapidly in the nineteenth century. The first sprang from the ancient theory of evolution and was promoted by Lamarck, Darwin, Thomas Huxley and Herbert Spencer. The materialistic doctrines of Karl Marx and others contributed to broaden this philosophy into what is known as evolutionistic materialism or naturalism.

The agnostic school group linked their theories with the ancient philosophy of pragmatism, giving it their own twist, and came forth with an agnostic pragmatism, or instrumentalism. Russell Kirk explains this basic doctrine of the Deweyites:

. . . Pragmatism, in the meaning it has acquired from its adoption by Peirce, William James, and John Dewey, is the policy of judging all things purely from the standpoint of how they "work"—that is, simply in the light of present experience, in contempt of tradition and the past, and in the confidence that somehow vague experiment with everything established will lead to future sure improvement. No conservative can hold with this notion, for the conservative judges all things in the light of authority and the wisdom of our ancestors, tempered by a willingness to accept evidence of altered circumstances. A pragmatist has no faith that abiding principles exist; while the conservative believes that a man without principles is an unprincipled man. . . .²

From Dewey's basic doctrines have come many theories and programs widely approved in our schools, such as the Activity School, the Project Method, the Child Centered School, etc. Here are some of their features:

1. They deny the Greek dualistic theory of man as mind and body, regarding man as a biological organism whose development is determined almost entirely from external stimuli (the experience) of his environment. In his *Culture and Education in America* (p. 128), Dr. Rugg asks: "May we not now assume that philosophic dualisms are to be permanently counted out?"
2. Since man is solely physical or material, the spiritual concept which gives man a soul is false; and our traditional concepts of truth, ethics and morality are purely relative and not constant or immutable. For how can they be important if environment determines truth, and conditions (environment) are constantly changing?
3. Since (1) and (2) are accepted, man wastes time looking to religion for standards of conduct, ethics and truth, as had been the custom for ages.
4. If there are no eternal verities, if 1-2-3 are accepted, it logically follows that education should not be burdened with the knowledge and experience of the past. Man's concern with the present alone is important.
5. Since education is to be used to remake society in accordance with this design, courses of instruction have been devised and are in operation to uproot traditional courses and methods from elementary grades to the colleges; to substitute courses of immediate (rather than deferred) value, and otherwise to conform to the educational theories and objectives of the Progressivists.

To Implement the Plan

In implementing this program, three main policies have been established and generally accepted by the leading Progressivists and their organizations—the Progressive Education Association, the John Dewey Society and the left-wing element in the National Education Association:

1. Opposition to methods of education using sequential curricula. In the place of this time-tested method, the Activity School is advocated as the only sound method of teaching.*
2. Opposition to efforts of the traditional school toward inculcating in the child even the moral values long regarded as fundamental to character training; and denial of the value of spiritual or religious influence on youth.
3. Approval of emphasis on feelings or emotions at the expense of knowledge and judgment.

Dewey on Religion

Dewey's materialistic philosophy, and particularly his concept of man as a biological organism, inevitably leads him to a primitive explanation of religion. He notes man's grim struggle for survival and regards religion as one of the things "cherished as a means of encompassing safety." Dewey wrote:

. . . [man] being unable to cope with the world in which he lived, he sought some way to come to terms with the universe as a whole. Religion was in its origin an expression of this endeavor. . . . As a drowning man is said to grasp at a straw, so men who lacked the instruments and skills developed in later days snatched at whatever, by any stretch of imagination, could be regarded as a source of help in time of trouble. . . . In such an atmosphere primitive religion was born and fostered.³

In this viewpoint Dewey is, in fact, only a step removed from Karl Marx, who said:

Religion is the sighing of a creature oppressed by misfortune, it is the "soul" of the world that has no heart, as it is the intelligence of an unintelligent epoch. It is the opium of the people.

Surely there is nothing "new" in this doctrine of historic materialism. For centuries, agnostics and atheists have sought to eliminate religion as a vital force in the life of man. For the past century it has been damned vociferously by the Marxists of

* "In this human-centered universe, there is no perfect hierarchy of truth, there are no criteria beyond the realm of experience. . . . Anything to be learned must be lived. . . ." Dean Ernest O. Melby, *Time* magazine, July 16, 1956.

various kinds. But the efforts have not succeeded for very sound reasons. Religion serves an inherent need of man for an explanation of life and its meaning. Philosophy alone cannot satisfy this need. Nothing in science nor in the best thought of the ages can assuage the longing in man to seek the truth of his existence, or what is known as the ultimate reality.

"Soft vs. Hard" Progressives

To understand the relationship of the original Progressivism and the current New Education, it is important that we do not lean too heavily on the doctrines of Dewey. It is true that he was the founder of the movement, but he had many pseudo-disciples who saw in Deweyism the chance to ride to glory in their own chariots. Becoming extremely vocal and insistent, their clamor forced a development within the cult of great importance, since it altered the nature of the Progressive movement by introducing new purposes and policies. Dewey, incidentally, was not too happy with some of the extremists who followed his banner.

Prior to 1932, the "new" pedagogy had been largely in the hands of Dewey and his true disciples, whose primary interest lay in the functions and philosophies of the educational process—the *methodology* rather than the *ideology* in education. "These dreamers . . .," said John C. Almack, Professor of Education, Stanford University, "took primitive man for their ideal and pattern as they envisioned him in their steam-heated flats in the cities of the Eastern seaboard. Because of their tendency to visionary idealism, they may be termed 'soft progressives.' . . . They were shoved out of the seats of control in the years immediately following the depression by comrades who believed in and practiced direct action. These more or less hard-headed adherents to alien methods had received some elementary schooling in the theories of Karl Marx, founder of Communism, and of his successors. Because of their faith in action and struggle, they may be called 'hard' progressives. . . ." ⁴

Dewey Opened the Gates

Although John Dewey was essentially a philosopher interested in the methodology of educators as developed through Froebelian and other philosophic approaches, many of his colleagues had different goals. Dr. George S. Counts, for instance, was a militant "hard" Progressivist who demanded that teachers reach for and use political power. Dr. Harold Rugg, a leading Frontier Thinker, was an ardent crusader and an expert in the techniques of indoctrination in the classrooms of the nation. Incidentally, he was an extremely successful seller of textbooks.

Although all were Progressivists, Dewey should not be held responsible for many of the inanities of the movement nor some of the radical actions of the Frontier Thinkers. Nevertheless, Dewey is clearly responsible for opening the seams in the armor of traditional education for entry by the aggressive pedagogues from Teachers College, Columbia University, who eventually took control.

Just as the Deweyites dominated the movement from 1903 to about 1932 in the era of educational reform, so the period after 1932 ushered in the second stage of the New Education stressing social and political reforms. It was led by the militant "hard" Progressives whom we shall discuss in the next chapter.

But whether they were "hard" or "soft" Progressives was largely a family affair amongst pedagogues. They belonged to the same teachers' associations and generally maintained a united front against opposition. Of course, there were vigorous protests from able educators, many of whom are mentioned in these pages, who were unable to stem the tide against the leftist-liberal element, aided as it was by the support of national teachers' organizations and several large foundations.

Teaching Bows to Political Objectives

Encouraged by the depression and the social and political climate of the times, this cult became more militant as its power

increased. Thus it was that the educational reform movement growing out of Dewey's leadership gave birth to a political and social reform movement of even greater significance.

In short, the Deweyite efforts to improve the methods of teaching were turned into a political movement in which the content of the curriculum became the goal of pedagogues intent on remaking society. The proposal to use public education to bring about the new social order was first advanced by responsible educators in the various reports of the American Historical Association (1926-1934). The last volume, *Conclusions and Recommendations*, reveals the Master Plan of the revolution in education. Because it furnished the blueprint of the program, it will be discussed at length throughout this volume.

The *key to this program was the new social science course*, replacing the teaching of history, civics and geography as separate subjects and subordinating other fundamental knowledge. This marked the turning point in the destinies of Progressive Education. Up to that time it had offered a few positive values, but when the "hard" Progressives took over, the effort to improve the methods of education were eclipsed by the politically-minded pedagogues. From that day on the movement called Progressive Education became radically different in character.

Dr. Arthur E. Bestor, who has been both a pupil and a teacher of the social studies courses, writes:

The social studies program . . . was an example of regressive education, because it pushed back to the infantile level again students who were already trained in systematic, analytical, critical thinking. This has happened on a tremendous scale in American education in recent years . . . because experts in pedagogy have insisted on applying to the secondary school and even the college certain rules of thumb that worked successfully in the primary grades. . . . In doing so, the regressive educators have turned their backs upon all the great educational thinkers of past times. Not least, they have repudiated the original principles of progressive education itself.⁵

Leading Progressivists

For authoritative data on the Progressive movement it is necessary to turn to the active leaders, their professional associations and their official publications. A most valuable source of information is the yearbook of the John Dewey Society, first published in 1937 and for several years thereafter. In these volumes we find a revealing statement of the doctrines and proposals of the principal leaders of the cult. For instance, in the first yearbook, *The Teacher and Society*,⁶ Dr. William H. Kilpatrick appeared as editor. Some of the chapters were authored by such well-known Progressivists as William H. Kilpatrick (three chapters), George W. Hartmann (one), Ernest O. Melby (one), Jesse H. Newlon (two), George D. Stoddard (one), Goodwin Watson (two), John Dewey (one).

Progressives' Magazine

Being able propagandists, the Progressivists saw the need for a journal to expound aggressively the doctrines of collectivism among the public school educators whom they planned to reach. Typical of the articles in their magazine, *Progressive Education*, is this statement by Dr. Norman Woelfel, Teachers College, Columbia University: "The call now is for the utmost capitalization of the discontent manifest among teachers for the benefit of revolutionary social goals. This means that all available energies of radically inclined leaders within the profession should be directed toward the building of a united radical front. Warm collectivistic sentiment and intelligent vision, propagated in a clever and undisturbing manner by a few individual leaders, no longer suits the occasion." (January-February 1934.) From 1934 to 1944, *The Social Frontier* magazine and its successor, *Frontiers of Democracy*, were educational spearheads in this campaign to gain converts for the new social order.

Teachers College, Columbia University, was the fountainhead of the movement and the executives and authors featured in the

magazine were drawn largely from the "ivory towers" on Morningside Heights. An editor of *The Social Frontier* was Dr. George S. Counts, and Dr. William H. Kilpatrick was chairman of the board of directors. Supporting the Counts-Kilpatrick team was an imposing list of well-known American educators.

In the first issue of *The Social Frontier*, October, 1934, the leading editorial explains its basic premise and objective:

For the American people the age of individualism in economy is closing and the age of collectivism is opening. Here is the central and dominating reality in the present epoch. . . .

. . . [*The Social Frontier*] represents a point of view, it has a frame of reference, it stands on a particular interpretation of American history. It accepts the analysis of the current epoch presented above and outlined in greater detail in *Conclusions and Recommendations*, Report on the Social Studies of the Commission of the American Historical Association. . . . (pp. 3-4)

It will be noted that this official voice of the Progressive movement accepted as authoritative the book *Conclusions and Recommendations*. We regard it as the "master plan" of the New Education.

That their "new society" meant the death knell of our free economy of free men is frankly stated in *The Social Frontier*, April, 1935: "The end of free enterprise as a principle of economic and social organization adequate to this country is at hand." (p. 8)

We learn more about these vehicles of propaganda from Dr. John C. Almack, in the *San Francisco Examiner*, October 14, 1942: ". . . The best single set of documents on the subject are the files of a magazine called *The Social Frontier*, edited for a part of its five years of existence by George S. Counts, of Columbia University. . . . *The Social Frontier* was a propaganda sheet from the first. Radical books were chiefly reviewed."

Marxist doctrine was presented in nearly every issue. "In form, substance, aim and style the journal was a kind of mixture of *The New Republic*, *The New Masses* and the *Daily Worker*,"

continues Dr. Almack. "The verse was invariably class angled and invariably atrocious. The Progressives ballyhooed the journal a good deal, but it was dull, heavy, superficial and hackneyed as are all reform sheets."

In 1939, *The Social Frontier* ceased publication and was absorbed by the Progressive Education Association with this announcement: "Readers of *The Social Frontier* and of *Progressive Education* (our older 'house organ') have long had mutual interests." Thus the Progressive Education Association gave its stamp of approval to the policy of *The Social Frontier*. After a bitter fight for control, the left-wing Local No. 5, Teachers Union, was purged and the magazine came under the management of the less extreme Progressivists. In its last few issues a milder tone was apparent and the Progressive Education Association took it over, changing the name to *Frontiers of Democracy*.

"Progressive" Comes into Disrepute

Ever since the embattled parents began to protest violently against Progressive Education, the name "Progressive" has been a thorn in the sides of the leaders of this cult. They have squirmed and twisted in all directions to avoid use of it, but to little avail. Finally, in 1944 the Progressive Education Association officially changed its name to the American Education Fellowship; "Progressive" was perhaps too closely associated with cartoons of children terrorizing teacher, says Albert Lynd.⁷

A worse fate of the adjective was its adoption by the Communists in one of the devious turns of their propaganda line during the thirties. Perhaps the most disconcerting blow of all is the fact that the Communists recently designated as "Progressives" the American prisoners of war in Korea who became Communists and refused to be repatriated! Now the Progressives prefer the use of the name "new" or "modern" education. But the word "Progressive" still hangs on and like the albatross of the *Ancient Mariner*, they cannot lose it.

Destroying the Fundamentals

Cautioning us against the dangers of destroying the fundamentals of traditional education evolved through centuries of trial and error, Albert Lynd states:

Much of the writing and speaking on behalf of the New Education is done by persons who understand what is easy to understand, that Mr. Dewey has given them license to chop down something: the traditional curriculum and discipline. Chopping is an occupation many find agreeable; they are less clear about what they should do to replace what they are destroying. Their efforts to make this intelligible in the books and articles which they write for one another may be responsible for most of the inanities of neo-pedagogy. It is easy, for example, to throw out formal grammar with some ponderous jargon about its failure to meet a child's "real needs." But any meaningful discussion of those needs (whatever they are) requires certain judgments—philosophical, historical, esthetic—about the nature of man and society.⁸

Positive Values Among Early Progressives

In fairness to Deweyites, a noted authority points out certain positive values in the early Progressive movement. For instance, the philosophy of naturalism, stressing the expectancy of "change," at least created an atmosphere of hope and optimism. It has stimulated research into the physical condition of children and encourages good working conditions. It has forced greater objectivity in examinations, eliminating some of the weaker points, and has given consideration to individualistic mental age in achievement. In many instances when education was too rigid, it has given needed elasticity. Unfortunately, many of these potentially positive values have been turned into negatives by being carried to extremes.

To naturalism we should credit recognition of the child as a real human being and the elimination of corporal punishment. And by adoption of Froebel's theory that the development

should be "inner-child-out" rather than "outer-child-in," the child has had a chance for self-expression and pleasure in school which is definitely of value in younger children.

The child of a Progressive school seems to possess more social consciousness; he is more world-minded and more critical of human institutions, particularly the "problems of American democracy." This topic has been so over-emphasized that too many have lost faith in our Republic. Some of the above ideas of the Deweyites could be a constructive influence if used with discretion and judgment, or if it were frankly recognized that they were desirable in some grades or courses, but harmful in others.

Unfortunately, since flexibility and common sense are not characteristics of the Progressivists, their methods, in practice, usually lead to extremes or bog down in faulty administration. Let us take a single example: The Progressive policy of favoring courses of immediate rather than deferred value has loaded the curriculum with vocational training and so-called "aptitude for life" courses. In the broad scope of public education, certainly these practical programs merit consideration in relation to all other values and objectives. But Kilpatrick, Dewey and other leaders insist that these and other "social aims" should be the main purpose of education, and their will has prevailed. As a consequence, the curriculum has been drastically revised with the disastrous results noted in forthcoming chapters.

In discussing the Progressive theory that immediate rather than deferred ends should determine courses of instruction, Albert Lynd stated: "Most people are suspicious of pragmatism, not because they fear its effects upon their interests but because they believe it to be flatly wrong. . . . But it is not their [Progressives] right, in the meantime, to slip into the schools of the community a philosophy of education which, if understood, would be rejected by the great majority of the people to whom the schools belong. That is a travesty of 'democracy.' . . ." ⁹

It Contradicts All Human Experience

Although this educational system has been gradually foisted on our schools from coast to coast, it was not introduced without opposition from many able educators who could see its defects and who courageously fought it every step of the way. Nicholas Murray Butler, then president of Columbia University, devoted one and a half pages in an Annual Report (1942) to the importance of "discipline leading to self-discipline" as the beginning of sound education and character building. Dr. Butler stated:

There is at the present time a vociferous enthusiasm for what is called Progressive Education, than which, in its extreme forms, nothing could be more reactionary or more damaging to youth. By progressive education appears to be meant the turning loose of youth in the world in which they live to express themselves, as the saying is, and to form such habits and tastes as they from time to time may choose or which appear to be natural to them.

. . . to call any such process education is in the highest degree absurd. It contradicts all human experience.

Leads to Atheistic Socialism

Dr. Milo F. McDonald, veteran educator in New York City schools, declared: "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 degeneration of the schools of the United States 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." ¹⁰

Fails to Utilize Human Experience

In an article in the *San Francisco Examiner*, October 13, 1942, deploring Progressive Education's neglect of history, control and discipline, Dr. Almack said:

Even under favorable conditions, it will take us a quarter of a century to restore American education to the level it held before the Progressive onslaught.

It is wrong not to utilize human experience to the fullest extent, not only to teach values and desirable practices but to expose failure, neglect and wrong motives. . . .

The Progressive policy of deprecating our history and of putting it on the scrap heap has materially weakened national unity and broken the continuity of the social process. . . .

The cult is also wrong in its play upon experience and activity as ways to education. All the hordes of ignorant and uneducated who have trod the earth stand forth in mute testimony to the fallacy that experience is enough to develop civilized and ethical men.

Educators Are Badly Confused

We have explored briefly the origin and development of Progressive Education, including the doctrines of many of its leaders, through the first stage of this revolution in education. Later we shall discuss the second stage, more properly called the New Education. But in the meantime, the bewildered reader may gain a bit of satisfaction from observing that leading educators are equally confused. In a recent interview, Dr. William Jansen, Superintendent of New York City Schools, which long have been a citadel of Progressive Education, declared: "The term Progressive Education means very different things to different people. . . . I have not used the term for many years in describing educational programs." The confusion is due to the fact that *many psychologists and propagandists have replaced the true schoolmen as the dominant force in our public education.*

Education vs. Reform

"I believe that nearly all the Frontier Thinkers consider themselves disciples of John Dewey," declared Dr. John L. Tildsley, eminent educator and assistant superintendent of New York schools. "But I find one fundamental difference between Dewey and some of his Frontier disciples. Dewey never loses sight of the child as the center of the educative process. For his growth, Dewey tells us, all schools exist . . . some of the Frontier Thinkers . . . lose sight of the child as the center of the educative process and are not concerned with his growth, save in one direction, viz., his growth into an accelerator of a democratic collectivist social order. They view the child as collectivist-Futter to be utilized without regard to the effect on him. . . ." ¹¹

Purists may ponder and educators argue over a definition of Progressive Education, but to the individual parent such a discussion is profitless. The parent does not care what it is called. But what it actually is and how it is affecting his children are of vital concern. Pedagogues may skillfully alternate the terms "progressive," "new," "modern," but the alert parent will not be misled. He sees in it a composite of the sterile doctrines of socialism and the discredited philosophies of Deweyism.

Can such an education strengthen the ideals, principles and character of youth for the battles ahead? In two great wars the youngsters of this generation have proved their unquestioned courage and patriotism in combat. But what about the psychological warfare? Does our New Education equip children in this atomic age with the understanding of our heritage and other intellectual weapons so essential to victory in this war of ideas between the forces of freedom and those of statism? It is a challenging question.

Progressive Education in Soviet Russia

Few Americans realize that Progressive Education was given a thorough tryout in Soviet Russia. When the Bolsheviks under

Lenin destroyed the Kerensky government in November, 1917, they believed that a similar revolution was imminent in other countries and they sought to expedite it by creating in Russia a Communist model for the world. They proceeded to inaugurate a series of drastic reforms and changes in the traditional life of the Russian people. A veritable orgy of change followed in all segments of their society—from education to marriage. Many of these “reforms” were not only unnecessary but proved to be harmful to the Communist cause.

Anything new or extreme was tried, provided it was a break with the traditional. The Communist leaders had heard of the Progressive Education system in America and in 1918 they imported its program almost intact.* Lenin saw in it an opportunity to eliminate from Russian life religious faith, private property, family and parental authority. If they could destroy family life, the Bolsheviks would strike a death blow to capitalism in Russia and also set the world an example which they confidently hoped would hasten the day of their world revolution.

The Communists, however, overlooked one vital factor in a civilized society: the family is the most important influence in the training of a child. By using public education to destroy the foundations of the family, they also lost a cohesive unit and stabilizing force in any society. With respect and authority gone, the Soviet family lost the ability to discipline its youth, with the inevitable disastrous consequences.

As early as 1920, the results began to be apparent. Dr. Kapterev, a liberal educator of old Russia, wrote in the *Educational Review*: “Two great misfortunes have befallen Russian education. One is the establishment of the Common Activity School and the elimination of all serious work that followed in the wake

* “The ‘new’ schools in Russia were organized and conducted after the model laid out by John Dewey in Chicago many years earlier. . . . Indoctrination in the practice of Communism was included as direct instruction.” Dr. John Almack, *San Francisco Examiner*, October 12, 1942.

of this reform, and the other is the elimination of discipline from the school." ¹² The Soviet Progressive Educators shouted against the "reactionary Tzarist professor" who had dared to criticize the New Education.

Through the behaviorist influence in Progressive Education and its emphasis on stimuli and response, the faith of the Russian children in the principles of freedom was destroyed, but the sequel was a shock to the Kremlin. Once started, the undermining process could not be controlled and the Communists saw that the product of their new education, no longer potential capitalists, were now unsuited to any community life. Soon there were roving bands of homeless children all over Russia, without belief in God, family, country or any standards of ethics or morals. In their numerous programs designed to destroy the roots of a capitalist society, the revolutionists had sown the wind and reaped a whirlwind.

As the gravity of the condition became more evident, responsible Communist educators began to demand that an end be put to the debasement of the schools. When adolescents whose whole preliminary training had been obtained in the Soviet schools began to arrive before the examining committees of the higher institutions of learning, their appalling ignorance of the fundamentals of the sciences and letters became evident beyond all possibility of doubt or camouflage. Rich collections of "boners" rapidly accumulated and the resulting ridicule seriously began to discredit the Communist functionaries responsible for this Soviet educational reform. ¹³

By September 5, 1931, the mounting tide of criticism caused the Central Committee to instruct the schools to apply themselves to the task of doing a more thorough educational job. In its decree, the Central Committee stressed the fact that a "fundamental defect of our elementary and secondary education is that school instruction fails to impart a sufficient grounding in general culture and in the sciences, and, as a result, it unsatisfactorily fulfills its task of sending to the technicums (vocational schools

on secondary level) and the higher institutions of learning, persons fully literate and possessed of the fundamentals of knowledge (physics, chemistry, mathematics, literature, geography, etc.)”¹⁴

On August 25, 1932, the Central Executive Committee ordered the reorganization of the entire educational system in Russia. On December 9, 1932, local superintendents of schools received their orders from the Soviet Commissary for Public Instruction as follows:

“The first thing I wish to impress upon you . . . is to re-establish discipline in our schools . . . the Soviet school is characterized by weak discipline and even in places by the complete absence of all discipline. . . . I know cases where the organization and maintenance of discipline is shoveled over to the student government . . . the teacher is assigned a passive role or even none at all.”

With the opening of the school year 1933-1934, Soviet authorities took the final step to abandon the “wasteful and chaotic project method and return to standards and system in education.” On September 2, 1933, Ralph W. Barnes, the Moscow correspondent of the *New York Herald Tribune*, reported:

When the 25,000,000 Soviet children and youths began or resumed their studies this week in the 200,000 “little red schools” of the U.S.S.R., they found that the educational revolution (counter-revolution) which had been in progress . . . advanced . . . with the scrapping of the so-called “brigade system” (a modified Dalton plan) and the “project method” and the restoration of the teacher to the time-honored position as disciplinarian . . . there is a new emphasis on the rudiments of human knowledge, including the traditional “3 R’s” and relegation of secondary matter to secondary importance. . . .

For the first time in a long period written examinations were held . . . textbooks, properly so-called, . . . substituted for the frequently changed pamphlets and the manuals hitherto in use. . . .

Under the new system such subjects as history and geography, which had been lost in a maze of “conferences” and “projects”

are definitely differentiated, with the result that, among the new texts, histories and geographies make their appearance for the first time (under the Soviet regime). . . .

That marked the end of Soviet Russia's fifteen-year experiment with Progressive Education. They returned this educational failure to America, whence it came, and to our starry-eyed Frontier Thinkers who were determined to foist it on the public schools of America—and did so.

The Soviet Union, however, took the lesson to heart. Despite their vicious propaganda courses, they insisted on basic knowledge in the education of their children. Twenty-three years later we are seeing the amazing transformation in the school system of the Soviets. In her eye-witness account in the *Ladies' Home Journal*, for May, 1956, Dorothy Thompson writes: ". . . Secondary education is growing with immense strides. Every youth who completes it will have had extended courses in basic higher mathematics—four years each of algebra and geometry, . . . and five of a modern foreign language . . . with a large amount of homework. . . . There is, as far as I know, not one high school in America where an ambitious student could get such preparation in science and mathematics. More than half of our high schools offer no physics at all . . . in 1950 only 5 per cent of American high school students were studying physics, 7 per cent chemistry, 27 per cent algebra and 13 per cent geometry. These are far lower percentages than in 1900. . . . A level of education based on average ability and ambition means universal mediocrity. . . ."

While the realistic Soviet officials saw the evil consequence of the New Education and discarded it in time, our educational leadership embraced it with a fanatical zeal. So during the same period that the schools of Russia have improved markedly in imparting the foundation knowledge so essential to the training of engineers, scientists and other skilled leaders in an atomic age, millions of our youths have found themselves seriously handi-

capped because their schools have failed to educate them properly on these important subjects.

NOTES

1. Milo F. McDonald, *American Education—The Old, The Modern and The "New"* (New York: American Education Association, 1952), p. 38.
2. Russell Kirk, *A Program for Conservatives* (Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1954), p. 46.
3. John Dewey, *The Quest for Certainty* (New York: Minton, Balch & Co., 1929), p. 10.
4. *San Francisco Examiner*, October 11, 1942.
5. A. E. Bestor, *Educational Wastelands* (Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1953), p. 51.
6. *The Teacher and Society*, John Dewey *Yearbook* (New York: D. Appleton-Century Co., 1937).
7. Albert Lynd, *Quackery in the Public Schools* (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1953), p. 19.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 184.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 209.
10. Milo F. McDonald, *American Education—The Old, The Modern and The "New"* (New York: American Education Association, 1952), p. 38.
11. *The Social Frontier* (July, 1938), p. 321.
12. Michael Demiashkevich, *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education* (New York: American Book Co., 1935), p. 186.
13. *Ibid.*, p. 184.
14. *Ibid.*, pp. 185-186.

CHAPTER IV

The Rise of the Frontier Thinkers

Thus the search led to the "frontier thinkers". Who are they? They are men of insight, men who see society from a height, and who detect its trends and the long-time movements of its affairs. They are seldom conservatives, and they are never followers. On the contrary, they lead, even though they may lead mistakenly.—Harold Rugg, *Building a Science of Society for the Schools*, p. 14.

IN THE PERIOD 1910–1925, there appeared among pseudo-savants a cult of educators known as the "debunkers," whose avowed purpose was to question the accomplishments, and particularly the motives of the Founders of this Republic.

The educational leader of the group was Dr. Charles A. Beard who wrote a book (1913) entitled *An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution of the United States*. This book is generally regarded as the source-book and inspiration of the swarm of debunkers which followed. The book is an application to American history of the theory of economic determinism—the theory that man's motives are dominated by his present or expected economic possessions, and that his acts can be explained solely in the light of his material self-interest.

There was nothing strikingly new about this concept when Beard advanced it. The Sophists and Cynics of ancient Greece had formulated it. Karl Marx had picked it up as a tenet of his socialist philosophy. But in the form in which Beard cast it, the

theory succeeded in throwing serious doubt on the motives of our Constitutional Founders and on the value of the immortal document which they produced. What he did was to apply to our Constitution the sordid Marxian interpretation that a stable social order can be achieved only by appealing to man's base and material instincts.

Beard Debunks Our Constitution

Since most of the delegates to the Constitutional Convention were men of some wealth, it follows, according to Beard, that their impelling motive in creating our Constitution was not to serve the good of all the people, but rather to further the delegates' own personal interests. Dr. Beard wrote: ¹

Suppose, . . . that substantially all of the merchants, money lenders, security holders, manufacturers, shippers, capitalists and financiers and their professional associates are to be found on one side in support of the Constitution and that substantially all or the major portion of the opposition came from the non-slave holding farmers and the debtors—would it not be pretty conclusively demonstrated that our fundamental law was not the product of an abstraction known as “the whole people,” but of a group of economic interests which must have expected beneficial results from its adoption? . . .

John Hancock was the wealthiest man in the Colonies. Washington and Charles Carroll of Maryland had vast realty holdings which were secure under the British Government; and most of the other signers were men of wealth. All knew beyond doubt that if the war against England was unsuccessful, they would certainly lose their property and probably forfeit their lives on the gallows. These patriots truly pledged their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor. And yet these were the men whom Beard maligned and “debunked.” The greater part of his book was devoted to demonstrating that they were men of property and thus, according to Beard, their motives and their work are suspect. He ignored completely the vital fact that these delegates were all respected leaders in their own communi-

ties; that to be a leader, one had to be educated, since only a small percentage of people then could read or write; and that to acquire even a limited education in those days required some wealth.

Seldom has a more unjust and destructive theory been advanced by a responsible authority in our country. The fact that Beard lived to be an eminent historian only added weight to this damaging attack on the Constitution of the United States. Perhaps adults could have offset his opinion with that of William E. Gladstone who regarded our charter of freedom as "the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and the purpose of man."

Immense Influence of Beard's Book

High school students, however, lack the experience to recognize Beard's historic myopia in judging the past in the perspective of a vastly changed present. Greater maturity would have enabled them to learn that the people of any given time or place can be judged fairly only in relation to their contemporaries.

For a generation, Beard's misleading text has been widely used in our secondary schools and colleges, either as required or reference reading. Beard died in 1952 and there is some indication that in his last years he regretted the book written in his youth. But the verdict of history is not impressed with the motives of men and even less by death-bed repentances. It hews to the line of their acts and their impact on the lives of men.

Beard's book has had a profound influence in educational circles. We find its cynical and sordid theories in numerous courses and educational materials, including the *Building America* textbooks before they were recalled and revised. We find its influence in Dr. Rugg's *The Great Technology*, in which the author excoriates the "theory and practice of Government set up by our fathers." In the foreword, Rugg acknowledges being guided by the researches of Beard and others. Indeed, Rugg became an ardent debunker.

A fair appraisal of the impact of *An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution of the United States* on the youth of our land is given by Walter Lippmann in an article, "On the Debunking of History," in the *New York Herald-Tribune*, October 3, 1940:

[It] has had an immense influence upon the writing and teaching of American History and upon the outlook of the generation that was educated in the interval between the two great wars. It would hardly be an exaggeration to say that this book is the classic which sets the fashion for the debunking historians.

During the same year (1913) that Beard loosed his attack on the foundations of our form of government and the motives of the Founders, other leftist-liberal educators were simultaneously busy with ideas for remaking our society. As Beard used our history in the demolition process, they too based their hopes of remaking society on the teaching of history. Although it was far too early for their plans to assume the definite form and shape appearing later in *Conclusions and Recommendations* (1934), these early Frontier Thinkers charted their intended course. For instance, a committee of the NEA recommended: "The aim of social science in secondary schools should be to cultivate an appreciation of social opportunities. . . . It is suggested that the historical events be selected with due regard to their significance, as illustrations or statements of the social force. . . ." ²

In other words, social aims were to be the primary purpose of education. Historical events were to be "selected" and history texts rewritten to meet this propaganda pattern. Social science courses were to be the vehicle of this sabotage of history, as we shall see in this book.

In a government bulletin,³ the Committee of the National Education Association, under the head "Point of View," explains:

. . . high school teachers of social studies have the best opportunity ever offered to any social group to improve the citizenship of the land. . . .

The million and one-third high school pupils is probably the largest group of persons in the world who can be directed in a serious and systematic effort, both through study and practice to acquire the social spirit.

Let us take a single instance of their point of view: "It is not so important that the pupil know how the president [United States] is elected, as that he shall understand the duties of the health office in the community," declares the NEA report. It recommends that two-thirds of the school time available be devoted to "government and public welfare," including health and sanitation, housing, pure food and milk, sewerage, waste disposal, utilities and a long list of similar community responsibilities.

Educators recommended that school children should discover history in the classrooms as a laboratory experiment, "in lieu of being given sound basic knowledge in that subject under a proper course of instruction."⁴

This was the genesis of the education for the new social order, or the "modern" or New Education as it is variously known. It is important to remember that the main idea is based on teaching and use of history for ideological purposes. We shall see how this concept has affected disastrously practically the entire curriculum. These were ideas of the "hard" Progressives who collaborated with the Deweyites and exploited them to further their own plans.

In 1919, the Frontier Thinkers established the Progressive Education Association which aggressively went to work to advance these new concepts and objectives. The date indicates that by the end of World War I some of these educators were well on their way toward demolishing many of our basic traditions and institutions while others were in the early stages of planning substitutions to fit the needs of their coveted new society. This period coincided with the establishment of the Communist tyranny in Russia.

From its inception, the new Lenin government addressed it-

self to the task of diffusing Marxist doctrines among intellectuals in every capitalist nation to further world revolution. In the United States some of the Marxist ideas found particularly fertile soil among radicals at Teachers College, Columbia University, and in other "liberal" schools whose facilities were heavily infiltrated by disbelievers in the capitalistic system. The doctrines of several of them are given briefly in these pages. They decided that this was an opportune time for a "new" society based on collectivism.

Although differing on other features, Communists and Progressivists alike seemed to agree that the economic base of the Utopia must be shifted from capitalism to collectivism. They decided that capitalism must go. Leaders in this agitation constituted the second group, or "hard" Progressives. They had experimented in liberal schools and tested the possibilities of capturing our educational system and using it to advance their pet ideologies. Their methods and techniques were extremely subtle and their doctrines were artfully concealed in the attractive package labelled Progressive Education.

Admittedly, the selling of the new social order was an ambitious undertaking. The first necessary step was the fundamental change in the prevailing "climate of opinion." The Frontier Thinkers realized sadly that there was little hope of winning the adult population to their advanced position. Their hope was in the young, and their instrument was the public school.

At first they encountered little serious opposition, since they disarmed critics with their deceptive "progressive" name. The new social order was advanced as a streamlined, modern "democracy." And who could be against democracy?

The Institute of International Education, Inc.

The enthusiasm of the Frontier Thinkers for the new society led to tours by teachers to the Old World, to Russia and Germany. To aid in these trips, the Institute of International Educa-

tion was established at Columbia University in 1919. It played an important part in the years to come.⁵ Aided by funds from at least one leading foundation, this Institute started conducting trips to foreign lands, particularly to Russia. George S. Counts, then an ardent admirer of the Soviet system, made trips to Russia in 1927 and in 1929. He wrote: "I am indebted to the International Institute of Teachers College, Columbia University, for making both trips possible."⁶ In 1931 Counts translated the *New Russia's Primer* into English. It was intended for school children twelve to fourteen years of age.

As we have noted, the new schools in Russia were organized and conducted after the model laid out by John Dewey in Chicago many years previously. This was in the early days of Soviet Russia's experience with Progressive Education. Dr. John C. Almack tells us that the children ran the schools, worked when they pleased, were rude and unmannerly, and showed no respect for parents or teachers. He continues:

[In the Russian schools] indoctrination in the practice of Communism was included as direct instruction. A teacher who would have introduced a doubt of its merits would have been liquidated by a comrade on guard as a counter-revolutionary.

Ardent American tourists saw and heard only what the boss Bolsheviks wanted them to see and hear. They missed many of the views that would have shown the system for what it was. However, they came back to America bubbling over with evangelism for the "new" education, . . . and particularly ballyhooed "education for a new social order."

Carnegie Fund Finances Master Plan

In 1926 the American Historical Association appointed a committee of nine to investigate and study the teaching of "history and other social studies in the schools." In 1928, this committee was enlarged to sixteen and, aided by grants of \$340,000 from the Carnegie Corporation, brought forth during the succeeding five years several volumes known as the *Report of the Com-*

mission on Social Studies. This undertaking proved to be a key event in the program of the Frontier Thinkers. The *Conclusions and Recommendations* of this Report became the Master Plan to bring about the new social order through education. On this Commission, the star performers included Charles A. Beard, Harold Rugg and George S. Counts, all of Columbia University, on the Committee of Objectives; William H. Kilpatrick, Advisory Committee; Edmund E. Day, Rockefeller Foundation, Jesse H. Newlon, Columbia University.⁷ Toward the end of their deliberations (1932), a draft of the final report was prepared and distributed for consideration.

Counts Compares U.S. with Soviet Economy

One of the group, Dr. George S. Counts, Teachers College, Columbia University, was also Director of Research of the Committee. Counts had long been a crusader for the new social order. He was eager for action. He had very definite ideas of the part which educators should play in rebuilding society, and he had written profusely on the subject. In 1931, Counts issued a provocative book, *The Soviet Challenge to America*, in which he praised Soviet Russia's approach to economic problems and damned our American system. He wrote:

In the societies of the West in general and in the United States of America in particular the evolution of institutions proceeds for the most part without plan or design, as a sort of byproduct of the selfish competition of individuals, groups and enterprises for private gain. In Russia, on the other hand, since the days of 1917, the Soviet government has sought to promote the rational and orderly development of the entire social economy . . . (p. 7) . . . this means that the institution of private property, at least insofar as it applies to land and the tools of production, will be abolished. (pp. 24-25)

Soviet System "Rich and Challenging"

Counts saw in the Soviet system "much that is rich and challenging in the best sense of the word . . . certainly no worse than

the drive toward individual success . . . in the United States. . . . It is only natural that this [Soviet] idealism and this passion should sweep through the schools as well as through the rest of the social order."

In 1932, Counts wrote a militant book named *Dare the School Build a New Social Order*, published by the John Day Company (1932). The book advanced some startling viewpoints. One of them was:

That the teachers should deliberately reach for power and then make the most of their conquest is my firm conviction. To the extent that they are permitted to fashion the curriculum and the procedures of the school they will definitely and positively influence the social attitudes, ideals, and behavior of the coming generation. (p. 28) . . . Our major concern consequently should be . . . to make certain that every Progressive school will use whatever power it may possess in opposing and checking the forces of social conservatism and reaction. (p. 24)

Returning to his pet hatred, our capitalistic system, Counts stated that the child is a "product of a society that is . . . victimized by the most terrible form of human madness—the struggle for private gain." (p. 17) Also, "If democracy is to survive, it must seek a new economic foundation . . . natural resources and all important forms of capital will have to be collectively owned." (pp. 45-46) . . . "Its [capitalism's] days are numbered. . . . It will have to be displaced altogether or changed so radically . . . that its identity will be completely lost." (p. 47) And also: "The urge for private gain tends to debase everything it touches . . . no longer works . . . is not only cruel and inhuman, it is also wasteful and inefficient." (p. 47)

Dr. Counts not only envisioned the death of the free economy of free men but the end of the individualism on which it is based. He wrote: ". . . a planned, coordinated, and socialized economy . . . would involve severe restrictions on personal freedom. . . . He [the individual] would not be permitted to . . . organize a business purely for the purpose of making money, to

build a new factory or railroad whenever and wherever he pleased. . . ." (p. 49). And then Counts ventured this priceless admission: "Progressive Education wishes to build a new world but refuses to be held accountable for the kind of world it builds." . . . (p. 25)

The reader may wonder if these socialistic ideas of Counts were exceptional in the Frontier Thinkers' cult. The answer is given in a pamphlet issued in 1933 by a committee of the Progressive Education Association, dealing with ". . . formulation of a policy with respect to the relation of the school to society." It is entitled *A Call to the Teachers of the Nation*, and was published by the John Day Company of New York. Members of the committee included George Counts, chairman, Goodwin Watson and Jesse H. Newlon, all of Columbia University.

Portions of the booklet read like the Communist Manifesto. It declared that ". . . [teachers] owe nothing to the present economic system except to improve it; they owe nothing to any privileged caste except to strip it of its privileges." (pp. 19-20). It makes frequent, significant references to the class struggle. In fairness, it should be said that Willard W. Beatty, president of the Progressive Education Association, stated that it "does not commit either the board of directors of the Association or the members . . . to any program or policy embodied in the report."

"God Is Served through Mammon"

Because the PEA represented the top leadership of the New Education at the time, we give from *A Call to the Teachers of the Nation* a sampling of its thinking on our American institutions and the teacher's role in our society:

. . . In America today God is served through mammon; the general good is made a by-product of the pursuit of private gain; self-interest is clothed in the garment of civic virtue; . . . In normal times they [teachers] are keenly aware of the injustice and the misery wrought by the existing economic system. They know that capitalism, with its extremes of poverty and riches and

its moral degradation of millions, makes an empty farce of our democratic professions and dooms multitudes of children to lives of severe privation. . . . (pp. 11-18)

What should teachers do to further this new social order? First, their loyalty is a class affair and goes to the various "members of the producing classes of the nation." But, teachers will first have to "emancipate themselves completely from the domination of the business interests . . . abandon the smug middle-class tradition on which they have been nourished in the past. . . ." (p. 20)

Unite Against the Privileged

And then these leading Progressivists sounded this clarion call for the leftist-liberals in their profession:

The progressive minded teachers of the country must unite in a powerful organization, militantly devoted to the building of a better social order and to the fulfillment, under the conditions of industrial civilization, of the democratic aspirations of the American people. In the defense of its members against the ignorance of the masses and the malevolence of the privileged, such an organization would have to be equipped with material resources, the legal talent and the trained intelligence necessary to wage successful warfare in the press, the courts and the legislative chambers of the nation. (p. 26)

In justice to the early Deweyites, it should be said that many of them did not approve such militant leadership but they were shoved out of the driver's seat. The Frontier Thinkers seized the reins and galloped wildly in directions which, they believed, would lead to a society which will "transfer the democratic traditions from individualistic to collectivistic foundations." (p. 21).

Several years later the seeds planted in this violent booklet, *A Call to the Teachers of the Nation*, and similar literature bore fruit in so much controversy that the National Education Association appointed its Commission to Defend Democracy through Education. And with the passing of another decade we

find that our entire nation is "pocked with the battlefields of the war against modern education," according to Dean Ernest O. Melby. Certainly there could be no better authority on public reaction to the New Education, since Melby had been a pioneer and important leader of the movement from its inception.

The Master Plan—"Conclusions and Recommendations"

In February, 1934, the final draft of the American Historical Association's report of the Commission on the Social Studies, *Conclusions and Recommendations*, heretofore mentioned, was approved and printed. The date is important since it shows that this volume, giving the working plan of the Frontier Thinkers for rebuilding society, was available prior to the fateful National Education Association and Progressive Education Association Conventions of 1934, when our great educational system definitely was turned to the left. *Conclusions and Recommendations* completely outlined the design of the leftist educators for a collectivist society in our country. It marked the second stage of the revolution in education in America.

In this volume, the point of entry for indoctrination in our schools is clearly defined—the social science courses intended to become the core of the curriculum. Textbooks were to be rewritten, special courses and teachers guides prepared and other teaching materials carefully "selected" to accomplish this purpose in education. Here is revealed the formula which has radically altered instruction in most of our public schools: "The commission . . . deems desirable . . . the incorporation into the materials of social science instruction in the schools of the best plans and ideals of the future of society and of the individual." (p. 27).

What are the "best plans," and for what kind of "society" are they headed? The Frontier Thinkers enlighten us. Because of the great importance of *Conclusions and Recommendations* to an understanding of what has happened in our public schools, we give below a few excerpts from this blueprint of the New Education. The similarity is obvious to the proposals adopted by

the National Education Association and the Progressive Education Association at meetings later in 1934.

Collectivism Is Emerging

Cumulative evidence supports the conclusion that, in the United States as in other countries, the age of individualism and laissez faire in economy and government is closing and that a new age of collectivism is emerging. (p. 16)

. . . the specific form which this collectivism . . . will take . . . is by no means clear. . . . It may involve the limiting or supplanting of private property by public property or it may entail the preservation of private property extended and distributed among the masses. (p. 16)

Pattern of Indoctrination

This Master Plan then outlines the overall purpose of using education to bring about the collectivist* form of society and stresses the "social obligation" of education to lead the way:

Organized public education in the United States, much more than ever before, is now compelled, if it is to fulfill its social obligations, to adjust its objectives, its curriculum, its methods of instruction, and its administrative procedures to the requirements of the emerging integrated order. (p. 35)

Later in this prophetic book we are given the "next steps" by which schools and colleges will be used to accomplish this ideological or political objective:

The writers of textbooks may be expected to revamp and rewrite their old works in accordance with this frame of reference. . . .

* Since the word "collectivism" is used frequently in *Conclusions and Recommendations*, it is noteworthy that Charles Beard, in a letter to Frederick Keppel, then president of the Carnegie Corporation, said that he had chosen the word because it "avoids the connotations of socialism and Communism." From statement of Charles Dollard, President, Carnegie Corporation of New York, *Hearings on Tax-Exempt Foundations*, 83rd Congress H.Res. 217, Part II, p. 975, 1954.

Makers of programs in the social sciences . . . may be expected . . . to recast existing syllabi and schemes of instruction in accordance with their judgment. . . . (p. 147) [Italics added]

. . . colleges and universities offering courses of instruction for teachers will review their current programs and provide for prospective teachers courses of instruction in general harmony with the Commission's frame of reference. (p. 147) [Italics added]

These are but a few of the directives and specifications of the Master Plan to recast our Republic into the mould of a collectivist state. Others will be discussed in these pages as their application is apparent. Time and again we encounter the battle cry, "a dying *laissez faire* must be completely destroyed," or similar directives chanting hatred of some part of our free economy of free men. And this effective working plan for the New Education was financed by 340,000 stupid capitalistic dollars given to the American Historical Association by the gullible Carnegie Corporation.

NEA Supports the Plan

The year 1934, we have seen, was a fateful one for American education. Although drafts of the Master Plan had been in the hands of key Progressivists for about two years, it was not until 1934 that *Conclusions and Recommendations* was published and widely distributed. So leading New Educationists were prepared for coming events.

At the National Education Association Convention in Cleveland, Ohio, on March 1, 1934, Dr. Willard E. Givens, then a superintendent of schools in California and thereafter the principal executive officer of the NEA for many years, submitted a report revealing the leftist philosophy rapidly taking root among prominent educators. The Associated Press, March 1, 1934, reported:

A warning that a dying *laissez faire* must be completely destroyed was voiced today at the NEA Convention.

"A large degree of social control" is necessary and education should be geared to the "New America," said a report presented to the Association's department of superintendence by Willard E. Givens, a chairman of General Subject Comm. IV. . . .

Observe once again the war-cry "dying laissez faire must be destroyed," prominently appearing in *Conclusions and Recommendations*.

PEA Gives Its Support

Immediately following the NEA Convention, the Progressive Education Association began its meetings. Dr. Harold Rugg was the first important speaker. Rugg announced plans to enlist fourteen million people in a national program of social-economic education. Leaders of forty national organizations cooperated with the PEA in shaping the proposals, reports the *Cleveland News*, March 2, 1934. Adoption of such a program came as a surprise, after the resolution adopted by the Committee on "Education for the New America" at the preceding NEA Convention, showing the fate in store for our free economy. Evidently the reporter was amazed that these forty national organizations, including many business firms, were so naive as to support a program tending toward the destruction of our free enterprise system.

The *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, on March 3, 1934, gives us this account: "Within a few weeks," Dr. Rugg reported, "the 'New America' campaign, financed by \$50,000 a year from an unnamed source, will be launched to win the support of all intelligent liberals of the country. Roosevelt will go as far to the left as he is pushed. The necessity of the moment is to create sufficient pressure. . . ."

Schools in the "New America"

Here is the picture of the school that will fit into Dr. Rugg's "New America," as drawn by L. Thomas Hopkins, Lincoln School, of Teachers College. States the *Cleveland Plain Dealer*,

March 3, 1934: ". . . The present secondary school should be thoroughly reorganized. Present subjects should be discarded, and the curriculum reorganized around pressing social problems . . . the learner will select and direct his own education under the guidance of the teacher. Present requirements for admission to college will be abandoned, thus removing the pressure for learning much useless information. . . . No uniform rigid standards will be imposed. Standards will be fixed by the learning group, or by the individual for himself. . . ."

Students' Reaction

Under the heading "Students Copy Radical View of Educators," with subhead "Capitalistic System is deplored in School Papers here," Mr. Omar Ranney reported in the March 3, 1934, issue of the *Cleveland Press* the effect of these teachers' conventions on local students:

While educators were winding up their series of conventions here today, the "radical" views they have put forth in the past 10 days were finding expression among students of Cleveland Public Schools.

Walter Rutkowski is quoted in the paper (*South High School Beacon*) as saying: "Can I succeed under the old economic system when I am honest? The man who has been able to gamble best got farthest ahead. Here is a direct challenge to capitalism. . . . The old theories won't work under present conditions."

To Take Over Industry and Utilities

In the NEA proceedings of the 72nd Annual Meeting held in Washington, D. C., July 1934, Dr. Givens gives us more details in a report under the heading "Education for the New America":

We are convinced that we stand today at the verge of a great culture. . . . But to achieve these things, many drastic changes must be made. A dying laissez faire must be completely destroyed, and all of us, including the "owners," must be subjected to a large degree of social control. A large section of our discussion group,

accepting the conclusions of distinguished students, maintain that in our fragile, interdependent society, the credit agencies, the basic industries and utilities cannot be centrally planned and operated under private ownership. Hence, they will join in creating a swift nationwide campaign of adult education which will support President Roosevelt in taking these over and operating them at full capacity as a unified national system in the interests of all the people. (p. 647)

University of Moscow Summer Schools

While completing their plans in this country to use our schools and colleges to create their new society, and having won important support from the 1934 NEA and PEA Conventions in Cleveland, Ohio, and Washington, D. C., the leaders of this cult again turned their eyes abroad for inspiration, particularly to Soviet Russia.

After four presidents had refused to do so, President Roosevelt granted official recognition to Soviet Russia in November, 1933. We have seen that the Institute of International Education had been established at Columbia University as early as 1919 to conduct tours to foreign lands. These trips were aggressively promoted under the leadership of Stephen P. Duggan, who organized an advisory organization of the Institute to guide American students and teachers who wished to take the prescribed course at the Moscow University Summer Sessions. Travel arrangements were made by Intourist, Inc., New York City, which offered a basic rate for travel and maintenance in the Soviet Union from July 16 to August 25 for \$176.

On the inside front page of the *NEA Journal*, March, 1935, appeared an advertisement for "Moscow—Summer School," with a half-page cut of Red Square, furnishing information for registration and suggestions by the Institute's Advisory Council. Included among the twenty-four listed members of the Council were W. W. Charters, Ohio State; Harry W. Chase, New York University; George S. Counts, Columbia University; John Dewey, Columbia University; Stephen Duggan, Frank P. Gra-

ham, University of North Carolina; Robert M. Hutchins, University of Chicago; Edward R. Murrow; Hallie F. Flanagan, Vassar; I. L. Kandel, Columbia University; and Susan M. Kingsbury, Bryn Mawr.

In a Soviet pamphlet describing the program for the forthcoming 1935 summer courses, we learn the purpose and some of the results of the 1933 and 1934 summer sessions held for our American educators:

The Moscow University Summer Session is sponsored in the Soviet Union by the People's Commissariat of Education.

. . . The Summer Session originated as the result of an experiment conducted during the Summer of 1933 by a group of American educators . . . to offer two courses dealing with "Experimental Educational Programs of the Soviet Union," and Institutional Changes in the Soviet Union.

At the second Summer Session (1934) thirteen courses were offered. . . . The staff was composed of 22 professors . . . two hundred and twelve attended the sessions. . . .

New York City school teachers may offer the certificates issued by the University of Moscow to meet the requirements for annual salary increment (alertness credit).

By providing a six-weeks' foreign tour, including maintenance, for \$176, and advising the New York City teachers that the University of Moscow certificate would meet their "requirements of annual salary increment" (alertness credit!), the Soviet leaders went far to make attractive their indoctrination courses in the glories of Communism.

Progressives Boost Moscow Courses

In February, 1935, the Progressive Education Association held a convention at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., during which Soviet Russia's tourist agency was accorded every facility to "sell" the Moscow Summer Sessions. In an article headlined "2,000 Educators Get Pamphlet Boosting Moscow College" in the *Washington Herald*, of February 23, 1935, we read:

Communist agents of the Soviet government of Russia are at work in the lobby of the Mayflower Hotel spreading subtle propaganda among the more than 2000 American school teachers attending the convention of the American Progressive Education Association.

"Study in the Soviet Union" commands a large poster at the booth established by Intourist, Inc., *Soviet Russia's Official tourist agency*. Large stacks of pamphlets and other propaganda are distributed daily to the teachers and all who pass the booth are requested to fill out cards giving their names and addresses so that other Soviet propaganda may be sent to them.

* * * *

The course "Principles of the Collectivist and Socialist Society" is pre-requisite for admission to all other courses in the Summer Sessions.

These elaborate plans of the Soviet educators and many of the Frontier Thinkers aroused serious opposition in some quarters. On February 18, 1935, the *Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph* exposed the program in a front-page article entitled "American Professors, Trained by Soviet, Teach in United States Schools." Shortly thereafter, the University of Moscow Summer Sessions (1935) were canceled without explanation.

But the Communists had not wasted the effort. The 1933 and 1934 sessions had been completed, hundreds of educators had taken the courses, and Soviet propaganda had reached thousands. Was it effective? Let us note the verdict of Dr. John C. Almack, who saw the results at first hand. His series of ten authentic and incisive articles appeared in the *San Francisco Examiner*, during October, 1942. He wrote:

Many teachers and students took the pilgrimage to the Old World, usually including Germany and Russia in their itineraries. Many of them returned challenging everything American, breathing fire and defiance to property, the profit system and the Constitution, and beating the tomtoms for a "new social order."

They began the active diffusion of economic reform ideas by means of pamphlets, papers, panel discussions, forums, lectures,

teaching and books. They were filled with the notion that the revolution was just around the corner, and that they must declare the way, after insuring their own safety, should things go wrong, by guarantees of "academic freedom."

These educators, of course, had an unquestioned right to journey to Moscow, although it is difficult to see what they hoped to learn of value. Since 1917, the Soviet record of tyranny and bloodshed had been fully publicized. But few of the Moscow pilgrims were concerned with such truths. Scorers of capitalism and the profit motive at home, they journeyed to Moscow apparently hoping to find vindication of their own preconceived economic and political beliefs.

Newspapers, Radio to Be "Taken from Private Owners"

To explain the background of this revolution in education, we have cited the statements of numerous Frontier Thinkers and the actions and public pronouncements of their professional organizations, such as the NEA, the PEA, the John Dewey Society and others. One more will be added because it occurred at a much later date and is representative of the attitude of these Progressive-New Educators at that time.

The occasion was one of the most important on the nation's educational calendar and no less than 18,000 delegates from all over the United States were in attendance. The time was the end of June, 1938, the second day of the NEA Convention held in New York City. The place was the ballroom of the Hotel Astor. "Before 3,000 cheering delegates," states the *New York Herald Tribune*, June 29, 1938, "Dr. Goodwin Watson, Professor of Education at Teachers College, Columbia University, begged the teachers of the nation to use their profession to indoctrinate children to overthrow 'conservative reactionaries' directing American government and industry. He charged that these 'plutocrats' were driving the United States toward Fascism and war instead of trying to preserve democracy and world peace."

The teachers applauded him vigorously although he castigated them for failing to mould the opinions of the pupils against "manufacturing interests, plutocrats and Mr. Million-bucks" who, he charged, were "ignoring and opposing the inarticulate desires of the masses for . . . democracy and world peace. . . ." Dr. Watson, who is described as a leader of the leftist group of educators, declared that Soviet Russia was one of "the most notable international achievements of our generation"; that democracy can be achieved only if newspapers and the radio, like schools, are taken from private owners and made public agencies.

Dr. Watson said that "we can't make government more democratic so long as economic power, and the power to pay for propaganda which moulds public opinion, are concentrated in the hands of the few." He said that "our government and that of France and England may pretend to be democracies but they are in truth plutocracies. . . . This predicament defines our educational task."

New Educational Fellowship

The Progressivists long have had close ties with the internationalist movement for world government, a cause rapidly gaining favor among leftist educators. In 1933, the Progressive Education Association, with headquarters in New York City and operating largely under the direction of leaders at Teachers College, Columbia University, became the United States section of the New Education Fellowship, an avowed peace organization. Thereafter all members of the PEA automatically became members of this international body and subject to its policies over which they had no control.

At the first session of the eighth International Conference of the New Education Fellowship on July 6, 1941, at Ann Arbor, Michigan, approximately 1800 delegates from fifty-one countries were present. The leadership of the Conference included many so-called Progressives and well-known leftist edu-

cators. Dr. Harold Rugg, who presided at the first session, stated that the Progressive Education Association came into the International Conference as the United States section since "they [the PEA] paid allegiance to essentially the same educational principles as those held by the New Educational Fellowship." On page 2 of the Conference program we note one of these principles:

... it can be said with justice that upon the whole the older type of education was a part of the old social order, whose bankruptcy constitutes the present epoch of history. A new social order must be built and a new type of education must be worked out as an integral part of the construction of this inclusive human order.

Professors Goodwin Watson and W. H. Kilpatrick spoke. The general trend of discussion favored a new social order and world union, to be reached through education. Thus we see that pioneering work for remaking society, with overtones of world government, was done by an international organization in this country as early as 1933, with the leading American Progressivists occupying front seats on the band wagon. These groups were the precursors of the powerful UNESCO of the present time, ceaselessly agitating for what amounts to a world authority on educational matters.

NOTES

1. Charles A. Beard, *An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution of the United States* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1913), p. 17.
2. "Preliminary Report of NEA Committee," *History Teachers' Magazine*, May, 1913, p. 136. Discussed at Superintendents' Meeting, Philadelphia, February 28, 1913.
3. *Bulletin*, No. 41 (Washington: U.S. Bureau of Education, 1913).
4. "A Bill of Grievances" (National Society, Sons of the American Revolution). Filed with Congress of U.S., 1949.
5. *University of Moscow Summer Sessions* (Intourist, Inc., 545 Fifth Avenue, New York City, 1935). Booklet.
6. George S. Counts, *The Soviet Challenge to America* (New York: John Day Co., 1931), preface.
7. *Conclusions and Recommendations* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934), pp. 156-158.

CHAPTER V

An Unvarying Program

WE HAVE CITED AT LENGTH the statements and activities of the New Educationists during the 1930's because it was during this decade that our educational system definitely turned to the left. To understand the present disquieting condition, it is essential to know just how, when and on what theories this transition was effected. Although some of its promoters were active at an earlier date, it was not until 1934 that the Master Plan furnished a comprehensive and detailed blueprint for concerted action.

Many apologists have contended that the educator-radicalism of the thirties merely reflected the depression mood, and that it is no longer typical of this element of the teaching profession. Unfortunately, the facts do not sustain such a comforting assurance. Let us consider the sequence of events. As early as 1897 John Dewey was crusading for his social and political philosophies. Charles A. Beard commenced his debunking writings in 1913. In the same year a committee of the NEA suggested "that the historical events be selected with due regard to their significance, as illustrations or statements of the social force. . . ." (p. 36) The Institute of International Education was established at Columbia University in 1919 and soon thereafter pilgrims were trekking to the Old World for inspiration. And in 1919

the Progressive Education Association started crusading for its "dynamic" education.*

At Lincoln School, New York City (financed by Rockefeller funds), Dr. Harold Rugg, as early as 1920, started experimenting with his social science courses, working out methods and concepts which eventually dominated the curriculum of the New Education. Three editions of his social science pamphlets appeared from 1922 to 1928 and "the current junior-high school social science reading books"—years before the depression.¹

Furthermore, the epochal study sponsored by the American Historical Association and financed by the Carnegie Corporation was launched in 1926. Charles Beard, Harold Rugg, George Counts and many others took leading parts in this five-year study which set the pattern for this revolution in education. So the new-world-makers were actively crusading long before the economic crisis of the early 1930's, which did not cause their program although it did intensify it.

The more recent attitudes of the New Educationists may be judged, as in the past, by their periodicals, conferences and conventions. Typical was the three-day convention of the New Education Fellowship, held in Chicago in late November, 1947. As this was the new name for the defunct Progressive Education Association,† its active leaders were present in force. The atmosphere of the meeting was shown when the delegates cheered the notorious poet Langston Hughes and accorded Harold Rugg a hero's welcome because of the widespread elimination of his social science courses, according to the *New York*

* For a full account of these developments, see *Communist-Socialist Propaganda in American Schools*, by Verne P. Kaub (Boston: Meador Publishing Co., 1953).

† Benjamin Fine, *New York Times* education editor, commenting on the announcement of the dissolution of the Progressive Education Association, said the principal reason for its disappearance was "the disrepute, even contempt, in which the term 'progressive' has been held in recent years. In many school systems, it has been the educational 'kiss of death' to be labelled a disciple of Dewey or a member of the Progressive Education Association." *Human Events*, July 9, 1955.

Journal American, November 28, 1947. Resolutions were passed condemning "thought control" and "witch hunts" of teachers, and calling for the abolition of the House Un-American Activities Committee. Of far more importance, however, was the adoption of the New Education Fellowship's policy statement, as reported in the *New York Times*, November 30, 1947:

1. The reconstruction of the economic system in the direction of greater social justice and stability; a system to be secured by whatever democratic planning and social controls experience shows to be necessary.
2. The establishment of a genuine world order, an order in which the national sovereignty is subordinated to world authority in crucial interests affecting peace and security . . . an order which must be geared with the increasing socializations and public controls now developing in England, Sweden, New Zealand and certain other countries; . . . an order in which "world citizenship" thus assumes at least equal status with national citizenship.

This significant resolution was passed with only one dissenting vote by delegates claiming to represent two thousand schools and colleges. As late as 1947, this large and representative group proved that there had been little if any change of heart among the crusading educators who had condemned the free enterprise system.

Of the top leaders, only Beard seems to have had a twinge of regret. In later years, Beard probably would not have penned the book of 1913 that made him the dean of the "debunking" fraternity. Rugg became frustrated and bitter with increasing opposition. Counts has denounced Communism in recent years, but there is no indication that he lost his early and ardent affinity for socialist doctrines. John Dewey retained his post as honorary president of the socialistic League for Industrial Democracy, offspring of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society, for "eleven years until his death in 1952," according to Dr. Harry W. Laidler, Executive Director.² The typical attitude was that expressed by Harold Rugg: "We shall make no compromise"

and "we cannot take a middle road."³ And three years after the 1947 NEF policy statement with its blunt endorsement of socialistic doctrines, *Progressive Education*, official organ of the American Education Fellowship, in most of its 1950 issues still listed these objectives prominently in the magazine:

1. . . . to channel the energy of the educators toward the reconstruction of the economic system.
2. . . . the establishment of a genuine world order, an order in which the national sovereignty is subordinate to the world authority in all crucial interests affecting peace and security . . . an order in which world citizenship assumes at least equal status with national citizenship.

In this and the preceding chapter, we have taken a brief but representative glimpse of leading New Educationists. We find no substance in the defense that their leftist doctrines were born of the depression in the 1930's and departed with it. Most of them charted their ideological courses long before that tragic period and adhered to them long thereafter, even when subsequent events proved the poverty of their theories, amazing lack of vision and faulty judgment. And their adherents, in general, followed the example. To the starry-eyed extremists among them, theirs was a "sacred" mission. As Dr. Rugg said, "They lead, even though they may lead mistakenly."

But we must know more about this leadership since our children are being led. So let us follow a single New Educationist but a very important one, Harold Rugg himself, and study closely his thoughts on our American ideals and principles—all from his own public statements. In no other way, perhaps, can we observe so closely the influence of this "modern" education on the lives of our children.

NOTES

1. Harold Rugg, *Building a Science of Society for the Schools* (Boston: Ginn & Co., 1934), p. 4.
2. *Hearings on Tax-Exempt Foundations*, 83rd Congress, H. Res. 217, Part II, p. 977, 1954.
3. *New York Journal-American*, November 30, 1947.

CHAPTER VI

Rugg—Frontier Thinker

As we look upon life, so we teach. What we believe, the loyalties to which we hold subtly determine the content and the method of our teaching. Each of us has a "philosophy," whether or not he has thought it through and definitely phrased it. Everything we say and do as well as what we think reflects that philosophy.—Harold Rugg, *The Great Technology*, p. 258.

OF THE FRONTIER THINKERS, Dr. Harold Rugg, Teachers College, Columbia University, was easily preeminent both as an educator and as a prolific writer. In sports parlance, Rugg was the triple threat in the Frontier Thinker line-up. His activities and influences were extensive in each of the following fields:

1. He was one of the principal architects of the ideological structure known as the "new social order."
2. For about fifteen years his social science courses, covering many grades, were the most widely used in our public schools. They exert a wide influence over impressionable student minds, both in what they teach and what they fail to teach.
3. For many years Rugg was a teacher of teachers at Columbia University. From this vital center, his propaganda and doctrines were spread throughout the United States. He also exercised a strong influence on pedagogical thinking through his Teachers Guides, which interpreted his economic, political and social philosophies to thousands of classroom teachers using his social science courses.

Rugg was one of the forerunners of the New Education.* As early as 1922-1928, he was busy with research in the field of American culture. He issued a series of social science pamphlets. He experimented at Lincoln School, New York City, then connected with Teachers College, which Rugg said gave the project an "institutional connection, a home and considerable financial support." At Lincoln School, Rugg's social science pamphlets were transformed into textbooks. Later we shall examine his comprehensive courses which have been used in thousands of schools. But first we shall examine his basic beliefs and philosophies. For as Rugg said, "As we look on life, so we teach."

In 1933, Professor Rugg wrote a book entitled *The Great Technology*.¹ In it he stated his belief that our American way of life is a failure and must be supplanted by a new social order. "Our task is nothing short of questioning a whole philosophy of living, the philosophy of private capitalism and laissez faire," he declared. He suggested doing away with most of the middlemen, who "interfere with the conversion of energy to the uses of man," and advocated "production for use as opposed to production for sale or private profit." He found serious obstacles in his path in the deep-rooted loyalties of the American people, our system of free competition and an "entire culture lacking in integrity." Professor Rugg insisted that we must "uproot" these loyalties as a necessary preparatory step in his new social order.

In the latter part of this volume Rugg explains how he and his "liberal" colleagues plan to bring about this new society. They propose to use the public educational system to "change the climate of opinion" of Americans. It is to be a bloodless revolution by education.

Professor Rugg's personal philosophy about social reconstruc-

* In this chapter and the one following, "Into the Classrooms," the author has drawn heavily on the booklet *Undermining Our Republic*, written by Augustin G. Rudd, Hamilton Hicks and Alfred T. Falk in 1939.

tion is boldly set forth in his *The Great Technology*. Of all his voluminous writings, Rugg has probably more reason to regret the publication of this volume than any other. For it not only contains untenable economic doctrines and reveals defective reasoning, but exposes his plan for reconstructing our society. His fantastic proposal would graft the tenets of technocracy upon a framework of socialism. The economic findings in this book have been thoroughly discredited by reputable economists and the author's whole plan would not be deserving of serious attention were it not for one important fact. That fact is Rugg's powerful key position in the scheme of the so-called Frontier Thinkers and his great influence over the teaching of millions of children.

In *The Great Technology*, intended for educators, Dr. Rugg frankly explains the scope and nature of "our task" and reveals his destructive attitude towards many of our American institutions. He wrote: "A deep gulf yawns between what we profess to be and what we are, what we fear and what we protest, what we believe and how we vote. Every institution, every way of living among us, is marked by this dishonesty—business and finance, politics, educational administration." (p. 191)

Loyalties, Concepts to Be Uprooted

But Rugg also sees obstacles in fundamental social and cultural attitudes held for generations. He explains the problem and the need to overcome it. He wrote:

There are huge obstacles in the path of those who would create a new climate of opinion in our communities. These obstacles reside in part in the powerful individuals and groups which control the economic system. But they lie even more deeply in the stereotyped loyalties and opinions of the public mind itself. Indeed, it is to the uprooting of ingrained concepts and motives that we must commit ourselves. (p. 188)

Dr. Rugg would discard the formal school, including the present curriculum, and rebuild it. But what of the American

people who have been very happy with their public schools for generations? He gives this answer:

. . . The emergence of the Great Technology necessitates the scrapping of the formal school and the setting up of a thoroughly new one. The content and organization of the school curriculum, as well as the underlying psychology and philosophy, must be drastically rebuilt . . . the climates of opinion of American communities, those now dictated by the dominant groups that own and control the economic system, must be made over. . . . (p. 203)

Flag Salute—Oath of Allegiance

In this revealing book, Rugg deplores the flag salute and the fact that "young nationals" may grow up feeling that their country is superior to another. He deals harshly with the oath of allegiance and other practices which compel teachers to "swear that they will protect the written Constitution of the United States." The author states: "It is clear, therefore, that if educational agencies are to be utilized in the production of a new social order, an indispensable first step is that of developing a totally new outlook upon life and education among the rank and file of teachers." (pp. 259-260) Rugg also states: ". . . There is no more serious obstacle to educational reconstruction than the unthinking adoption of the current American gospels of success through competition and conformity to the greater group. . . ." (p. 259)

Our economic system is vigorously attacked by this teacher of teachers:

We know, now, that a large and growing group of middle men and manipulators of sales, money, investment, and credit have interjected themselves into the economic system. . . . Most of them, however, . . . are exploiters. . . . The postulate follows that the economic system can be operated efficiently and humanely only by the elimination, re-education and assignment to productive work of the parasitical members of this group of middle-men. (p. 179)

Degradation Due to Theory of Government

From an author of textbooks for our children, one would expect at least a friendly and understanding attitude toward the Founders of this Republic and their great charter of freedom. But this is the viewpoint of Dr. Rugg:

Nothing about this story of degradation is clearer than that in any of those decades a fairly decent standard of living could have been had by the peoples of the expanding West. That it was not and is not today can be traced primarily to the theory and practice of government set up by our fathers. (p. 95)

Furthermore, the American owners of property have never hesitated to express both fear of the common people's assertion of class rights and contempt for their stupidity. Recall statements of the Fathers of the Federal Constitution. . . (p. 100)

Production for Use—Not for Profit

In this book we find that Dr. Rugg outlines his ideal economic system. Among other features it would provide that "quantity" goods be centrally controlled and operated as a single unit. Rugg was a director of the League for Industrial Democracy, successor to the Intercollegiate Socialist Society,* whose slogan was "For a New Social Order based on production for use and not for profit." It is apparent that the convictions which drew him to this organization colored his economic thinking. For instance: "In thinking about human wealth the scientist rules out all pecuniary matters, all questions of the 'rights' of individuals to take larger-than-average shares of the world's wealth, and all legal rules of contract-relationship. Furthermore, he rules out all *economic* services of men which do not contribute to the production and distribution of physical goods for use." (p. 108)

* The Intercollegiate Socialist Society was organized in New York City in 1905 and changed its name to the League for Industrial Democracy in 1921. A full account of its activities and influence on American education will be found in *Turning of the Tides* by Paul W. Shafer and John H. Snow (New York: Long-House, Inc., 1953), Part I.

This Teachers College professor reveals his feeling that the establishment of his new social order, based on collectivism, is no small undertaking and he asks that the Frontier Thinkers "be given the opportunity" to create a design and the freedom to accomplish it. . . ." Rugg tells us, in *The Great Technology*, something of the regimentation to come: "Under a designed society these engineers, architects, doctors, lawyers, teachers, talented artists, and skillful craftsmen could all be busily and happily at work. . . . Their place in society would be determined by a scientific determination of the quantity goods and socially useful services which are needed, and the allocation of workers to produce them. . . ." (p. 250)

Revolution?

But suppose this Utopia does not work, what then? Rugg has some interesting suggestions to meet that contingency: "Secure these sums—probably totaling between \$2,000,000,000 and \$3,000,000,000 each year—from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. (*If a choice must be made between liquidating the banks and liquidating creative youth, it will be wiser to cast the banks into the discard rather than the youth.*)" (p. 252) And then he offered this grim alternative: "Our task, therefore, is to launch a nation-wide campaign of adult education to create swiftly a compact body of minority opinion for the scientific reconstruction of our social order. . . . The alternative to this extension of the democratic method is revolution." (pp. 24-25)

The foregoing excerpts are a fair sampling of Rugg's 302-page book, *The Great Technology*, in which he gives a detailed description of his contemplated new social order, to be ruled over, presumably, by a sort of American politburo of master minds.

Rugg's Plan to Use Schools

But Harold Rugg is a teacher and his crusade is based on using our educational system to accomplish his ideological objective. He summarizes the obstacles in his path:

. . . basic problems confront us: *First* and foremost, the development of a new philosophy of life and education which will be fully appropriate to the new social order; *second*, the building of an adequate plan for the production of a new race of educational workers; *third*, the making of new activities and materials for the curriculum. . . . (p. 258)

But, says the author, “. . . if educational agencies are to be utilized in the production of a new social order, an indispensable first step is that of developing a totally new outlook upon life and education among the rank and file of teachers.” (p. 260)

With this first step accomplished, Rugg sees “educational reconstruction” well on its way and ready for a new program of studies “. . . built directly out of the content of our changing cultures . . . this step amounts to the preparation and introduction into the schools of the world of a courageous and intelligent description of our new society.” (pp. 272-273)

Social Science Course Explained

Rugg explains his own series of social science textbooks in the pamphlet, *Building a Science of Society for the Schools*, in which he says: “The preparation of such a description of modern society is, then, an indispensable first step in educational as well as social reconstruction.” What kind of social reconstruction? Rugg tells us near the end of his little pamphlet: “We stand indeed at the crossroads to a new epoch. Some of the pathways lead to ‘social chaos.’ One of them leads, however, to the era of the Great Technology.” From this it is clear that this “new epoch,” which is to be built through education, is the one he has outlined above in his book *The Great Technology*. Describing the method to be followed the author explains:

A new public mind is to be created. How? Only by creating tens of millions of new individual minds and welding them into a new social mind. Old stereotypes must be broken up and new “climates of opinion” formed in the neighborhoods of America. But that is the task of the building of a science of society for the schools. (p. 32)

In Rugg's *Culture and Education in America*, and other public pronouncements, he has been very frank in revealing his social, economic, and political beliefs which, he admits, determine a professor's "content and method" of teaching. In his school textbooks, however, Rugg has been far more subtle, as we shall see in the next chapter.

In March, 1941, when his courses were under vigorous attack, Rugg told a group of social science teachers that "it is a vicious thing to evaluate a textbook by picking out a few paragraphs." But he did not find it difficult to sum up in a single sentence his own standpoint as a writer of textbooks on American history. "I want to cut straight through all the bunk and debunk the heroes," he said, according to an account in the *New York Times* of March 18, 1941.

Not only did Rugg eagerly "debunk" the writers but he went to great lengths to attack the motives and discredit the work of the Founders of this Republic, undeterred by a sense of fairness or of consequence. It is not that his criticism of our institutions is entirely baseless for all know that they are not and could not be perfect. But Rugg's approach lacks objectivity and the historic perspective. It is not the historian or philosopher speaking—it is the propagandist.* Rugg has an idea to sell and he artfully crusades for it. But no scholar would commend this as a method of teaching history. Repeatedly, we discover Beard's (and Karl Marx's) vicious theory of "economic determinism" subtly advanced in disparagement of our Constitution and the integrity of the brilliant men who created it. After reading Rugg's weird economic and social theories, his unsound political doctrines and his unwarranted attacks on our institu-

* Rugg said that his social science course is the carefully planned recurrence of important concepts, generalizations, etc., which he charted in advance. "Hence the student will encounter the important meanings, principles and movements [as Rugg sees them] over and over again, but constantly presented in new and varied settings." Harold Rugg, *Our Country and Our People* (Boston: Ginn & Co., 1938), p. ix.

tions, can one have any doubt of the effects of such teachings on the faith of millions of young Americans who will determine the destiny of our Republic?

NOTES

1. Harold Rugg, *The Great Technocracy* (New York: John Day Co., 1933).

CHAPTER VII

Into the Classrooms¹

TO INTRODUCE THEIR PROGRAM in our schools, it will be recalled that the Master Plan of the Frontier Thinkers required rewriting of textbooks and the use of selected materials to accomplish their purpose in education. To this end, traditional courses were scuttled and many standard subjects or texts replaced by studies meeting the specifications for the new social order. Considering the magnitude and scope of the task, progress in revising the curricula was very rapid. Indeed, by 1945, there were few economics or social science courses in general use which were not unfriendly to our capitalistic economy and other traditional American institutions.

A Brookings Institution survey of economics instruction in fifteen hundred high schools; an extensive study by Dr. A. H. Hobbs of eighty-three sociology textbooks; and similar findings document this condition. Space will permit examination here of only one of many courses but, from 1930 to 1950, the most widely used of all—the social science courses generally known as the “Rugg system,” prepared by Dr. Harold Rugg in collaboration with James E. Mendenhall. Although many others were engaged in preparing or rewriting texts for introduction into the classrooms of America, none was as successful as these two “liberal” educators then on the staff of Teachers College, Columbia University. Not only did these

courses cover many grades, but a prodigious publisher's sales job had already placed these books, as early as 1940, in the hands of an estimated 5,000,000 children.²

The Master Plan tells us that the indoctrination of the children is to be accomplished by means of the social science courses which Professor Rugg said would be the "very core of the entire program." They eliminate time-honored history, geography, and civics as separate studies, but include parts of these subjects and other materials which give the author unlimited opportunity to "interpret" anything of social significance to suit his avowed purpose. In *Time* magazine, of November 6, 1940, we learn that Rugg "undid the old packages (i.e. history, geography, etc.), and dumped all his information in one basket—social studies." (p. 61)

The working tools of the Rugg-Mendenhall system are as follows:

1. Fourteen textbooks—eight for elementary grades and six for junior high school. Author—Harold Rugg.
2. *Pupil's Workbooks of Directed Study* in which questions are posed for the child to answer. Authors—Harold Rugg and James E. Mendenhall.
3. *Teacher's Guides* in which the teacher is given the required answers to the posed questions and is instructed how to interpret historical facts and other material in the textbooks. Parents do not see these. Authors—Harold Rugg and James E. Mendenhall.

A few examples will show the nature of this system, which emphasizes "attitudes" instead of knowledge.* In one of the

* Most of the excerpts given are from Rugg's texts in use in schools during 1938-1941. Since these volumes were constantly being revised, especially after nation-wide protests against them in 1940, it is impossible to state that a given excerpt will be found in earlier or later editions of the same title. Indeed, even some titles were changed. The texts mentioned in this chapter were used not only by the aforesaid 5,000,000 school children (1940) but by unknown millions since that time. Even when his textbooks were removed from classrooms, they often were placed in school libraries as reference reading. The books are now out of print.

Pupil's Workbooks the question is asked, "Is the United States a land of opportunity for all our people? Why?" This is the answer the child should give, according to the *Teacher's Guide*.³ (p. 38)

The United States is not a land of opportunity for all our people; for one-fifth of the people do not earn any money at all. There are great differences in the standards of living of the different classes of people. The majority do not have any real security.

Most of us hold the belief that our country is superior to dictatorships of other nations. But apparently we are wrong. For this is how the *Teacher's Guide* (p. 52) rules out any such attitude:

Of the 315 pupils, 88% said that the following statement was true, "My country is unquestionably the best country in the world." Now the attitude thus expressed is one that we decidedly do not want to develop in our classes.

Among other tips to teachers, we find this in the *Teacher's Guide*:⁴ "Treat the War for Independence essentially as an economic struggle between the ruling classes of England and the Colonies." (p. 68)

These examples illustrate the kind of "attitude" taught by the Rugg system. In scores of other instances the American way of life is subtly undermined, disparaged or openly attacked. It is readily apparent that the courses have deeper purposes than merely to impart knowledge. Obviously, one of the primary purposes is to develop certain attitudes antagonistic toward some of our social, economic and political institutions. The factual education of our children is ingeniously employed as the vehicle for propaganda. To understand its subtle method this fact clearly must be kept in mind.

These courses are not history although they have replaced courses in history. They are not geography although they have stolen much of the time formerly devoted to geography. As for

civics and the U. S. Constitution, the Rugg system has largely ignored them as studies and scoffs at American institutions and their Founders.

We now find an all-embracing propaganda system, with books for every grade up to the ninth, molding the immature minds of our children. The operation of this system is simple and direct: (a) In the *Pupil's Workbooks*, the authors pose leading questions and direct the child's thoughts into the channels desired. (b) In his textbooks, Rugg provides the "selected" materials from which the child must formulate answers to the questions, thus directing the child's conclusions. (c) And through the *Teacher's Guides*, the authors not only prescribe the answers to their own questions, but attempt to control also the thinking of the teacher. Thus from beginning to end it is a system of indoctrination.

In his *Social Reconstruction*, prepared for group and class discussion, Professor Rugg states: "This Study Guide has one major purpose: to help focus thought upon the insistent current problems of social reconstruction." Not education, but "social reconstruction" is the aim. For reference reading, he recommends a list heavily loaded with leftist authors, including twenty-one specific references to his own revolutionary *The Great Technology* and seven references to Professor Counts' *The Soviet Challenge to America* and *Dare the School Build a New Social Order*.

Professor Rugg is clearly a reformer, a new-world maker, before he is an educator. Where his system is used, children have little opportunity to learn the history of any country; certainly not the value of their great American heritage. The method used in the Rugg textbooks is extremely clever. The approach is one of stealth. With gentle language and a pedagogic smile, the child is led through the successive stages of indoctrination. So subtly is the material prepared that the average adult can scan it without being aware of its unfortunate influence on the youthful mind.

While the approach is devious and surreptitious, the method is fairly simple. There are four steps in this indoctrination:

First, the child is taught the great principle of Change.* Everything is in a constant state of change, and we must expect all institutions to be changed in the future, especially forms of government and social organizations.

Second, the student is shown, by numerous examples of factual and fictitious evidence, that our present situation in this country is very unsatisfactory and that our system has worked badly.

Third, the child is disillusioned of any preconceived ideas that America has a glorious history or that the Founding Fathers were men of good intent. Rather, it is shown that our form of society was designed to benefit only the minority of well-to-do citizens.

Fourth, the panacea of social reconstruction and collectivist planning is advanced as the inevitable coming change.

In training the student's mind to follow these four lines of thinking, Professor Rugg makes expert use of those psychological devices which are the most potent instruments of clever propagandists. It is very unusual to find such devices in public school textbooks. In Rugg's material they are well camouflaged by the modulated language of the pedagogue and a pose of impartiality and objectivity.

With calm assurance he quotes mythical authoritative spokesmen, sometimes even putting quotation marks around the words, though both the spokesmen and statements are figments of his own imagination. All too often his spokesmen do not tell the truth. As, for instance, when the authors write in *Teacher's Guide*:

Point out that the industrial engineers estimate from careful investigations that all that is needed to maintain a high standard of living could now be produced in a twelve-hour working week.

* It will be noted that these pupils are being taught to accept newness as the sole test of values. The vital truth that there can be old values tried and precious and new values that are false and wicked has not been pointed out to them.

Note the use of the direct quotation in the following passage from *Conquest of America*:

The business men demanded that, now that the war is over, the Government take its hands off business. "Give back the railroads to their private owners," they said. "Let us run our affairs now ourselves. We don't need you," they cried. . . .⁵

Apparently a case of the ungrateful child kicking his mother in the face as soon as he has grown strong enough not to need her protective care. What a fine piece of emotional dramatization—" 'We don't need you,' they cried!" The passage is packed with false implication; yet it is so simply and beautifully put over to arouse antagonism against these ingrate businessmen.

Another favorite device of Rugg's is the unrepresentative example. His books are full of them. In describing conditions in contemporary America, he digs into the darkest corners and brings out the worst possible illustrations, which are then set before his juvenile readers with the presumption of being typical. Describing conditions in the area developed by the Tennessee Valley Authority, he says in *Conquest of America* (p. 540):

These people did not want to go to the towns to work in factories because the wages there were poor indeed—fifty hours a week for \$5.

Throughout Rugg's textbooks we find overemphasis on the unfavorable aspects of American life and history and underemphasis of favorable aspects, or omission of them altogether. The chief impression that the child gets, for instance, of such men as Washington, Jefferson and the others who founded this nation and helped to shape its democratic ideals is that these men were large property owners and members of the ruling class. The magnitude of their public service and the extent of their personal sacrifice are hardly mentioned.

Concerning the operation of our economic system, much is said of poverty, depressions, unemployment and other ills, with hardly any mention of the tremendous economic and social

progress made by our people as a whole and particularly by those at the smallest end of the scale. The impression is clearly given that our situation as a whole is growing steadily worse and that it is the free enterprise system which is at fault.

Wherever possible, Rugg assigns the meanest of motives to businessmen. In *Conquest of America* (p. 517) he blames the greed of employers for the loss of jobs to machines, which he alleges took place in this depression more than ever before. He explains, "To make more money employers tried in many ways to save money."

Underlying his whole unsavory description of conditions in our society is Rugg's great theme of expected change. In *Teacher's Guide* he says: "We remind the teacher again that the most important single concept illustrated in the entire course is the concept of 'change.'" He adds that the "momentum of change is rapidly increasing." Hence, he explains in the booklet introducing his textbooks, ". . . the generations shortly to be given the responsibility of self-government must be practiced in the attitude of expectancy of change . . . change in economic and social government . . . and in objects of allegiance."

It might well be questioned whether it is the function of teachers to see that children under their care become practiced in the attitude of expecting change in their objects of allegiance. But it is the avowed purpose of the Rugg system thus to condition the minds of our children. With this accomplished, the dismal Rugg picture of the present state of our economic and social organization quite logically leads to an active demand for the social reconstruction so assiduously promoted by the Frontier Thinkers.

The breeding of this demand in the immature mind of the child is accelerated by a twisted version of how our present system and our form of government came into being. In *America's March Toward Democracy* (p. 110), Rugg says this about the reasons for adopting our Constitution:

These two classes of speculators were gambling in public lands and public money. They added in no way to the country's wealth. They produced nothing from the earth, manufactured no new goods, suggested no new ideas to benefit the people. They were simply making money by gambling. But to make their speculations profitable a strong central government was necessary. It is easy to understand, therefore, that they would be among those who worked hardest to establish such a government.

Referring to the same subject in *History of American Government and Culture*⁶ (p. 132), Rugg remarks that in making the Constitution, the delegates exceeded their authority; and in the same chapter he adds that the merchants, landowners, manufacturers, shippers and bankers were given what they wanted, namely, a strong central government which, it is implied, would protect their ill-gotten gains.

In *Teacher's Guide* (p. 72) he and Mendenhall advise, "Furthermore, show that not more than three percent of all the inhabitants of the United States actually voted on the ratification of the new Constitution; that thus only the small property class was represented." On page 75, he admonishes the teacher: "Confront the pupils with an important question: Did the ruling class administer the Government in the interests of all the people or chiefly in their own interests?"

On page 80 of this same *Teacher's Guide* accompanying *America's March Toward Democracy*, Rugg gives these instructions on teaching about the Supreme Court function under the Constitution:

In this unit the influence of powerful groups is also shown. . . . In their future studies the pupils should ask themselves questions about this court. From which economic class did the members come? To what extent did they interpret the laws in the interest of all the people? In the interest of the well-to-do classes?

Keeping in mind Rugg's central theme-concept of expected change, plus the described failure of our present system, plus the selfish motives of the Founders in setting up the present

system, it is easy to see that the child would receive in refreshing contrast the shining suggestions of a beautiful new social order where everything is perfectly planned and where there is no poverty and no selfishness or injustice. Rugg repeatedly adverts to these suggestions, meanwhile pointing out, as he does on page 595 in *An Introduction to Problems of American Culture*,⁷ that the great obstacle at present is private ownership and individual enterprise. He is distressed that economic activity cannot be planned now because the Government does not own most of the enterprises. Indeed, he complains, "Only a small percentage of all our people believe" that farming, mining, railroads, telegraphs, telephones, power plants, buying and selling goods, building houses, "should be owned and operated by all the people through their government." Since they are not now government-owned, there unfortunately is no "single agency that could plan for the country's needs and control transportation, communication, power, and the production of goods." And on the following page (596) Rugg stresses the evil results of competition: "As a result, hundreds of thousands of owners of land, mines, railroad, and other means of transportation and communication, stores, businesses of one kind or another, compete with one another without any regard for the total needs of all the people."

However, this same textbook gives the hopeful subject heading "But America Is Now Entering a New Age of Social Planning." This new age, explains Rugg, is being brought upon us by two factors. The first factor was World War I, which demonstrated the need for world-wide planning. And the second factor was the demonstration by Soviet Russia that planning is feasible. He gives an enthusiastic description of Communist Russia's Five-Year Plan by which that vast agricultural nation is trying to rebuild itself into an efficient industrial country. His glowing account imaginatively relates:

The daily press of Europe and America is full of reports of this gigantic attempt to plan the life of a nation. The amount of coal

to be mined each year in various regions of Russia is planned. So is the amount of oil to be drilled, the amounts of wheat, corn, oats, and other farm products to be raised. The number and size of new factories, power stations, railroads, telegraph and telephone lines, and radio stations to be constructed are planned. So are the number and kind of schools, colleges, social centers, and public buildings to be erected. In fact, *every aspect of the economic, social, and political life of a country of 140,000,000 people is being carefully planned!* (p. 597)

Coming after his discouraging description of conditions in America, with constant reiteration of the theme that our troubles are due to lack of planning, would it not be natural for the impressionable child to conclude that things will be all right soon if we follow the example of Soviet Russia?

Soviet progress is sympathetically illustrated by the following very human description of peasant life in *Changing Countries and Changing Peoples*:⁸

It is true, however, that many of the farms have changed little. On these the peasants still work the same strips of land. In some places the same bony, undersized horses drag clumsy plows. . . . However, if you were to stop to talk with one of these farmers, he would probably say that his life has changed in many ways. Perhaps these would be his words: "We peasants still toil long hours and earn little, but we are freer, and some are richer. In the old days I was yoked to the plow, like my horse here. Today I still work hard, but now my neighbors and I own much good land. We are not driven like horses, as we were under the Czar. We feel more like men now, not driven beasts. We work to feed ourselves, and work means bread. But we feel that it is our land we are working."

There is no mention of bloody purges, the economic and political slavery and mass starvation under Communist dictatorship, which were already well known to the world when Rugg wrote.*

* In expounding their radical political doctrines and weird economic theories, The Frontier Thinkers often remarked that our Republic was an experiment

The appeal to class feeling is clear in this excerpt from the *Teacher's Guide for America's March Toward Democracy* in its discussion of the Constitution: "The convention, however, consisted of a very small self-selected group of well-to-do, educated 'upper class' Americans, many of whom were exceedingly conservative." (p. 71) And also in this poisonous propaganda dropped in the child's textbook, *America's March Toward Democracy*: "Those who opposed the Constitution were principally the small farmers, the frontiersmen, the artisans, and the poorer people, many of whom were in debt. Generally speaking, then, the well-to-do classes were in favor of its adoption; the poorer debtor classes were against it." (p. 123)

To understand this master propagandist's style and cleverness, it will be helpful to see how artfully he imparts his ideas. For example, we shall examine his introduction of the youthful mind to one of the great tools of America's mass production system—the institution of advertising.

Advertising to Be Abolished?

Rugg, despite his contempt for our economic system, often found it expedient to avoid a frontal attack. In such instances, his strategy was an enveloping movement, choosing an objective style of writing, and avoiding downright denunciation. An excellent example of his adroitness and subtlety is found in his attack on advertising as an institution of our free economy. It may come as a distinct shock to thousands of honest advertisers and hardworking advertising men and women to learn that for years one of Rugg's widely used textbooks taught students in our schools that advertising is harmful to the consumers' in-

and chided us to keep an open mind and be tolerant of Soviet Russia which they regarded as another experiment in "democracy"—twentieth century version. This recalls the sage advice, attributed to Dr. Neilson, to a graduating class at Smith College—"keep an open mind—but not so open that your brains fall out."

terest. This volume is entitled *An Introduction to Problems of American Culture*.*

In a pamphlet, *Anti-Advertising Propaganda in School Textbooks*, Alfred T. Falk⁹ presents an able analysis of Rugg's attack on the medium without which the majority of our newspapers, magazines and radio stations would suspend—or at least lose their independence.

The keynote is struck at the beginning of a chapter with a story which puts nationally advertised products in a bad light and arouses suspicion as to product quality. Rugg writes:

"Two men were discussing the merits of a nationally advertised brand of oil.

" 'I know it must be good,' said one. 'A million dollars' worth of it is sold each year. You see advertisements of that oil everywhere.'

"The other shook his head. 'I don't care how much of it is sold,' he said. 'I left a drop of it on a copper plate overnight and the drop turned green. It is corrosive and I don't dare to use it on my machine.' "

"But we are curious," continues Mr. Falk. "Let us actually look up the authority and find out which one of the popular brands of lubricating oil this is—this disguised agent of destruction. The footnote refers to page 258, in *Your Money's Worth* by Chase and Schlink. Looking there, we find the story which Rugg has quoted, but there the authors call it a 'hypothetical case.' In other words, it is not true at all. There is no actual case of a nationally advertised brand of oil corroding a copper plate. . . . These passages, when taken in conjunction with the rest of the text matter, have the effect of pointing a finger of suspicion at all advertised goods. While the author does not say so directly, he leaves an impression that the mere fact of an

* On exposure of this text by the Advertising Federation of America (1940), it was revised or eliminated from subsequent editions. However, we are told that it was in use as early as 1934 when Rugg's books were in 4200 school systems and their use was growing rapidly. By 1940, therefore, this attack on advertising had been in the hands of many millions of school children.

article being well-advertised should be sufficient reason for doubting its quality. . . ."

Discussing the growth of advertising in America and the large amounts which business now spends for this means of persuading people to buy, Rugg exclaims:

And who do you suppose really pays for the advertising? It is you and your neighbor and every other consumer. The manufacturer adds his advertising costs to the price which he charges the wholesaler; the wholesaler adds his advertising costs to the price he charges the retailer; the retailer adds his advertising costs to the price each of us pays as the ultimate consumer. Hence it cannot be denied that advertising *has* increased the cost both of selling and of buying goods.

Perhaps you may ask then, "Is advertising necessary?" (p.454)

Ignores Mass Production Savings

"While placing so much stress on the obvious point that the purchase price of an article must cover its selling cost, which includes advertising," continues Mr. Falk, "Rugg ignores the widely known fact that the savings of mass-production methods are possible to industry largely because advertising makes mass-selling possible. Goods can be made for less cost when they are made in large volume, and only with the help of advertising can the large volume be sold. Competition sooner or later forces manufacturers to pass the savings on to consumers."

In general, Professor Rugg has the students believe that advertising is mostly dishonest, that it raises prices continually higher and higher, and that it has a bad effect on the way people live. He implies that it is an economic waste and asks the students to consider whether it is necessary.

"In this democratic country," concludes Mr. Falk, "everyone has the right to express his private views about business, advertising, politics, religion, or any other subject, and it is perfectly proper for an individual to write books and disseminate propaganda to influence public thinking and promote his particular

point of view. Schools, however, are the property of the people, and the democratic principle of academic freedom does not confer upon individual educators the personal privilege or the moral right to use the school room for the propagation of their pet prejudices or social theories. When parents send their children to school, they have a right to expect unbiased education and truthful teaching."

*Rugg's Overall Plan*¹⁰

The general plan of indoctrination is frankly stated by Rugg in *Building a Science of Society for the Schools*: "The preparation of such a description of modern society is, then, an indispensable first step in educational as well as social reconstruction. As far as it concerns the schools, its content will be used in that central strand of the curriculum known as the social sciences, and thus will come to constitute the very core of the entire program. Through it teachers as well as pupils may become informed and oriented concerning the new world-wide civilization. . . ." (p. 3)

As Teachers College, Columbia University, espoused this movement and other radical educational doctrines, the social reconstruction philosophy was soon an integral part of many training courses for teachers who flocked there in thousands from every state in the Union.* Many were aghast at what they saw and heard. But who were they to question the imposing academic celebrities enthroned on Morningside Heights? Most skeptics were quickly overawed and silenced, for if they expected to prosper in their profession, discretion beckoned them to get on the bandwagon. Were they not progressive? Well, the way to prove it was to join the Progressive movement.

Soon the New Education dominated our educational system from top to bottom—from teachers training to the framing of the curriculum and the methods of teaching our children. Few

* Chapter XXIV, "Teaching the Teachers," discloses the widespread influence of Teachers College on American education.

schools could completely resist, although many fine educators fought the trend they knew to be wrong and came off with half a loaf. Such was the power of the educational hierarchy, however, that dissenters actually risked their professional careers. The New Education leaders, of course, were the "hard" Progressives, whose zeal now centered in the opportunity offered to remake society. To them this fermentation presented an irresistible challenge, not only in the education of youth but of adults as well. Harold Rugg, always a militant crusader, went into rhapsodies as he visualized a gigantic propaganda campaign in which the government would issue leaflets "in 10,000,000 lots," on a scale that would "dwarf anything that has ever been dreamed of in this country, and with the finest talent drafted to write. Drafted, I say." ¹¹

Caution, however, was necessary lest our people sense the significance of these plans, so they were presented in the attractive-sounding name of the Progressive movement. Nor did most of the early Progressives seriously object. Indeed, except possibly for Dewey and a few true disciples, they were quite happy with the more militant leadership of the Frontier Thinkers, who did not suffer the qualms and inhibitions which beset the idealists among the "soft" Progressives, but dreamed of a Utopia based on a regimented society. The end would justify the means within a generation, or so they believed, if they could control public education.

So it was that the second stage of the revolution in education was established, with the Frontier Thinkers taking control and forcing the Deweyites into the background. The child-centered school and the methods of teaching the curriculum were, in the plans of these pedagogues, of secondary importance to changing the curriculum itself. Not the fundamental education of the child but conditioning the child for an ideological purpose was their aim; not the development of the individual but the remaking of society, to which end it was essential that they control the content of the curriculum. That is the explanation of the

dominance of the social sciences, with its consequence of disastrous neglect of basic skills and knowledge.

The new-world makers were now in the saddle and riding high, implementing the movement and giving it direction and an aggressive leadership previously lacking. Now they had a fixed objective—the ideal state, their new social order of collectivism. They eagerly set to work to get our schools and colleges to do the job.

Although this was a sinister turn in the purposes of a great American institution, there were few defections from the ranks of the faithful over the years. Organized opposition within the movement has been effectively squelched. So any further distinction between “soft” and “hard” Progressivists is more relative than real. For instance, at the 1947 convention of the American Education Fellowship, the socialistic “policy resolution” was passed by the 6000 educators with only a single dissenting voice—that of an unnamed hero who exclaimed: “We have just adopted a program of socialism.”

Thus through the schools of the world we shall disseminate a new conception of government—one that will embrace all of the collective activities of men; one that will postulate the need for scientific control and operation of economic activities in the interests of all people; . . . —Harold Rugg, *The Great Technology*. (p. 271)

NOTES

1. See chapters “The Harvest,” “The Tripod of Liberty” and “The New Economics.”

2. “. . . It is my confident estimate, however, that not less than 5 million young Americans have studied one or more of them.” Harold Rugg, *That Men May Understand* (New York: Doubleday-Doran & Co., Inc., 1941), p. 44.

3. Used with *Our Country and Our People*. Harold Rugg (Boston: Ginn & Co., 1938).

4. Used with *America's March Toward Democracy*. Harold Rugg (Boston: Ginn & Co., 1937).
5. Harold Rugg, *Conquest of America* (Boston: Ginn & Co., 1927-1930), p. 504.
6. Harold Rugg, *History of American Government and Culture* (Boston: Ginn & Co., 1931).
7. Harold Rugg, *An Introduction to Problems of American Culture* (Boston: Ginn & Co., 1931).
8. Harold Rugg, *Changing Countries and Changing Peoples* (Boston: Ginn & Co., 1938), p. 414.
9. Director of Research, Advertising Federation of America, New York, N.Y., 1940.
10. In tracing the pattern of the comprehensive Rugg social science system, why did we select his books in use in 1938-1941 rather than earlier or later editions? There are a number of reasons. (1) This period represents the zenith of the Rugg system. Public opposition was just beginning and the texts still represented the full-flowering of the social science scheme of indoctrination which was such a vital principle of the New Education. (2) Our volume does not feature analyses of textbooks. We use them to show trends and the successive stages of the revolution in education. As the Rugg courses were the largest and most successful in penetrating the classrooms, we believe that his uninhibited texts—those which brought his courses under heavy fire—would give the reader the true picture of his doctrines, techniques and objectives. (3) The revisions made by Rugg were minor and palliative. Rugg's recent statements stress "no compromise" and show no change in his philosophies and objectives so the nature and influence of his social science courses, now out of print, changed little if any right up to the end.
11. *Frontiers of Democracy*, December, 1942, pp. 75-81.

CHAPTER VIII

The Harvest

IT IS TIME that we assess the results of thirty years or more of the New Education. In the beginning, some of us were enthused by its claims. They intrigued the imagination. But a sober examination of the results has aroused serious misgivings. After a full tryout, we find that the New Education has little to do with progress, but that it breeds destructive influences in the education, patriotism, and citizenship training of our children.

The evidence which is offered in the following pages has been selected from a great mass of similar materials. It is confined largely to surveys and reports by responsible *groups* of citizens and by those especially qualified to be competent witnesses, including many educators.

In an earlier chapter it was shown that the initial inspiration for the modernist education came from John Dewey and his disciples, the "soft" Progressives, and it was pointed out that about twenty-five years ago, the "hard" Progressives, the aggressive Frontier Thinker cult, took control. The John Dewey group was primarily interested in pedagogy and methods of teaching; the "hard" Progressives were obsessed with a zeal for the reconstruction of society along collectivistic lines. Their main purpose was to use our schools to accomplish ideological ends. The two elements soon closed ranks and have worked together for their

program. Today it is difficult to distinguish one group from another.

In changing the direction of education, it was, of course, necessary to completely revamp the curriculum.* We have noted that an important part of this process provided social science courses which were to become the core of the programs. History, geography and civics thus would be eliminated as separate subjects. Let us see how this has worked out.

History

History is the essence of human experience and its knowledge is indispensable in man's struggle for self-government. "Not to know what happened before one was born is always to be a child," said Cicero. In a survey made by the *New York Times*, April 4, 1943, college freshmen throughout the nation revealed a striking ignorance of even the elementary aspects of United States history and "knew almost nothing about many important phases of their country's growth and development," wrote Benjamin Fine.

College Freshmen Ignorant of History

Seven thousand students in thirty-six colleges and universities in all sections of the country were examined. A large majority of these college freshmen could not identify such names as Abraham Lincoln, Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson or Theodore Roosevelt. Of those questioned 25 per cent did not know that Abraham Lincoln was president of the United States during the Civil War. Twenty-five students listed George Washington as having been president during that highly important period; 35 per cent listed Alexander Hamilton as being famous as president of the United States. A number of students listed Hamilton as being historically important because of his watches.

* For further data on this subject see *Conquest of the American Mind* by Felix Wittmer (Boston: Meador Publishing Co., 1956), Chap. III.

"Analyzing the results of this nation-wide test," continues Benjamin Fine, "the conclusion is inescapable that high-school students now possess an insufficient knowledge of United States history."

Effects of "Social Science" Instead of History

The survey revealed that most of these students had taken social studies or social science, but that 82 per cent of the colleges of this country do not require the teaching of United States history. In commenting on the alarming results of this survey, Mr. Hugh R. Fraser, then an official of the U. S. Office of Education and Chairman of the Committee on American History, said that "social studies extremists" were responsible for the "present appalling neglect of American history in the high schools and elementary schools of the nation."¹

In accordance with the Master Plan of the new-world makers, history has been rendered sterile as important sequential knowledge. It has been so diluted or supplanted by other materials that it has almost completely lost its identity. This condition did not come about by accident but by design, as we have seen. The elimination of history, geography and civics as separate subjects to be replaced by the hodge-podge social science courses is really the *key to the whole program for a new social order*.

Civics—Concepts of Government

For many generations, the course known as civics had an important place in the curriculum of American schools. It comprised the study of the United States Constitution, its history and philosophy, and the functioning of the federal government. A child who had studied this course left school with an excellent basic knowledge of our theory of government, our Constitution with its Bill of Rights, and our general American political heritage. These separate civics courses were supplemented by readings in history and English relating the bravery and patri-

otism of George Washington, Paul Revere, Nathan Hale, and other national heroes.

Under the New Educational curriculum, all this is changed. Civics is another subject which has been dropped as a separate study and fused into the social science courses of "social stew," as one distinguished educator aptly described them.² Moreover, the inspirational stories have been edited out. National heroes have no place in the theories or plans of the Frontier Thinkers.* Let us see how today's children have fared in learning our system of government.

Only One in Seventeen Take Civics

Figures of the United States Office of Education show that only 5.97 per cent of high-school students, or one in seventeen, took civil government, and many of these courses stressed police, firemen, garbage removal, fly control, and similar matters of local government. Such information is desirable, but hardly at the expense of the knowledge and understanding of our charter of freedom and the basic law of the land.

The *New York Times* survey also revealed that these college students had only a hazy knowledge of the Bill of Rights and the Constitution of the United States: "Less than half of the students could name two of the many specific powers granted to Congress by the Constitution, . . . only 45 per cent could name four specific freedoms guaranteed in the Bill of Rights. . . . For example about 500 students listed 'freedom from fear' and 'freedom from want' . . . or 'freedom to think as one wishes.' Nearly

* Our school texts formerly featured such episodes as Nathan Hale's immortal saying "I only regret that I have but one life to lose for my country," and Patrick Henry's "Give me liberty or give me death." Commodore Perry, John Paul Jones, Daniel Webster, Captain James Lawrence also were the source of inspirational stories. In a survey of 14 history texts of 1920 it was found that these six episodes were quoted 45 times. None of the 40 modern texts mentioned the quotations of John Paul Jones and Commodore Perry. Only one quoted Nathan Hale. Patrick Henry's famous message appears in only three books among the modern history texts reviewed, *Senate Investigating Committee on Education (California)*, 14th Report, 1956.

1000 thought they were guaranteed the right to vote, the right to go to school or the right to work."

Some new, weird "rights" and freedoms appeared in this survey including the right "not to be punished by whipping," the right of "white people in the South to lynch Negroes" and numerous others showing amazing ignorance of these two immortal documents.

High School Students Reject Democracy

At Purdue University, the Purdue Opinion Panel conducted a poll of 15,000 high school students to find out what the high school age group thinks of freedom. It was directed to teen-agers of all major racial, religious, economic, and regional divisions. William Houseman, in *Look* magazine of February 26, 1952, tells of the results:

Without hinting at what they were doing, the poll takers based two sets of questions on statements found in (1) the Bill of Rights and (2) the Communist Manifesto of Marx. . . .

The Purdue Panel questions which were paraphrased from the Communist Manifesto refer to the idealistic, theoretical communism of Marx and Engels rather than to life in Soviet Russia today. . . . The poll shows that a solid *majority* of teen-agers agree with at least a few Marxian principles.

Fifty-six percent, for instance, agree that large estates, on which the land lies idle and unused, should be divided up among the poor for farming. And fifty-eight percent believed the statement: "Most history is the story of the fight for power between different classes: master and slave, landowner and peasant, management and labor." . . .

Perhaps the most disheartening sign of fascistic tendencies among teen-agers lies in the fact that forty-nine percent of those who were polled believe that large masses of the people are incapable of determining what is and what is not good for them.

Geography

Geography is the third basic subject submerged in the "social science" scheme of the New Educationists. The results are at

hand from many sources but space limits permit us to cite only one instance. Benjamin Fine, who directed the history survey for the *New York Times*, conducted a similar research on geography, and on June 11, 1951, reported that: "American college students know shockingly little about the geography of this country. They know even less about the world. American or world geography is a forgotten subject in our institutions of higher learning."

A total of 4,752 students—2,308 upper classmen and 2,444 freshmen—in forty-two colleges and universities were interviewed in this nationwide survey. A previous *New York Times* study had revealed that less than 5 per cent of our college students were taking even one course in geography on the theory that it was not needed in college as high schools did an adequate job.* There follows a fair sampling of the revelations of this comprehensive report:

Students' Appalling Ignorance of Geography

The lack of knowledge of even fundamental aspects of American life is appalling, the present survey shows. An analysis of the thirty-two questions asked in the test indicates that both world and American geography have been by-passed by the vast majority of our students. . . . Less than half the college students know even the approximate population of the United States. . . .

Only one out of every four students knew even the approximate population of the world. . . . Many thought the world had 100,000,000 or fewer people. Others listed it as above 200 billion. They weren't even close. Similar appalling misstatements were found concerning the Soviet Union or Great Britain. . . .

Only eighteen of the 4,752—they were all upper classmen—could list and give the approximate population of the five largest cities in the United States.

* Had these educators kept abreast of the revolution in education, they would have known that not only history but geography and civics had been emasculated in favor of the social science courses.

Meager as was their knowledge of the geography of their own country, these college students knew even less about world geography, reports the *New York Times*, June 11, 1951:

... Only 5 per cent of the students could list the states ... [bordering] the Atlantic Coast. They named many inland states, even going west of the Mississippi. ... Although we border on the world's largest oceans, few students knew it. Only 25.7 per cent could name the four largest oceans in the world. ...

To an upper classman an isthmus is "land with hot water on two sides." To another the vernal equinox is "a great circle directly overhead."

Despite the role that this country is now taking in world leadership, the college students know very little about the world beyond their own borders. For example, only seven out of the 4,752 students—and all were upper classmen—could name the countries that border Yugoslavia.

In addition to the scuttling of history, civics and geography to make room for "social aims" courses in the revised curriculum, other fundamental subjects have been denied adequate time or eliminated as unsuited to the new purpose in education. Arithmetic, English, reading, grammar, spelling and writing and other subjects were all victims in some degree, depending on the extent to which the New Education dominated a public school. Here are some tangible results:

Mathematics Failures—Navy

During World War II, Admiral C. W. Nimitz, U.S. Navy, wrote to Professor L. I. Bredvold, University of Michigan, in part as follows:

Thank you for your letter of October 30. While we have not felt that it was our business to compile exhaustive data on our observations of the products of the educational systems of this country, we are in a position to give you some information on the subject.

A carefully prepared selective examination was given to 4,200 entering freshmen at twenty-seven of the leading universities and

colleges of the United States. 68% of the men taking this examination were unable to pass the arithmetical reasoning test. 62% failed the whole test, which included also arithmetical combinations, vocabulary and spatial relations. The majority of failures were not merely borderline, but were far below passing grade. Of the 4,200 entering freshmen who wished to enter the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, only 10% had already taken elementary trigonometry in the high schools from which they had graduated. Only 23% of the 4,200 had taken more than one and a half years of mathematics in high school.

... In order to enroll the necessary number of men in the training schools, it was found necessary at one of the training stations to lower the standard in 50% of the admission. . . .

This condition has not improved. The Navy has accepted the inevitable, and "after a survey by the Bureau of Personnel, the Navy's technical writers are being instructed to rewrite textbooks used in training enlisted men. The Bureau discovered that the IQ's of new recruits are the lowest in fleet history." ³

Service Trainees "Grossly Deficient"

The average American high school graduate is ill-prepared to read, write and speak the English language, according to a report by Professors Albert Elsasser, of Princeton University, and Albert H. Thayer, of Bowdoin College, and submitted to the School and College Conference on English at the Hotel New Yorker. Based on a poll of English instructors in 106 colleges and universities which trained Army and Navy students during World War II, they made fifteen recommendations to modify English teaching practices in secondary schools. "Of the 106 colleges and universities polled, only seven disapproved of the Committee's indictment of the trainees' preparation in English. One institution reported that a third of its trainees were so 'grossly deficient' as to make it incredible to us that any secondary school would permit their graduation," states the *New York Herald Tribune*, of February 22, 1948.

Army Tests Also Reveal Deficiencies

The Army experienced similar trouble. It organized during World War II the Special Training Reserve program for enrolling 25,000 male high school students who had "attained" the required score in the joint Army-Navy qualifying test. The program's beginning was far from successful and some of the reasons are given in a report by Major Alan L. Chidsey, Curricular and Standard Br., A.G.D.: ⁴ "There are too many who, with the advantages of youth added to their native intelligence, should succeed in handling responsible assignments, but who fail. They have courage; they have intelligence. But they lack the mental discipline that only a rugged training of the mind can give, the discipline that makes precise thinking automatic, just as the discipline of drill makes automatic the obedience to a command . . . not only were we concerned with the lack of knowledge of geography but we were tremendously upset by the limited knowledge of even the chronology of American history. Some boys have had no American history since the 8th grade . . . enough of them to cause alarm about the whole situation."

The question arises—were the ASTP requirements or standards too high? Major Chidsey replied: "Our requirements now are so low that they cannot even be called college requirements. . . . Frankly, are not up to the curricula of any college in peace time." He then pointed directly to a major cause of this alarming national condition. "A study being made . . . indicates that 22 out of 90 institutions reported . . . inadequate high school preparation in mathematics. This does not reflect poor teaching. It reflects the *choice of the individual at that age to take or not to take mathematics.*" [Italics added]

Cost of Dropping Mathematics

The tragic truth of this warning with reference to mathematics is dramatically told in the January, 1954, issue of *The Phi Delta*

Kappan, by Dr. Leland Miles, World War II flyer and now head of the Department of English, Hanover College, Illinois:

When I arrived in China in 1944 to join the Flying Tigers, I was handed a memorandum prepared by the legendary Chennault himself. This memorandum informed me that 95% of the casualties in the China-Burma-India theatre of war were the result of faulty navigation. Now in China, . . . where there are no radio and radar beacons, where there are no maps except "Mercator" maps marking longitude and latitude, the only type of navigation possible is celestial navigation.

Celestial navigation does not involve higher mathematics. Although the theory is complicated, the Air Force technique reduced the calculation to simple fifth-grade arithmetic—or, speaking more accurately, to what *used to be* fifth-grade arithmetic. For there are young navigators who died in China because they could not add, subtract, divide, and multiply two and three digit figures without making a mistake; and a mistake in the air of *one degree* means that your airplane will miss its home base by *sixty* miles . . . you can understand why it would be hard to persuade me that simple arithmetic is being taught in elementary and high schools. . . . I say simply I have some flying friends—some dead ones—to prove that it is *not* being taught.

Lack of Arithmetic Discourages Engineering

Lieutenant General Leslie R. Groves, head of the Manhattan atom bomb project, told the Columbia University faculty that the failure to teach the fundamentals of arithmetic has had far-reaching consequences. It is a primary reason for the growing dearth of engineering candidates in colleges. He cited failures in the Manhattan project by physicists "who knew everything, but did not have the basic approach to arithmetic."

General Groves said that "lack of interest in science and engineering was in large measure due to a fear of mathematics, stemming from the fact that the grade schools no longer emphasized arithmetic as they once did." General Groves contrasted the present day curriculum weakness with the adequate treatment of the basic subject that used to prevail and declared in the

New York Times, January 15, 1954, that "the implication was strong that the failure to build firm foundations of study and learning in the primary schools resulted in a top-heavy structure where undergraduates and even advanced graduates lacked the essential tools of learning, not only in the other branches but even in their own specialty."

The effect of this deficiency on our national security was pointed out by Assistant Secretary of Defense Donald A. Quarles, in an article in *Planes*, a publication of the Aircraft Industries Association. He wrote: "Since 1950, there has been a steady decrease in the number of technical graduates from United States schools, which has now levelled off at less than half the 1950 figure." In the *New York World-Telegram and Sun*, of January 26, 1955, he estimated that the Russians are graduating 50,000 engineers this year—more than double the number who will get degrees from United States colleges and universities. Confirming this condition, Dr. John R. Dunning, dean of Columbia University School of Engineering, said: . . . "We have already lost the battle for engineering manpower." Calling the situation "desperate," he pointed out that we had slipped from a peak of 50,000 engineering graduates to 20,000 graduates this year whereas Russia turned out 28,000 in 1950 and 54,000 this year.⁵

Very Few Proficient in Three R's

Tests conducted at an elementary school at Roseville, California, indicated that only 35 per cent of those graduating had sufficient knowledge of reading, writing and arithmetic to enable them to do satisfactory work in a high school. It was necessary to get textbooks with a simplified vocabulary because of the general lack of training in fundamentals under the Progressive method of instruction.⁶ The new superintendent, Dr. Alpheus W. Ray, who inherited this condition and tried to correct it, was discharged.

Progressivism In Action

In view of the highly successful history of our public school system, it is difficult to believe these painful facts. How has it happened? A glance at a Progressive class in action is enlightening. "For six momentous years, 75,000 children in 70 New York City elementary schools have been the happy guinea pigs in this happy experiment," wrote Benjamin Fine in 1941. Having adjudged the experiment a success, its proponents soon established it in all elementary, and later in junior and senior high, schools. "Activity programs" operated in more than 500 New York City elementary schools. Let us look into one of the classrooms where the program is "at work."

Revolutionary changes were introduced in their classrooms. Instead of studying their reading, 'riting and 'rithmetic in the sedate traditional way, the children played and frolicked all day long. Gone were the agonizing hours spent on long division, on bounding the State of Maine, on grammar and composition. Homework consisted in finding an orange crate, a prune box or an old lard tub. Children played at being Indians; in homemade costumes they war-whooped through corridors, diligently seeking pale faces with scalps to spare. . . .

They took imaginary bus trips to far-off places, built crude replicas of the Statue of Liberty, and constructed miniature post offices. Their classroom ran over with . . . packing boxes, posters and similar unorthodox objects—enough to give a disciplined schoolma'am of the conventional order apoplexy. . . .

The author then gives us this outline of the day's activities in a "class of ten- or eleven-year-olds": "The program emerging from the morning huddle looks something like this: 9:40-10:30—preparation of a booklet based on Wednesday's trip to Chinatown; 10:30-11:00—fix roof on bus terminal; 11:00-12:00—intermission and luncheon; 12:00-1:30—work on bus project; 1:30-2:00—remedial exercises; 2:00-3:00—hobby hour."⁷ Several years later, the "happy guinea pigs" of the Activity Program are in

their first jobs in their home town—New York City. And how does it go with them?

Spelling, Reading, Grammar, English and Punctuation

In New York City there is an association of women executives known as the Transcription Supervisors Association, membership in which is confined to those in charge of centralized stenographic and typing departments in some of the largest corporations, banks and business offices in the metropolis. They are responsible for training the high-school graduates selected for employment.

Several of the supervisors observed marked lack of basic knowledge among their new employees. It was decided to send a questionnaire to all supervisors with ten or more years tenure in their positions, so that students graduating under the prevailing Progressive Education theories could be fairly compared with students who obtained their education ten or more years previously.

“Our primary concern,” states this report,⁸ “was the shocking deficiency of the students’ knowledge of the fundamentals—grammar, spelling, reading, arithmetic, etc. We did not know at the time what the reason for it was nor even if it was a general condition. We decided to poll our members to see what the consensus was and if it seemed to be a general condition, to present this information to the school authorities to see if something couldn’t be done about it. *Question:* Do you find today’s high school graduates deficient in the fundamentals of spelling, grammar, punctuation, reading and language sense? How would you rate this condition?”

From a membership of approximately 150, replies were received from 42 supervisors, constituting all with ten or more years of service in their present positions. Only one of the 42 supervisors found the present education satisfactory. An analysis of all replies follows:

<i>Answer:</i>	<i>Deficiency in knowledge of:</i>	<i>Needing Attention</i>	<i>Serious</i>	<i>Extremely Serious</i>	<i>Not Needing Attention</i>
	Spelling	9	21	11	1
	Grammar	10	25	6	1
	Punctuation	10	20	11	1
	Language Sense	11	17	13	1
	Reading	15	19	7	1

Supervisors added comments as follows:

It is unbelievable the lack of knowledge these beginners have.

We are in the position of having to reject 9 out of 10 applicants for jobs as stenographers because they cannot spell or read. About 50% of those hired are later found lacking in grammar, punctuation, and language sense.

Men who used to be meticulous about their work have been glad to get it done at all. When I first started to work, such laxity wouldn't have been tolerated, and I personally think it is deplorable.

Present high school graduates do not read good literature and therefore do not recognize good English when heard or seen, much less know how to write it.

Vocabulary very poor. Have little idea of sentence structure. Fail to recognize an incongruous statement.

In his wide experience as a teacher and now as a business executive, Mr. Albert Lynd gives this forceful confirmation of the condition: "Shoals of comparative 'proof' of achievement mean little to an employer who cannot find among recent high school graduates one girl in twenty who can write a letter or a report to a standard of literacy which was a minimum requirement for high school graduates before the First World War." ⁹

Character Training Also Defective

The Transcription Supervisors Association survey also revealed a distressing lack of responsibility among recent graduates "which made it harder to integrate them into work. They were

notably more restless, undisciplined and apparently unable to concentrate on their tasks unless they were 'interesting.'"

As compared to graduates of pre-Progressive days, these products of the New Education were adjudged trailing as follows: 34 to 6 reported that present high-school graduates had less stick-to-it-iveness; 34 to 4 that they had less ability to grasp instructions readily; and 34 to 4 that they displayed less thoroughness. Other comments: "Almost all new employees, when asked, would like to have a position where they could change duties frequently, even during a seven-hour period, to relieve the monotony." Yes, their school stresses "Do what you want." One supervisor remarked, "It not only takes two to do the work one formerly did, but it takes twice as much time of the supervisor to see that half as much is accomplished."

Miss Trusselle Harvey, then president of the TSA, explained her efforts to get corrective action:

We invited some prominent New York City school officials to one of our meetings and presented this information to them. They listened to our complaints and first tried to cajole us into thinking that the fundamentals were not as important as we thought they were. Then when they found we were not to be dissuaded they replied in substance as follows: "Well, if you think a knowledge of spelling, punctuation, sentence structure, arithmetic, etc., is important to the conduct of your business, then it is up to you to teach them as vocational subjects in on-the-job training programs." "We," they went on to say, "are teaching the children something more important. We are teaching them 'democracy.'"

Teachers Size Up Students' Faults

Striking confirmation of the experiences of these competent women executives was revealed in a survey (1955) by the High School Teachers Association of New York City, as reported in the *New York Herald Tribune*, January 23, 1955. Questionnaires were answered by the majority of 1,949 teachers from academic and vocational high schools. The teachers "found

their students had little reading ability or 'good factual foundations for opinions'; little feeling of responsibility or respect for school authority; and little ability to cope with topics or problems in a thorough manner."

Rating the characteristics of their students on the basis of "little," "medium," and "much," here are some of the results: "On their realization that rewards or advancement must be earned, 681 recorded 'little,' only 19 'much.' On reading ability 706 recorded 'little,' 15 'much.' On ability to cope with topics or problems thoroughly, 797 recorded 'little,' 12 'much.' "

The cause? Basic problems such as overburdened teachers and overcrowded classes were mentioned. "Mr. Raymond F. Haloran, president of the HSTA, suggested that the 'so-called new curriculum, so-called Progressive Education,' in emphasizing the social characteristics rather than academic training and attitudes, 'is concerned with creating the happy child rather than the civilized child.' " And then the teacher added this significant statement: "We ask that this study be not brushed off as the reflection of the opinions of a few disgruntled teachers who are not alive to the progressive aims of education. The study is an index of the climate of opinion which is widespread in high schools. Other studies in individual high schools indicate a general retardation of pupils in reading levels and arithmetical competence." ¹⁰

Getting Rid of the Three R's

That millions of our children have been so neglected is still difficult to comprehend until you hear a dyed-in-the-wool New Educator talking to his colleagues. The following is part of an address by a school principal at a meeting of the National Association of Secondary School Principals:

Through the years we've built a sort of halo around reading, writing and arithmetic. We've said that they were for everybody. . . .

The Three R's for All Children, and All Children for The Three R's! That was it.

We've made some progress in getting rid of that slogan. But every now and then some mother with a Phi Beta Kappa award or some employer who has hired a girl who can't spell stirs up a fuss about the schools . . . and ground is lost. . . .

When we come to the realization that not every child has to read, figure, write and spell . . . that many of them either cannot or will not master these chores . . . then we shall be on the road to improving the junior high curriculum.

Between this day and that, a lot of selling must take place. But it's coming. We shall some day accept the thought that it is just as illogical to assume that every boy must be able to read as it is that each one must be able to perform on a violin, that it is no more reasonable to require that each girl shall spell well than it is that each one shall bake a good cherry pie. . . .¹¹

Dr. Arthur Bestor comments: "An anti-intellectual point of view that would have furnished grounds for dismissing a first-grade teacher a half-century ago is now a respectable one to address to the most influential body in the field of secondary school administration."¹² Few incidents could better illustrate the extent to which the New Educationists have succeeded in diverting the educational process from its primary purpose of imparting basic knowledge.

Tommy Can't Stick to Anything

Fortunately for our preoccupied and complacent people, there are many courageous teachers who have been fighting these trends for years. A high-school teacher, Ann L. Crockett, writing in the *Saturday Evening Post*, March 16, 1940, recounts some experiences from various parts of the United States:

Said the mother of one of my seniors, "Why hasn't Harold learned to spell? He can't write a letter to his girl without asking me the simplest words. And he wants to go to medical school!" Another mother exclaimed, "I am worried sick about Tommy. He can't stick to anything. One day he is going to design airplane engines;

the next he's going to lead a band. He does too much at school—this activity, that activity—everything but study. How is he going to make a living when he graduates?"

. . .

From all quarters I hear the sad results of too enthusiastic an "irrigation" of the "dry" curriculum. In recent tests thousands of high school graduates showed the literacy of third and fourth graders. A number of colleges—Dartmouth, Hiram and Mount Holyoke among them—include reading tests in the examinations given entering students, and offer special courses to teach freshmen how to read.

. . .

Dr. Edwin B. Place, chairman of Romance languages at Northwestern, asserts that high schools everywhere have become kindergartens, under the "Progressive slogan 'to know more and more about less and less.'"

The Dallas Teachers Association, declaring that the frills of Progressive education have been carried too far, recommend that the schools go back to teaching the "three R's" straight, and cut down on the top-heavy socializing trappings.

The *St. Louis Post Dispatch*, in a vigorous editorial, concludes that the "idea of our modern schools seems to be to do it without work." . . .

Progressivism "Ceases to be Education"

"Progressive education has progressed so far that it had ceased to be education," said the distinguished educator Millicent C. McIntosh, former president of Barnard College. "[We need] to get back to fundamentals. . . . They now teach 'masterpieces,' a random assortment of books. They substitute social studies for the teaching of history and literature, and they use pamphlets, tracts and periodicals instead of books. As a result, they turn out young people *eager to discuss a society for which they have no background or roots* . . . who are alert, opinionated and, in my opinion, half-baked." ¹³

Illiteracy Among College Graduates

Serious as are the drawbacks to those who do not go beyond secondary schools, the college student labors under even greater handicaps. President A. Whitney Griswold, of Yale, in his *Annual Report* for 1952-1953, has told us something of the present alarming deficiency among college graduates in reading, writing and rhetoric. He mentioned the report from the dean of one of our professional schools who complains of "widespread illiteracy among college graduates . . . want of competence to read, write and spell the English language . . . want of capacity to acquire and apply intelligence."

Undermining Liberal Arts

A man who has mastered the liberal arts can concentrate and readily apply himself; he can deliberate and make objective decisions based on logic and the evaluation of the vital factors involved. In short, he has acquired the basic *tools of learning*. If he sharpens them, he will be prepared to learn quickly any business or profession. After stating that "I could multiply it many times from business and industrial as well as professional and academic sources," the Yale President said in this annual message that no substitutes have been found for reading and writing. He stated that the practice and enjoyment of those skills "are both ends and means to the liberal arts" and that under present programs "both schools and colleges and through them American civilization are denying themselves the benefits of studies which, for 2,000 years, throughout the Western civilization, have been esteemed as the key to the good life as well as to all true academic achievement." (pp. 6, 7)

Defects Show Up in Business

In business and industry the deficiencies in basic knowledge are a constant concern. We refer to one of many extensive surveys confirming the evidence at Yale. In May, 1953, the Com-

merce and Industry Association of New York reported findings of a survey it had made to learn what changes in high-school teaching and guidance would better qualify students to take their places in commerce, industry and the professions. A total of 288 firms representing 15 different industries gave their opinions based on observations during a one-year period of nearly 32,000 high school graduates and non-graduates. *Better Homes & Gardens* (October 1953) reports these results:

Do you believe they have received sufficient basic training in:

	<i>Number of Firms</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
Reading	260	166	96
Writing	267	91	176
Spelling	260	43	217
Grammar	262	51	211
Arithmetic	260	118	142
Good citizenship	242	154	88
Need of constant self-improvement	243	64	179

In answer to the question, "What are the high schools not doing at present that you, as an employer, would wish them to do?", the companies made many thoughtful comments: "There is need for more thorough training in the fundamental subjects, reading, writing, grammar, spelling and arithmetic" . . . "Scholastic standards are too low. The general philosophy of passing students through grades—whether they complete the work satisfactorily or not (100 percent graduation)—should be abandoned."

College Conference Discusses Communism

This volume has grown out of the fact that the author, with millions of others, is gravely concerned over the effects of the New Education on the rising generation of Americans. Will it injure or aid a youth's ability and determination to reject influences that undermine our Republic? Important as are basic knowledge and all other elements of education, the will to maintain our heritage of liberty must be regarded as of paramount importance, since without freedom all other values turn to ashes in our hands. Therefore, the incident which follows is ex-

tremely significant. That it could happen in 1953 in a group of 109 outstanding students from many leading colleges proves how these institutions have failed to shed truth and knowledge on the most vital issue of our time. It was revealed by Dr. E. Merrill Root, of Earlham College, in an article in *Human Events*, issue of July 1, 1953.

On April 23, 1953, the seventh annual Tau Kappa Alpha speech conference was held at Denver, Colorado. Students and faculty from colleges in Utah, Florida, Ohio, Indiana, Texas, Alabama etc., attended; it was a gathering of some of the outstanding speakers and debaters in many American colleges. One of my own students, Conrad Joyner, attended and won some of the highest honors.

Conrad Joyner is one of the splendid group of young radical conservatives who here and there challenge the dull orthodoxy of the day. Keen, experienced, richly gifted, he is sound and brilliant; his judgment is sober and reliable. In discussing the conference, he summed it up succinctly thus: "Several incidents occurred which disturbed me greatly."

One of the purposes of the annual conference is to discuss current problems and to suggest solutions. These, in the form of resolutions sponsored by Tau Kappa Alpha, are sent to Congress as an expression of collegiate opinion. One main topic this year was: "How can we effectively meet the threat of Communism?" The resolution formulated, accepted and passed by a large majority, was—to invalidate the Smith Act, the McCarran-Walter Act, and the Internal Security Act of 1950! These outstanding students from American colleges all over the map could see only, as a way to combat Communism, the repeal and annulment of the defenses we have so painfully and too slowly built up against our most ruthless, militant and secret enemy . . .

How do students get that way? They get that way because of the intellectual climate, the psychological weather they find in the colleges which they attend. To prove my point, let me refer simply to what one of the professors present said when the resolution was passed: "I am tickled pink!" Conrad Joyner asked him: "Do you know the implications of what you say?" . . . "I do. And I

am not just 'liberal'—I am Left of liberal. I thought it the best thing I had ever seen done in a student assembly."

Such are the sowers—and such the harvest.

This "harvest," of course, is in no sense a reflection on the younger generation; they are the innocent victims. In two recent wars our youth have amply demonstrated their valor and ability on land, sea and in the air. But it is not the foreign foe so much as the disintegration from within that menaces our heritage of freedom. It is the slow erosion of standards and values, and the lack of understanding and appreciation of their importance, that changes the ideals and undermines the character of a people.

Few realize that the spade work to produce such shocking incidents as the above has been long in preparation.* Rarely are such results the work of Communists alone. Before their harvest, the soil must be carefully prepared by the pale sister—socialism. It is socialistic, economic and political doctrines which poison the educational cup, drop by drop, thus helping to undermine faith in God and the principles of our Republic.

The teacher, of course, is the crux of this whole situation. But how far can a teacher—a public servant—go in crusading for his special causes? Is he a free agent to do as he pleases? We know that zealots among the New Educationists believe theirs is a "sacred mission." (Chapter XXVII) But what of their employers—the citizens of the community? They, too, have rights. It is their school, their money supports it, including the teacher, and their children are being educated. Many New Educationists regard parents as incompetent in school matters and ignore lay criticism.

But who knows better than an average intelligent parent what he expects his child to learn in school? Does a parent need courses in pedagogy to tell whether or not his or her child is learning to read, write and figure? Or whether he is learning to

* For further instances of this condition, the reader is referred to *Collectivism on the Campus* by E. Merrill Root (New York: Devin-Adair Co., 1956).

love his country or denounce it? Does one have to be an artist before he can decide whether or not *he* enjoys a painting? Could it not be that a parent is the best judge of the results of a child's schooling since its interest is direct and personal and *results* are less likely to be confused with *theories* of education? At any rate, this issue has engendered one of the greatest controversies in the history of our schools—the battle of academic freedom.

NOTES

1. *New York Times*, April 5, 1943.
2. A. E. Bestor, *Educational Wastelands* (Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1953), p. 46.
3. *New York Herald Tribune*, November 14, 1954.
4. Address, Conference of Educators, July 26, 1944, New York City.
5. "U.S. Stockpile of Engineers Drops," *New York Herald Tribune*, February 6, 1955.
6. "A Bill of Grievances" (National Society, Sons of the American Revolution, 1949).
7. "New York's Six-Year Progressive Education Experiment," *American Mercury*, June, 1941.
8. Trusselle Harvey, Past President, Transcription Supervisors Association, New York City.
9. Albert Lynd, *Quackery in the Public Schools* (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1953), pp. 23-24.
10. *New York Times*, January 11, 1955.
11. A. H. Lauchner, "How Can the Junior High School Curriculum Be Improved," *Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals*, March, 1951, pp. 299-301.
12. A. D. Bestor, *Educational Wastelands* (Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1953), pp. 55-56.
13. School and College Conference on English, February, 1950, Hotel New Yorker, New York City.

CHAPTER IX

Academic Freedom

IN COMMON WITH the parlance of the New Educationists, the term *academic freedom* is confusing to many people. Does it mean the right of a teacher to free inquiry on any subject and to the maintenance of his personal beliefs on any controversial subject? If so, few will question academic freedom, since this is the basic right of any American citizen. Or does it mean that these rights which he enjoys as a citizen empower him as a teacher—a public official—to urge his personal beliefs on vital social, economic and political issues in opposition to the principles and ideals on which this Republic was founded? The Progressivist viewpoint was expressed in an editorial in their magazine, *The Social Frontier* (October, 1934): "To enable the schools to participate in raising the level of American life the educational profession must win meaningful academic freedom, not merely the freedom for individuals to teach this or that, but the freedom of the teaching profession to utilize education in shaping the society of tomorrow."

For many generations our people have respected the teaching profession and seldom have questioned its independence of thought. Attacks on our institutions were occasionally made and generally accepted as of good intent regardless of their merit. The agitation for academic freedom has become only recently a public issue. In the same year that the United States recog-

nized Soviet Russia (1933) the Progressive educators launched a noisy crusade for academic freedom. They used radio talks, panel discussions, lectures, etc., to present themselves as champions of underpaid and oppressed public school teachers. Their concept of academic freedom was essentially that of the American Civil Liberties Union which contended that teachers should have the same freedom inside the classroom that all citizens have outside the classroom.

Why have the past two decades seen such heated controversies on this subject? Is it because there has been any new reactionary trend to abridge freedom of inquiry or to place educators, particularly those in the fields of economics and sociology, in a sort of mental straight-jacket? Has it arisen out of unreasoning opposition to progress? Or has controversy occurred because the liberalism of the Founders of this Republic, maintained for generations in the liberal attitude of our people toward critical-minded teachers, has been flagrantly abused, and in some quarters used to undermine our Republic? The most vigorous demands for academic freedom have come from two sources—one subversive and the other sincere.

1. It has come from the Communists and their fellow-travelers, both in and out of the educational profession, who see in it a great opportunity to exploit an honorable American institution. They use it to win acceptance of Communist doctrines, even if the result be only socialism—the two-thirds point on the Kremlin's long-range schedule of world domination.

2. It has come from the New Educators and those who generally are sincere in believing that the dignity and position of a teacher entitles him to complete freedom from accountability on such issues to the communities which employ him. A large portion of this element, however, has a more weighty reason—they regard this license as essential to their long-established plan "to utilize education in shaping the society of tomorrow."

Let me emphasize that the first (Communist) group is a tiny one in education but, having the support of the whole Commu-

nist apparatus, its influence is infinitely greater than one would expect from the small percentage of educators under its discipline.

How, then, do these two groups use or interpret the issue of academic freedom:

1. *Communists.* Dr. Bella Dodd, former teacher, Communist and organizer of the New York Teachers Union which was later expelled from the AFL, testified before a United States Senate Committee as follows: ¹

Dr. Dodd: The executive committee of the Teachers Union always, from the time that I knew it, had a majority of Communists. . . . We had as many as 80 or 90 per cent of the executive board who were Communists.

Of the 11,000 members in the Teachers Union, Dr. Dodd testified that at the very peak "about 1,000 of these teachers were Communists."

Mr. Morris: Were the other 10,000 drawn by the instrumentality of the Union within the Communist periphery?

Dr. Dodd: Yes, they were.

Mr. Morris: Dr. Dodd, will you tell us whether or not the question of academic freedom was ever discussed behind the scenes in the Communist Party as a tactical move?

Dr. Dodd: The question of academic freedom would be discussed every time we had a serious menace to the Communist movement in the schools or in any other of the intellectual centers.

An excellent example of the duplicity of the Communists is seen in their attitude toward Progressive Education. In Chapter III, we noted that the Soviet Union discarded Progressive Education after its ignominious failure in the Soviet Union. Yet the Commies and their fronts soon thereafter were actively pushing it in this country. Dr. Bella Dodd in an interview in the *Los Angeles Tidings*, November 23, 1956, recalled this Communist tactic at the time she was an active worker in the Teachers Union. She declared:

... the Communist party whenever possible wanted to use the Teachers' Union for political purposes but the party had a definite interest in education also. The Communists in the Teachers' Union were for progressive education. *We were its most vocal and enthusiastic supporters.* I wondered at the time why the people at Columbia were interested in a small union like ours. Then I learned that the function of the Communist party was to be the lead donkey pulling the drift of American life to the left. [Italics added]

"Most of the programs we advocated," continued Dr. Dodd, "the National Education Association followed the next year or so. They were following the Columbia group too." When asked to tell of some of the specific things in Progressive Education that the Teachers' Union advocated, the former teacher replied: "I remember the banning of report cards, the abolishment of fixed standards of achievement and the abolishing of a set curriculum. All Progressive Education principles." From their own experiences the Communists knew the evil results of Progressive Education, so they promoted it for America!

Nowhere is the philosophy of Communism more harmful than in a university, declared Dr. Robert G. Sproul, President of the University of California, in *American Affairs*, January, 1950:

... Why should our institutions offer hospitality to those who use a false and brutal hope to persuade the young and gullible to sign away their birthright? Why should they cooperate, even passively, in a program of insidious infiltration of the free governments of the world? That such infiltration of the educational system . . . especially of its universities, has been and is being attempted is all too clear.

Under the guise of academic freedom, the Communists have persistently, through all the years of my academic experience, at least, sought to carry out in American colleges a program of indoctrination and propaganda against the spiritual as well as the material values of democracy.

In short, academic freedom to Communists and their fellow-travelers is simply a cloak to cover their program of spreading

Communism. Since Communism is now universally recognized as a criminal conspiracy to destroy our Republic by force and violence, few loyal Americans will contend that educators who follow the "line" should enjoy academic freedom to promote its war on us. It not only makes a mockery of the word "freedom" but also denies to our Republic its first right and duty—self-preservation against its sworn enemies.

Although many educators have been slow to do so, practically all now concede that the plea of Communists for academic freedom is pure hypocrisy. Their case is settled for all intents and purposes and is mentioned here primarily because they have shrieked the loudest, and their presence has badly confused an issue which, without them, would merit debate by free men of good intent but differing viewpoints.

2. *New Educationists*. The main problem, however, is presented by the demand for academic freedom by members of the second group—the New Educationists, and a small percentage of educators in general. What does academic freedom mean to them? Their views, of course, show a wide diversity but there have been pronouncements by leaders which can be considered representative.

For instance, in *Look* magazine, March 9, 1954, Dr. Robert M. Hutchins, Director of the Fund for the Republic, contends that the nation-wide alertness to subversive influences has resulted in a condition whereby teachers are afraid to teach or even to discuss controversial subjects: "The teachers of many subjects cannot teach without risking their jobs. . . . What can we ask of our teachers? We can demand the fairest possible presentation of a problem—of all sides of a problem."

But the difficulty of being impartial, indeed, the undesirability of it, is pointed out by Dr. Hutchins in the same article: "It is equally absurd to insist that teachers hide their opinions or their professional judgments from their pupils. Anybody who has ever taught knows that this can't be done." Dr. Rugg also admits it: "As we look upon life so we teach. What we believe, the loyal-

ties to which we hold subtly determine the content and the method of our teaching."

If the teaching profession is to be accorded special rights and privileges under the mantle of academic freedom, how far should this go in a democratic society in which no group is sacrosanct and no individual is shielded from responsibility for his own acts?

A keen observer at the birth of this important issue, Dr. John C. Almack, writes: ²

No one can honestly contend that teachers should be granted privileges not extended to others. They should not be exempt from military service, taxes, or indictment for crime. They should not be tried in special courts.

"Academic freedom is not a special right," says Hans Kohn. "It is a part of the general right to freedom of every citizen. . . ." He explains that it is "often invoked by those who do not believe in it . . . and who wish to use it solely for the purpose of undermining and destroying these liberties and their foundation."

It is likely that the National Education Association had in mind the purpose of blocking subversive activities in the schools under the guise of "teaching controversial issues" in the resolution of July 3, 1941. It read: "Neither freedom of speech nor academic freedom should be used as a cloak for activities or teachings subversive to the fundamental principles and ideals of the United States."

Although recent statements from various subsidiaries of the NEA on the subject are far less forthright and worthy, this policy hits directly at the heart of the problem—"subversive to the fundamental principles and ideals of the United States." And what are these ideals and principles? They are clearly given in our Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. This gives a reasonable limit beyond which a teacher, a servant of the people, should NOT go under his license of academic freedom.

Among the most aggressive champions of academic freedom are leftist educators who clearly see that it is essential in their crusade for their coveted new society. Some are artful. Dr.

Kilpatrick finds that those who have profited most by our American way of life fight changes in it and that the whole population seems caught in a "vicious circle." How can educators help people to think and break this vicious circle? How can our culture be expected to change itself? By education, of course, and he finds that teachers have advantages peculiar to them including:

. . . the tradition of academic freedom gives helpful immunity to the expression of views that selfish interests might otherwise wish emphatically to condemn. Most of all, the teaching function, from lowest to highest, affords the rare privilege of contact with young minds not yet closed by hardened habit or desire for selfish profit.³

Others are openly militant. In the booklet *A Call to the Teachers of the Nation*,⁴ we have noted how the leading Progressives openly challenged the paramount right of our people in public education. Teachers were harangued to unite in a powerful organization equipped with all resources to "wage successful warfare" in support of their program of "building a better [new] social order." As to a teacher's especial rights or "sacred" mission, this provocative booklet stated: "Also they must insist on the public recognition of their professional competence in the field of education; they must oppose every effort on the part of publishing houses, business interests, privileged classes, and patriotic societies to prescribe the content of the curriculum. . . ."

The reader will recall that these theories and aims have been voiced repeatedly in these pages by leaders of the revolution in education and their professional associations. It is the alarming demand for control of public education, too long ignored by naive or preoccupied parents, that is revealed in the above amazing call to "warfare" on opposing groups of parents. These Progressive leaders realize that to control the curriculum is to shape the entire educational process including the thinking of our children.

Because of their self-evaluated "professional competence," this cult in time would destroy "home rule" public education, one of our greatest bulwarks of freedom. Once local control is surrendered to any group or authority, regardless of its professional competence, the Rubicon will have been crossed.

Dr. William E. Russell, former president of Teachers College, Columbia University, the laboratory of the Frontier Thinkers, in the *New York Journal-American*, June 26, 1949, declared that while teachers may claim a right to choose what they teach, parents and taxpayers have a primary right to know what they choose. And, it may be added, to pass judgment on their selections.

We find, therefore, that the militant champions of academic freedom clash head-on with the majority of informed parents in certain vital areas of the educational process: (1) They seek a new social order of socialistic design and other innovations which our people have shown no inclination to accept, (2) They insist on using our tax-supported schools and colleges to sell our youth on the desirability of such changes, (3) When criticized for these actions, they challenge not only the right of lay citizens to judge them but also their "professional competence" to do so.

When indignant parents demand an end to the inanities and blunders in the education of their children, these pedagogues fall back on the false argument that the *schools* are under attack, and that their academic freedom has been flouted.

Even prominent educators become confused on this question of responsibility. In an article in *Look* magazine, March 9, 1954, Dr. Robert M. Hutchins stated: "When a school board conducts an investigation, it will fire a teacher for insubordination if he refuses to answer a question. The constitutional protection open to the American citizen in criminal trials or Congressional investigations will not save a teacher's job."

Dr. Hutchins draws a long bow in comparing a teacher who is an employee under contract as a public servant with a crimi-

nal before the bar of justice. The teacher can and should be separated from his job if his employers find him unacceptable. He has no vested rights of employment because he is an educator. Unless his legal rights of contract, applicable to all citizens, are violated, there is no "constitutional protection" afforded him by nature of his profession.

It should be said that this agitation for academic freedom is not representative of the profession as a whole. Most of the schoolmen are too busy trying to do an important job on an inadequate salary to join the new-world-makers who seek special dispensation when in trouble. They realize that very few citizens will deny an educator all reasonable freedom in the exercise of his duties. But they also know that he is not of a privileged class and, if engaged in controversial issues, must expect criticism given any public servant including the president of the United States.

One of the most sensible statements on academic freedom was issued several years ago by the American Association of College and University Professors. Declared Dr. Almack:

"Institutions of higher learning," they declare, "are conducted for the common good, and not to further the interests of either the individual teacher or the institution as a whole." Academic freedom "carries with it duties correlative with rights." Only one right is maintained that has direct reference to individual freedom. This is freedom to teach the truth. It is not freedom to propagandize, to express opinions and to agitate by controversy. His freedom is subject "to the adequate performance of other duties . . . he is expected to limit it as much as may be necessary to adapt instruction to the needs of immature students. Caution is to be used in extra-mural utterances." ⁵

When a fuzzy-minded or politically inclined pedagogue regards his sheepskin as his license and the school as his rostrum to crusade for his doctrines, how are his employers—the community—to express disapproval of his activities?

Professor Henry S. Commager, of Columbia University,

speaks for the leftists: "We must abandon the indignity of teachers' loyalty oaths and legislative investigations to discover subversives among educators. . . . We must cease meddling in their intellectual and private affairs. We must abandon . . . inquiries into the curriculum and the libraries and the textbooks to discover dangerous ideas." ⁶

To adopt such a course in the interest of sincere liberals would automatically open wide the gates to the Communists in their avowed determination to destroy our institutions. Certainly no realistic teacher could expect this. The teacher surely has the rights of all citizens, but so do the parents. If parents feel that his influence is injuring their valued institutions, or inadequately educating their children, they not only have rights but duties. And one of these is to determine his fitness and to censure or remove him if they see fit.

The paramount right of a community in cases involving the academic freedom of public school teachers was asserted unmistakably by the Massachusetts Supreme Court in upholding the Boston School Committee's dismissal of George R. Faxon, Boston Latin School teacher, who pleaded the Fifth Amendment in refusing to answer questions of a United States Senate investigating committee headed by Senator Jenner.

A unanimous opinion (331 Mass. 531 [1954]) written by Chief Justice Stanley F. Qua, declared that Faxon:

. . . may have a constitutional right not to incriminate himself, but he has no constitutional right to be a public school teacher. . . . The best interests of the schools are paramount, and we cannot say that the school committee exceeded its powers.

We do not believe that dismissal of a teacher for pleading self-incrimination before a Senate committee when asked about affiliation with the Communist party can be held by the courts to be arbitrary, irrational, unreasonable or irrelevant to the task of the school committee.

. . . Refusal to testify does not prove guilt and no inference of guilt can be drawn from it in a criminal case. But the question

here is not guilt or innocence. It is a question of administration by a public board in the public interest. . . .

Justice Qua cited an "epigrammatic statement" by the late U. S. Supreme Court Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes relating to a New Bedford case when Holmes was serving on the Massachusetts Supreme Court: "The petitioner may have a constitutional right to talk politics, but he has no constitutional right to be a policeman," Holmes wrote. (155 Mass. 216, 220 [1892]).

If parents permit a new social order to be the aim of our schools today, what might be the aim of educators a few years hence? Might it not well be a new moral order, or no moral order? Might it not be a new religious order, or no religion? If we establish the right of teachers to advocate and teach as they please without regard for the rights and interests of the people who employ them and are responsible for education, the schools would soon become political footballs and be ruined for their main purpose of imparting basic skills and knowledge.

In our democratic way of life, reformers serve a useful function and the educators a vital one. "But why mix the labels?", asks Dr. John L. Tildsley in *The Social Frontier*, issue of July, 1938. "The Frontier Thinkers are primarily Social Reformers, New World Makers. . . . As I see it they are no longer school masters, they are just emotionalized social reformers. The world needs both . . . but . . . *why employ the very expensive machinery of the school for an end that is not education but merely conversion?*"

There are many who are not as emotional as they are deliberate and calculating in their plans for a socialist form of society. If they crave such a change let them resign and crusade among adults where grappling with intricate political and economic problems belongs. No reasonable concept of academic or any other freedom can justify indoctrination of school children with philosophies tending to undermine the ideals and principles of our Republic.

NOTES

1. *Subversive Influence in the Educational Process*, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Seate, March 10, 1953, p. 516.
2. "Progressive Ideas Held Schools' Bane," *San Francisco Examiner*, October 16, 1942.
3. *The Teacher and Society*, John Dewey *Yearbook* (New York: D. Appleton-Century Co., 1937), p. 40.
4. Commission of the Progressive Education Association on Social and Economic Problems, 1933.
5. *San Francisco Examiner*, October 16, 1942.
6. Conference on Adult Education for a Free Society, Chicago, November 7, 1954.



PART II



CHAPTER X

The Battle of Ideas

IN THE FIRST PART of this volume we traced briefly the origin and development of public education in the United States, and particularly the rise and reign of the Experimentalists during the past three decades. We have examined many of their theories and doctrines; their methods and techniques; their aims and objectives, and the results or effects of their programs.

Despite many exceptions and variations, it is obvious that there are certain conditions so prevalent that they must be considered representative of our schools and colleges in general. Millions of our people are deeply concerned over the failure of the New Education as shown in the chapter "The Harvest" and elsewhere in this book. There is no intent here to blame our educational systems for the ills of society over which they have no control; but they must be responsible for their curricula, their policies and their administration.

Deficiencies and attitudes alarming to parents are the apparent or surface conditions—the results or effects. But for each of these there is a cause, deeply rooted in the philosophies underlying this program in the schools of America. Since no effective cures can be taken until the causes as well as the effects are clear, this part of the book is devoted to a discussion of political, social, economic and educational theories and philosophies at issue in this struggle for the minds of our children.

We have described the position of the New Educationists, and the new social order they seek. We shall set forth the position of those who oppose this projected revolution in education. Their position derives from the principles and spirit of the Constitution which, in the words of Cardinal Gibbons, has proved to be "the greatest instrument of government that ever issued from the hand of man." Sometimes called conservatives, traditionalists or other names less respectful, the author prefers to designate the opponents of the New Education as Essentialists, since they insist that a sound educational program must be built on a base of essential knowledge, skills and sound and just principles.

According to Demiashkevich, one of the greatest of educational philosophers, the Essentialist:

. . . insists upon the duty of educators to develop in the young fundamental attitudes, appreciations, skills and information, the value of which has stood the test of the history of civilization and which therefore can be regarded as constant, unchanging fundamentals in the education of man, citizen, and world inhabitant.

The Essentialists believe that the New Educationists have succumbed in large measure to the Neo-sophism which flourished in Greece after the Greco-Persian Wars. They believe that sound education for free men must return to the simple unsensational truth formulated by Socrates in his counter-sophistic doctrine. "This doctrine was, in substance, that there are permanent, unchanging moral values; that not man as an individual, but the consensus of humanity is the criterion of moral values and of the good life, and that man should be prepared for that good life by careful, systematic training. The role of the Essentialists in education in our own days is very similar to that of Socrates and the Socratic philosophic schools."¹

It can be no part of this volume to explore the great debates in the Convention of 1787 which gave birth to our Constitution; discussion must be limited to the broad concepts and prin-

ciples inspiring the supreme law of our Republic. The New Educationists, however, have repudiated many of these principles in their proposed society, and have introduced into schools and colleges courses of instruction to match their philosophies.

As we study this conflict in contemporary education, we are increasingly impressed by the recognition that its roots lie in the wider conflict between the two opposing philosophies of life battling for men's minds. One is the concept of a free society based on the primacy of the individual; the other is the concept of a statist order, based upon the centralization of power in a collectivist society. Let us examine the structure of the new society which leftist educators are proposing.

NOTES

1. Michael Demiashkevich, *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education* (New York: American Book Co., 1935), pp. 147-148.

CHAPTER XI

Design of the "New Social Order"

IN THESE PAGES scores of leaders of the New Education have advanced their thesis of a "new social order" for America, but they have been deliberately vague in defining it. That it is a collectivist society all agree, but that does not sufficiently describe it. Dr. Rugg said that its leaders, the Frontier Thinkers, "... see society from a height . . . they lead even though they lead mistakenly." (Chap. IV) That does not help us. Counts said "Progressive education wishes to build a new world but refuses to be held accountable for the kind of world it builds." That helps us still less. The discussion bogs down into a fog of semantics.

Since we can expect no clarification from the pedagogues themselves, we must reach our own conclusions by an objective analysis of their stated economic, social and political doctrines. If we find that its sole claim to newness is its glamorous facade, then we can evaluate it by a study of past experience with similar movements. In all recorded history, perhaps there is no wiser counsel than that of Patrick Henry: "I have but one lamp by which my feet are guided; and that is the lamp of experience. I know of no way of guiding the future but by the past."

We know that most of the social and educational tenets of the proposed society are of ancient vintage (Chap. XX), but what of its economic and political features? A fair method of

bringing its structure into focus is to add the common denominators of the doctrines and objectives advanced by the New Educationists. We find that their form of government is characterized by the following features:

Main Features of the Proposed "New" Society

1. Implicit in their credo is the belief that our present form of society has failed and should be replaced by one based on the principles of collectivism, which they hope will eliminate social injustices, economic inequalities and other evils of our civilization.

2. They advocate a form of society which would curtail the freedom of the individual; deny or limit the concept of unalienable rights expressed in our Declaration of Independence and implemented by the Constitution of the United States; and propose to increase powers of centralized government at the expense of our states and communities.

3. They propose to discard, or greatly restrict, the profit system, competition, and other fundamentals of the free economy of capitalism, and to substitute an economic system based upon collectivism in place of capitalism.

4. They stress social aims as primary; emphasize materialistic concepts over spiritual and religious values; and transform or discard many of our traditional loyalties, customs and cultures because they impede the acceptance of this new social order.

5. They would use our educational system to bring about these projected political changes. To this end, many favor centralized control of the schools over our time-honored policy of home rule. Thus education would lose its cultural objective and could, in time, become an instrument of national policy.

History has given us repeated examples of the deathly threat to human freedom which accompanies centralization of education. The control of education is an early step of all dictators. To see where they propose to lead us, let us again glance at a

startling example of New Education doctrines and program-making as late as 1947.

In that year, the American Education Fellowship (formerly the Progressive Education Association) met in Chicago to formulate a new or post-war policy for their organization. Dean Ernest O. Melby, New York University, chairman of the Policy Committee, appointed Dr. Theodore Brameld, one of the more radical Frontier Thinkers, to prepare the draft of "A New Policy for the AEF." As submitted, Brameld's first draft contained the following very significant paragraphs:

I. To channel the energies of education toward the reconstruction of the economic system, a system which should be geared with the increasing socializations and public controls now developing in England, Sweden, New Zealand, and other countries; a system in which national and international planning of production and distribution replaces the chaotic planlessness of traditional free enterprise; . . . a system in which the interests, wants, and needs of the consumer dominate those of the producer; a system in which natural resources, such as coal and iron ore, are owned and controlled by the people; a system in which public corporations replace monopolistic enterprises and privately owned "public" utilities. . . .

II. To channel the energies of education toward the establishment of genuine international authority in all crucial issues affecting peace and security; . . . an order in which international economic planning of trade, resources, labor distribution and standards, is practiced, parallel with the best standard of individual nations . . . an order in which world citizenship thus assumes at least equal status with national citizenship.¹

Is this an educational program or propaganda for socialism, particularly the Fabianism of England and New Zealand? After slight modifications, which took the form of editing Brameld's frank language into more subtle verbiage, a revised resolution was submitted to the conference as a whole and passed by an overwhelming majority. In commenting on this incident, Rep. Paul W. Shafer of Michigan said: ". . . The Brameld draft, particularly Part I, is an explicit, detailed advocacy of teaching

Socialism. The revised statement is less clear. Nevertheless, beneath its verbal outer garments, the Socialist slip is clearly showing." ²

In an excellent study of the Dewey philosophy Albert Lynd, a former teacher, tells us in *Quackery in the Public Schools*:

Many of Dewey's educational disciples may be coy or confused, but the master himself is clear enough in his writings about the implications of his philosophy. It excludes God, the soul, and all the props of traditional religion. It excludes the possibility of immutable truth, of fixed natural law, of permanent moral principles. It includes an attitude toward social reform which is anti-Communist, but unmistakably socialist. (p. 206)

And Mr. Lynd also states:

Though Dewey himself is clearly opposed to Communism, more than a few of his Educationist disciples during the thirties took a remarkably sympathetic view of the Soviet leviathan. . . . Finally, despite his anti-Communism, there is no aid or comfort in Deweyism for the believer in free economic enterprise. The only revolution which Dewey endorses is that which will operate through educational change of habits and impulses, but the kind of society toward which he wants this change to operate is definitely a species of socialism, different as it may be from that of Marxian orthodoxy. (p. 202)

Dr. John L. Tildsley, true and experienced schoolman, accurately appraised the Frontier Thinkers, in *The Social Frontier* for July 1, 1938. He wrote: "I have come to believe the group in the main favors a society not dominated by the profit motive, a society labeled as a democratic collectivist society . . . and therefore seemingly indifferent to the quality of the education actually in operation in our schools today. . . . To them Freedom of the Teacher and a Democratic Collectivist Society loom larger than the fullest growth of children. . . ."

Dr. Tildsley then stressed the subtlety of this revolution in education:

The extreme Frontier Thinkers . . . plan to establish the collectivist society by exploiting (not really educating) the children

through the agency of the teachers and enrolling them in a movement approved by probably not five per cent of the parents. Such a plan is both immoral and impracticable. . . .

In the fervor of their devotion to one cause, the collectivist society, they have lost sight of the cause to which (because of the positions they hold) they are supposed to give the full measure of devotion—the growing of children. . . .

But perhaps the judgment which should carry the greatest weight is that of Professor Harold Laski, noted English Marxist, who played an important part in the rise to power of the Socialist government in England. In reference to *Conclusions and Recommendations*, the Carnegie Foundation-financed blueprint for this Utopia, he wrote in *The New Republic*, July 29, 1936:

. . . stripped of its carefully neutral phrases, the report is an educational program for a socialist America. . . .

[It] could be implemented in a society only where Socialism was the accepted way of life; for it is a direct criticism of the ideals that have shaped capitalist America; . . .

. . . the report, I believe, underestimates the passion with which men cling to the religion of ownership; and . . . would lead . . . to the angry perception that the liberal teacher is an even more dangerous heretic than they had hitherto been accustomed to affirm. (pp. 343-345)

That Professor Laski was accurate and informed on the socialist movement in America at that time is confirmed by the program and leaders of the League for Industrial Democracy. This organization, formerly named the Intercollegiate Socialist Society, was organized with a definite objective: "Education for a new social order based on production for use and not for profit." Among the listed officers and directors of the League for Industrial Democracy were Robert Morse Lovett, president; John Dewey, Francis J. McConnell, Alexander Meiklejohn, Helen Phelps Stokes, vice presidents; Stuart Chase, treasurer;

Mary Fox, executive secretary; Norman Thomas, executive director; and Dr. Harold Rugg and Jerome Davis, directors.

Despite the fact that their program obviously is socialistic and has been so characterized by such an eminent authority as Harold Laski, Rugg and other New Educators refuse to admit it.* They prefer, of course, the better-selling name "democracy." Notwithstanding efforts to camouflage and confuse, the socialistic design is clearly revealed even though it is a hybrid, something like the jackass, having no pride in ancestry and no hope of posterity. Their program must be separated from its protective covering of "democracy," "new social order," "new society," and identified as a frank amalgam of socialism and statism, both born of Marxian doctrines and philosophies.

Socialism is older than Plato and trails behind it a consistent record of failure and despair, if not loss of liberty, right down to contemporary regimes in New Zealand, England, Denmark, Sweden, Norway and all countries in which it has become entrenched. Indeed, many other socialist governments, including those in Czechoslovakia, Poland and Hungary fared even worse, for they fell under the yoke of Communism. As an unknown pundit has said, "Socialism will work in only two places: In Heaven where it is not needed and in Hell where it is already in operation."

NOTES

1. *Progressive Education*, November, 1947-January, 1948.
2. U.S. House of Representatives, March 21, 1952.

* "I am not a Socialist. I have never been a Socialist. I have never been a member of or affiliated with the Socialist party . . ." Harold Rugg, *That Men May Understand*, p. 89.

CHAPTER XII

The Tripod of Liberty

There can be no successful constitution for any people unless it has a deep and vital sense of constitutional morality, and its essence is a spirit of self-restraint which is willing to subordinate the fleeting interests and ardent passions of the living moment to certain fundamental truths which are believed to be immutable.—James M. Beck.¹

IT IS ONE of the miracles of history that a little group of inspired and brilliant men should come together at one time and in one country in an historic setting which made possible the creation of the Constitution of the United States. Their work became the inspiration of liberty-loving people throughout the civilized world. Time has verified the prediction of William Pitt, England's great Prime Minister, that our Constitution would be the admiration of the ages. Between 1789 and 1860, more than 350 constitutions were patterned after it.

But the fact that it emerged in complete form at a single convention does not mean that this group of truly brilliant men proclaimed new principles of government. Their charter embodied the essence of man's experience through the ages, his successes and failures, including their own inadequate Articles of Confederation. Although relatively young men, averaging only forty years of age, these delegates had been successful leaders, especially noted for a knowledge of history, the law

and the struggles of men to govern themselves.* Their records bespoke elevated thought, a belief in God, a high degree of moral courage and intelligence, and the rare endowment of common sense.

What were the beliefs and ideals the Founders built into their American way of life? Many of these ideals had already been embodied in the statutes of the early Massachusetts colonies by the Pilgrims and Puritans and included:

1. They firmly believed that all men are equal before God and therefore before the law. They fled from the Old World idea that man had only such rights as the state chose to grant him. They insisted that man had certain inalienable God-given rights with which he has been endowed by his Creator. And so their form of government, unlike any other of that time, issued directly from the people under Divine guidance.

2. They had a fundamental concept of the purpose of human life. That purpose was to provide opportunity to develop character, to build the human personality, and to pass on this culture to posterity. Such a life is possible only when man enjoys freedom and is able to follow the dictates of his own conscience. So the Founders were unalterably opposed to regimentation or to collectivism of any kind.

3. They believed that church and state were made for man, and not the reverse. They insisted on the right of private judgment over both these institutions. This love of freedom resulted in the famous New England town meetings; in self-governing churches, and in the training of their own clergy.

4. They believed in the system of free enterprise, recalling the speed with which their forbears at Plymouth Plantation had discarded their socialistic experiment after its tragic failure.

* Edmund Burke stated that in no other country of the world was law so generally studied and referred to the fact that as many copies of *Blackstone's Commentaries* had been sold in America as in England. James M. Beck, *The Constitution of the United States*, p. 20.

5. One deep conviction dominated all else; confidence in themselves and in the powers of the human personality.

The seeds of these cardinal principles will be found in the immortal Mayflower Compact, the Pilgrim charter of self-government, signed beneath the murky lamp in the cabin of the *Mayflower* at anchor, the night before the colonists disembarked. In essence, the Compact provided that "We combine ourselves into a civil body politic to enact and constitute just and equal laws and offices from time to time for the general good of the colony, unto which we promise all due submission and obedience." This was the first government of English-speaking people to derive its power solely from the people, as their inherent and inalienable right under God. It was the beginning of the ascendancy of government by law over government by men.

And so on January 21, 1787, when the Congress finally met the challenge of a desperate situation and called a convention of delegates to "revise the Articles of Confederation," there assembled the top-flight leadership of a people long steeped in the tradition of freedom. Indeed, the vital principles of the Mayflower Compact and other New England governments, tempered and tested in the crucible of one hundred and sixty-seven years of experience in America, had long been subjects of deep and penetrating study by the delegates as they faced their task. Their early Colonial experiments proved that the new Republic, if it was to survive, must erect a more centralized form of government, and consolidate into a harmonious union the thirteen states of varying sizes and interests, quarreling bitterly among themselves.

At the same time, the dedicated leaders held firmly to the great guiding principle of our Declaration of Independence that the individual had certain rights and liberties which no man-made authority could abridge or deny. They were in revolt against the despotism of the state and the aristocracy; but they dreaded equally the blind and cruel force of mob rule. It was

clear to them that the tyranny of the majority was no better than the tyranny of the few.

The framers of the Constitution were determined to build a structure to effectuate their ideals, strong enough to survive but containing definite checks and limitations which would preserve the personal rights, opportunities and freedom of the individual. After months of bitter and eloquent debates, during which dissension reduced the number of delegates from the original fifty-five to thirty-nine, they brought forth their immortal work. It had been built around three main concepts of freedom which may well be called our Tripod of Liberty:

1. *Religious*—belief in God.
2. *Political*—a constitutional Republic, guaranteeing political rights and establishing obligations.
3. *Economic*—a free enterprise system, based on private ownership of property.

1. RELIGIOUS

Of all the ideas which shape the destinies of men, the religious concept is primal. By religion we mean neither sectarianism nor dogma, but the broad recognition of man's natural need to understand his existence and his relationship with his Maker. Striving to work out this personal formula of life has brought mankind more solace and satisfaction, and at times more grief, than any other concern.

"Mankind needs to worship, needs incitements to love, reverence and duty, and a happy spiritual conception of the universe," wrote Dr. Charles W. Eliot, then President of Harvard University. "Without these conceptions of the finite and infinite values, man cannot rise in his nature or his life from bad to good and from good to better."²

Seldom has the problem, including the part played by science, been as realistically presented as it was by Signor Guglielmo Marconi in Venice:

The mystery of life is certainly the most persistent problem ever placed before the thought of man. . . . The inability of science to

solve it is absolute. This would be truly frightening were it not for faith. . . .

If we consider what science already has enabled men to know—the immensity of space, the fantastic philosophy of the stars, the infinite smallness of the composition of atoms . . . without our minds being able to form any concrete idea of it—we remain astounded by the enormous machinery of the universe.

If, then, we pass toward the consideration of the phenomena of life, this sentiment is accentuated. The complexity of the different organs which all work out in co-ordinated and determinate functions, the constant preoccupation for the conservation of the species, man's marvelous adaptation of his constitution to surroundings, the transmission of instincts, the mechanism of thought and reasoning, and, lastly, the specter of death, place man, who wishes to explain the tormenting mystery, before a book closed with seven seals.³

To Americans the influence of religion has an especial importance because our Republic was born in a religious atmosphere, and our highest courts have held that we are a religious people.

In all history, no nation had been founded on the sacred God-given rights and dignity of the individual. "This concept has a distinctly religious origin which can be traced back to the 15th Century, when John Wyclif first placed his translations of the New Testament in the hands of the common people of England," declared H. W. Prentis, Jr. How deeply rooted this concept became in the generations that followed is evidenced by John Adams' assertion, when the Constitution was under discussion: "You have rights antecedent to all earthly government; rights that cannot be repealed or restrained by human law; rights derived from the Great Legislator of the Universe."

Applying these principles to education, "If it is the responsibility of our public educational system to give the students a complete understanding of their cultural background, then religion cannot be denied," declared Joseph B. Cavallaro, chair-

man of New York City's Board of Higher Education, in an address in New York City, on October 9, 1953.

The place of the spiritual in our society has been well stated by Justice William O. Douglas: "God's order in man's world includes a moral code, based upon man's unchanging nature, and not subject to man's repeal, suspension or amendment." In America, it follows "that each man's equality before the law is based upon each man's dignity in God's sight."⁴

As we have seen, however, this spiritual concept clashes head-on with the philosophies of the Frontier Thinkers, who generally have espoused the Dewey beliefs that religion was born of fear and is little more than a superstition. But science cannot fill man's spiritual void since it is unable to answer the ultimate questions of the universe. "Doubtless religion will survive the agnostic instrumentalism of Dewey," says Demiashkevich . . . "for the simple reason that religion proposes to give man something that he needs most even when he has obtained all other things. This is . . . the ultimate certainty which neither science nor philosophy can supply."⁵

Our traditional policy of separation of church and state has resulted in a public school policy which may be called a "negative" secularism. The Dewey approach rejects God and regards man as a biological organism, the only reality being experience. It contends that knowledge to be real must be functional rather than conceptional. But man is endowed with intelligence and a conscience. Education which treats him solely as an animal, therefore, is false and inadequate. Of necessity, our public school education, while properly avoiding sectarianism, must be based on broad moral and spiritual as well as material values. So education is far more than method or "living richly."

Dewey's agnostic materialism is so close to Marx's atheistic materialism that his disciples cannot consistently oppose many of the tenets of Marxism, even if so inclined. So we find among the New Educationists a marked absence of the spiritual ideals

and standards which guided our schools and colleges until recent times.

Since religion plays an important part in our social controls, one would expect to see it considered seriously, if not sympathetically, in current textbooks on sociology. In a scholarly and exhaustive survey and analysis covering fifty-four texts evaluating religion Dr. A. H. Hobbs found that thirty-three texts "contend that religious organizations should reorient themselves in the direction of secularization . . . that [they] should participate actively in attempting to improve or even to revise the existing social system by eliminating . . . social evils. Religious organizations should decrease or eliminate their supernatural appeals, their abstract moral doctrines, their ritual, mysticism, and allegiance to traditional codes." ⁶

As alternatives, thirty-three texts recommend secularization of religion "in a program of social action . . . to demonstrate a practical relationship between scientific analysis and religious objectives. . . . Religious organizations should help in the shaping of a new moral code since the old one involves 'cultural lag.' . . ."

Dr. Hobbs points out: "The fact that the author cannot prove his statements, nor demonstrate that the 'remedy' will not destroy the essence of the institution, appears to be a secondary consideration." *Only eleven of fifty-four texts stress the need for spiritual guidance* and "accept the view that this is still the primary function of religion." [Italics added]

Although the authors of these widely used texts claim that they support rather than oppose religion, Dr. Hobbs observes that their support of "religion" is similar to their defense of "democracy" and "education" in that it involves a redefinition in sociological terms. "Religion is redefined in terms which make it practically synonymous with social work. In the 'sociological' religion, a social problems textbook would be a more important reference than the Bible."

During the past century, material and scientific progress has

been vast, but in all his wisdom man has yet to discover how to govern himself without God. The New Education has excluded God from the classroom and has given us a secularism based solely on materialistic values. Such a philosophy denies the dual doctrine of soul and body so important in the development of our Western civilization. By denying the soul, our Frontier Thinkers have stripped man of his spiritual being and have left him as little more than a creature whose fate is dependent on the vagaries of external stimuli or environment—a vessel buffeted by every changing wind, a ship without a rudder.

2. POLITICAL

The rights and liberties of men are secure only if they are bulwarked by a sound and representative form of government, the second leg of our Tripod of Liberty. Being a history-minded people, the Founders had studied all forms of government and were well aware of the fact that pure democracies, almost invariably, had been wrecked on the reefs of socialism or dictatorships.

DeTocqueville makes this comparison of democracy and socialism:

Democracy extends the sphere of individual freedom; socialism restricts it. Democracy attaches all possible value to each man; socialism makes each man a mere agent, a mere number. Democracy and socialism have nothing in common but one word: equality. But notice the difference; while democracy seeks equality in liberty, socialism seeks equality in restraint and servitude.

The ideal which the Founders had in mind was unique. They sought the advantages of the democratic way of life without the handicaps and fatal weaknesses of the political entity of democracy. So they selected a representative republic in which no government would have the power to destroy the God-given rights of the people. These rights were defined in a written Constitution and the powers of government were strictly limited to insure that government became the servant and not the master of the

people. And the powers thus granted to government were divided between the national authority and the states. Powers of the national government were further divided among the Congress, the President and a Court. By inspired vision, the Founders created this remarkable system of checks and balances which has been the salvation of our Republic.

In selecting a republican form of government, the Founders revealed their misgivings about the practicality of a true democracy. James Madison, one of the principal architects of the Constitution, clearly set forth the thinking of the delegates: "... democracies have been spectacles of turbulence and contention; have ever been found incompatible for personal security, or the rights of property and have in general been as short in their lives as they have been violent in their deaths. A republic, by which I mean a government in which the scheme of representation takes place, opens a different prospect, and promises the cure for which we are seeking."

The Constitution does not provide for socialism, whether it be Marxian, Fabian or any other kind. It is flexible and contains the machinery for its own amendment. Article V provides the method by which those who favor a new social order, or socialism, can constitutionally effect their aims, if they win the consent of the people.

Unfortunately, the advocates of these drastic changes do not submit their proposals to the honest method of Constitutional amendment. They seek to accomplish their aims by reading into the Preamble and general clauses of the Constitution certain specific powers which the Founders did not provide and obviously did not intend, for the Constitution is a very *specific* document. And to make sure that their intent could not be misunderstood, they added the Tenth Amendment. The leftist-liberals ignore these facts and the pedagogues among them feel that they have a "mission" to use public education to advance their ideologies.

Throughout this book we have repeatedly pointed out the

lack of sympathy, if not actual animosity, exhibited by most of the New Educationists to vital principles of our Constitution, wisely placed therein to assure political rights and liberties. Many social and political provisions, as we have seen, grew out of an essentially spiritual concept of life, and their value to our society is emphasized by two noted educators, former college presidents, Dr. Donald J. Cowling, and Dr. Carter Davidson:

. . . For more than a century and a half our Constitution has served as the basis for a way of life which has brought to the rank and file of our people as individuals a sense of dignity and personal worth equaled under no other system of social or political thought. . . .

All the progress we have made so far as a nation, all our institutions, all the blessings, both material and spiritual, which our citizens have enjoyed have resulted from a social and political philosophy based on the assumption that man is a spiritual being—that men and women as individuals possess in themselves all rights, and that the primary function of government is to safeguard these individual rights and to reconcile them when they come into conflict. The state itself has no rights or functions of its own. It is merely an instrumentality of the will of the people and has no authority except such authority as may be delegated to it by sovereign citizens.⁷

A charter of government not granted by sovereign or ecclesiastic power, but deriving its authority from certain natural rights of man was the inspiration of the Founders of this Republic. They protected these rights so carefully that even the people themselves could not curtail them, except by amending their Constitution, a procedure requiring time and assuring ample deliberation.

They described it as “*Novus ordo seclorum*”—the new order of the ages. The phrase, a quotation from Virgil penned nearly 2,000 years ago, may be found engraved on our one-dollar bills. They wrought better than they knew, for they had at last produced a balanced structure of power in which equality, order

and liberty were provided. And still seeking Divine guidance for their work they stamped on their coins "In God We Trust."

This is the concept of government that we are asked to replace with a new social order, properly defined only as socialism. This is the code of political rights and liberties, based on the supremacy of the individual, which these leftist-liberal educators would submerge into the morass of collectivism with its penalties on individual merit, with standards levelled down to mediocrity and with the inevitable loss of freedom.

3. ECONOMIC

The framers of our Constitution were staunch believers in private ownership of property, the third leg of their Tripod of Liberty. Being bitter opponents of state interference or dictation, they readily saw that government ownership of the means of production or services would inevitably result in control, and thus loss of personal liberties. For the government must direct the spending of its public money and the hand which feeds and clothes the child reserves the right to spank it.

The Founders were suspicious of "the state"—any federated state—and well knew the insatiate appetite of government to encroach on the rights of the people. In state control or ownership of property, they sensed a socialistic trend threatening the free economy of free men. They would have no part of it. They realized, as many moderns do not, that if economic freedom falls, political freedom will not long survive. So their economic code respected and protected private property. They planned to keep that power in the hands of the citizens. Their position was essentially the same as that of Abraham Lincoln who said nearly a century later: "Property is the fruit of labor. Property is desirable; it is a positive good in the world. That some should be rich shows that others may become rich and hence it is a just encouragement to enterprise. Let not him that is houseless pull down the house of another, but let him work

diligently and build one for himself; thus by example assuring that his own shall be safe from violence when built."

The Founders knew that the inherent urge of men to acquire properties for themselves or their families is a vital force springing from the instinct of self-preservation—the first law of nature. They did not regard this personal ambition as an evil thing but respected it as a good quality and one of the greater driving forces of civilization. They regarded as a monumental fallacy socialism's claim that it can take over a vigorous, free enterprise system, retain its wealth and income, but make a better job of distributing it. In truth, once the blight of Marxism threatens a nation's economy, the whole picture changes and the wealth begins to evaporate at once. This is because socialism destroys two of the greatest factors in the production of wealth: (1) the incentive or the hope of reward; (2) competition which insures the requisite efficiency.

In the study of history the Founders had learned that wealth is far more than material things, be they in the ground or on the surface. Its source is in the minds of men, in their imaginations, their aspirations for better things—their desire to *create* useful services or successful products, and make a living in the process. But under socialism, the paralyzing hand of statism shrivels or destroys this whole delicate mechanism. Risk capital goes into hiding, creative ability is discouraged, production eases or ceases and out go the plans for expansion, orders for products, equipment, services, and the indispensable jobs which sustain our great free enterprise system. The wealth disappears. So the socialists have far less—not more—to distribute. Their Marxian credo has killed the goose that laid the golden eggs—has destroyed the intangible factors, the all-important human considerations in the wealth-producing process.*

* Plutarch tells us that Lycurgus, the ancient Greek law-giver, was preparing to abolish luxuries but found it unnecessary to pass any laws because wealth and luxuries vanished with the first step toward a communist or collectivist form of society.

Any doubts the Founders may have had on this score were dispelled quickly by recalling the bitter and nearly fatal experience of the Pilgrims at Plymouth Colony, as chronicled in William Bradford's *History of Plimouth Plantation*. Arriving on the bleak New England coast in the middle of winter, "What could they see but a hideous and desolate wilderness, full of wild beasts and wild men," states Governor Bradford . . . "and these savage barbarians were readier to fill their sides with arrows than otherwise."

The lack of any existing civilization, the very extremity of their circumstances and their total dependence on each other, provided a perfect setting for the creation of a collectivist government. These rugged souls, literally and figuratively, were "all in the same boat"; all spoke the same language; all were of the same religion, customs and ideals; and all were endowed with a courage that impelled them to risk everything to build a life of their own in an unknown wilderness. Socialistic or communist forms of society are supposed to derive their strength from the interdependence of their members. It is difficult to conceive of any group of people anywhere having a greater community of interests in the success of their venture than had these Pilgrims.

With the arrival of the first spring, and with only fifty of the one hundred and two colonists remaining alive, they diligently set to work to provide a food supply for the next winter. Fortune favored them for they found a store of Indian corn seeds and beans, for which the Indians were paid "to their good contente" about six months later. In cultivating and harvesting this crop on which the survival of the colony depended, the work was divided equitably among the men, regardless of the size of their families; and the harvest was placed in the community storehouse from which all shared alike. It was community work, community crops and community rations—the collectivist's dream with the driving power of stark necessity to make

it work. But it didn't work. As always, what we call "human nature" took a hand.

It happened that some of the Colonists were bachelors and the proportion of work that would feed them took relatively little time; and they enjoyed playing "game ball" or turkey hunting. "This communitie," says Bradford in his *History of Plimouth Plantation*, "was found to breed much confusion & discontent, and retard much employment that would have been to their benefite and comforte. For ye yong men that were able and fitte for labour and service did repine that they should spend their time & strength to worke for other men's wives and children, without any recompense. The strong . . . had no more victails & cloaths than he that was weake & not able to doe a quarter ye other could; this was thought injustice."

Nor was that the only cause of ill feeling. The inevitable question of rank and prestige soon made its appearance. "The aged and graver men," continued Bradford, "to be ranked and equalised in labours, victails and cloaths with ye meaner and yonger sort, thought it some indignite and disrespect unto them. And for men's wives to be commanded to doe service for other men, as dressing their meat, washing their cloaths, etc., they deemed it a kind of slaverie; neither could many husbands well brooke it."

Despite a favorable growing season, the first harvest was a great disappointment. After seed corn was put aside, it was obvious that there was only enough remaining to last them through half the winter. Famine again stared them in the face. "So presently they were put to half allowance, one as well as another, which began to be hard . . . and famine began to pinch them sore."

By trading beaver skins and other furs for food and by the strictest economy, the little colony managed to survive a most grueling winter. By the time the next planting season had arrived, the Pilgrims had seen enough of socialism. "So they begane to thinke," says Bradford, "that they might raise as much

corne as they could, and obtaine a beter crop than they had before done—that they might not still languish in miserie.” At length, after much debate of things, the Governor “(with ye advice of ye chieftest amongst them), gave way that every man should sett corne for his owne perticuler and in that regard trust to themselves . . . and so assigned to every family a parcell of land, according to the proportion of their number; and to that end ranged all boys and youth under some familie.”

Governor Bradford tells us that this policy had “very good success.” Never thereafter was the Colony short of corn during the long winters for “it made all hands very industrious.” When the spark of personal incentive was struck, the whole situation changed. Much more corn was planted than was thought possible under the collectivist experiment and the pioneers were far more contented. But let the Governor tell it in his own words: “The women now wente willingly into ye fields, and tooke their little-ons with them to sett corne, which before would aledge weakness and inabilitie; whom to have compelled them would have bene thought great tiranie and oppression.”

Perhaps never before in history did a socialistic experiment have a more favorable original setting, yet it ended in complete failure. But, when it proved unsuited to the nature of man, Governor Bradford paid his respects to the communistic theories of both ancients and moderns in a most enlightened observation—almost prophetic when considered in the light of trends in recent years: “The experience that was had . . . tried sundrie years . . . amongst Godly and sober men may well evince the vanitie of that conceit of Plato and other ancients, applauded by some of later times—that ye taking away of propertie, and bringing in ‘communitie’ into a common wealth, would make them happy and flourishing; as if they were wiser than God.”

NOTES

1. James M. Beck, *The Constitution of the United States* (New York: George H. Doran Co., 1924), p. 23.
2. "Dr. Eliot Points Way to Right Living," *New York Times*.
3. International Congress of Electro-Radio-Biology, Venice, 1934.
4. *Time* magazine, March 9, 1953.
5. Michael Demiashkevich, *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education* (New York: American Book Co., 1935), p. 115.
6. A. H. Hobbs, *The Claims of Sociology* (Harrisburg, Pa.: The Telegraph Press, 1951), pp. 128-129.
7. "The Government's Reach for Education," National Industrial Conference Board, Inc., New York, *American Affairs*, Winter, 1949.

CHAPTER XIII

The New Economics

UNTIL ABOUT 1930 most of the courses of instruction in economics in our schools and colleges had approved the traditional American free enterprise system. While recognizing its imperfections, they defended it as the only possible system which could give full play to individual opportunity and provide the incentives and competition essential to economic growth and progress. Our New Educationists, however, reject this thesis. Few have a good word for free enterprise and that "dying *laissez faire*" which, they say, must be destroyed. Likewise, the profit motive is regarded as anti-social. Competition is dismissed as the surly brat of capitalism. The new society of these leftist-liberals would have its economic base shifted from capitalism to collectivism, controlled or managed by government.

In place of formerly accepted ideas, they propose a "new economics," although most of its doctrines are not new but are ancient and discredited. Sometimes called the Keynesian revolution, the new economics advances a "set of doctrines purporting to prove that free enterprise, in addition to other alleged faults, is 'without a steering wheel or governor,' inherently unstable and inefficient . . . unless government comes to the rescue,"¹ according to V. Orval Watts. Therefore, they contend that

the government must step in and manage the national economy in all major essentials.

Dr. Watts points out that: "Typical of this 'new economics' is the book which has held a leading place in college adoptions since 1949: *Economics, An Introductory Analysis*, by Paul A. Samuelson, professor of economics at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology . . . (and) other textbook writers of the same school of thought. . . . These authors and teachers, along with . . . their associates, are deliberately and systematically trying to bring about what they themselves call a revolution in the economics being taught to American college students." ²

Economics at 127 Colleges

In a review of Samuelson's book, Dr. Charles L. Kramer of Wagner College ³ points out that he leans heavily on the work of John Maynard Keynes. "Most obvious in their absence are the theory of production and a recognition of the role of enterprise in production. The genesis of value and price and the 'forces' which cause economic activity, hitherto given first place in emphasis in elementary textbooks in economics, are given a place of secondary importance. . . . Samuelson's evident purpose is to convince the reader of the need for controlling the national income through planned government intervention." Samuelson reveals his economic bias (p. 590) in such sentences as "On the other hand Socialist Britain (1948) has more liberties than did the United States in the 1920 era of rugged individualism. . . ."

In addition to Samuelson's book, at one time used in 127 colleges and universities including state-supported and religious institutions, the new economics offers such widely accepted texts as *The Elements of Economics* by Lorie Tarshes; and *Income & Employment* by Theodore Morgan, who says: "The right of a man to engage in business for himself, is not a basic freedom." In general, individual savings are scorned and a "large public debt is praised," wrote Lawrence Fertig.⁴ In all these

texts the liberal new economics "is taught exclusively in social studies and it is a powerful factor in the field of economics," he continued.

Brookings Institution Survey

The Brookings Institution conducted a survey to ascertain the nature of courses and texts on economics in our schools and colleges. Questionnaires were sent to 1,500 high schools throughout all states, to the larger private business schools, to colleges and universities and to special interest groups including business organizations, advertising and public relations agencies and labor organizations.

In the secondary schools it was found that only 3.7 per cent of all students were enrolled in the economics course, but that many schools included economics in the social science courses. In numerous states a course in social studies is a requirement for graduation. It appears that more than 50 per cent of all high school students are enrolled in social studies courses. Moreover, the trend is strongly in the direction of these courses rather than toward exclusive economics study—the argument being that high school students, if they are to become good citizens, should be afforded a broad view of the problems of democracy.

In this connection the survey states: "In view of the increasing interest in general courses on the problems of democracy, and the character of the discussions of economic problems typically found in these texts, it seems clear that only a very small percentage of our high school students are afforded an opportunity to get any real grasp of the economic factors and forces which are responsible for [our] higher standards of living."⁵ With respect to institutions of higher learning, the Brookings report states:

A question frequently raised is whether the college textbooks of today are radical in character, designed to stimulate interest in socialistic experimentation. No single answer can be given to this question—applicable alike to all books. . . .

. . . In none of the texts most widely used do we find a strong exposition of the virtues of free private enterprise. Rather, most of them emphasize the shortcomings of private enterprise without stressing the good points. Some, while admitting the significant contributions of private enterprise in the past, question whether it can bring equally fruitful results in the future. . . .

These texts are not forthright exponents of a planned society or extensive government control of the economic system. Nevertheless, they subtly condition the student to accept the thesis that the role of government over economic life must inevitably be progressively greater. In most cases this may not be the conscious purpose of the author; but the result is the same.⁶

Courses for Armed Forces

As might have been expected, this widespread left-slanted economics instruction was slipped into the educational courses of the Armed Forces during World War II. An example was the two-volume text entitled *Economics: Principles and Problems*, authored by Paul F. Gemmill, University of Pennsylvania, and Ralph H. Blodgett, University of Illinois, and used as a textbook in the Army Information and Education program. D. E. Casey, of Georgetown University, has pointed out some of the socialistic content of the Gemmill-Blodgett opus. On the use of taxes for "equalization" of income, the authors declare:

. . . We propose, in this connection, a permanent extension of the Federal income taxes, with very considerable increases in rates of the high-income brackets. There can be no doubt that we are far from having exhausted our possibilities of securing revenue through the agency of income taxation. Progression in taxation . . . could be used, if society deemed it desirable, to bring about a virtual equalization of incomes. (Vol. I, p. 521)

Discussing the corporation income tax, the text stresses the double taxation that exists on corporate earnings distributed as dividends. On page 277 of Volume II, it states: "This is unquestionably double taxation but it seems to us that double taxation is bad only if it is *unintentional*. If double taxation is intentional . . . there seems to be little or no cause for complaint."

Bring All Land into Hands of Government

The textbook tells the GI students: "The estate tax that we have proposed would within a century at the most bring all lands into the hands of the Government. We believe that estate and income taxation should be made to promote equality not only by relieving the rich of their surpluses, but by bestowing upon the poor the revenue collected in this way." (Vol. I, p. 523)

The text suggests the abandonment of the price system and the substitution of a planned economy, "for extensive economic planning could scarcely be carried on under capitalism." And it adds: "If business depressions are to be eliminated, it must be through public rather than private control of credit, investment, or profits—perhaps even through government ownership and control of business." ⁷ These excerpts are samples of much similar material, declared Mr. Casey, whose Association vigorously opposed these textbooks.

In the Army, this economic textbook was known as *Educational Manual: 763*. Its preface states: "For use in full-year introductory college courses in general economics" and "for use of personnel of Army-Navy-Marine Corps-Coast Guard." It is reported that 36,000 of these texts were distributed to the Armed Forces before vigorous protests from irate citizens brought explanations from the War Department that the text is not a service publication but is a reprint of a standard college text. It was selected by the editorial staff of the U.S. Armed Forces Institute, a project of the American Council on Education. The selection was based upon a comprehensive survey of "outstanding educators."

In view of this top-level sponsorship, one cannot criticize the Army officials for using these books. The texts were adopted in May, 1944, suspended in September, 1946, and eliminated by the Army in November, 1946. Most significant is the shocking revelation of the widespread acceptance of such views on economics

by so many of our colleges and universities. Harper and Brothers issued a chart naming 194 institutions in 43 states and the District of Columbia "... [which] Are Using or Have Used *Economics: Principles and Problems*."

To understand this major part of the revolution in education, it is necessary that the reader remember the steps in the process. When social aims superseded the acquisition of fundamental knowledge as the primary purpose of public education, social studies naturally soon dominated the curriculum. This resulted in various social science texts or courses, of which those of Harold Rugg were the most influential. These courses, in turn, were developed and introduced at the expense of bona fide courses in economics, as revealed in the aforesaid Brookings survey and elsewhere in this book, since these pedagogues were less interested in teaching basic facts and knowledge of any kind, including sound economics, than they were in selling the ideologies of their new social order.

But the influence of this social science concept did not end with the downgrading of economics instruction—it influenced the teaching of all other subjects related to economics, including political economy, civics or government, and sociology. Wherever these courses developed social, economic, and political philosophies, the social science imprint was fixed upon them. Particularly was this so in sociology courses, rapidly gaining in teacher popularity.

Criticism of U.S. Economic System

In his valuable study of the most widely used sociology textbooks discussing economics, Dr. A. H. Hobbs gives us this sampling of the attitude of leading authors toward our American economic system: ⁸

In 1930, Gillin and Blackmar contended that what was frequently called "business" was actually the perpetuation of ancient forms of piracy and brigandage. In 1932, North described the economic system as being "highly inefficient."

In 1933, Hiller described the principal products of "this impersonal social system" as devastating competition, unemployment, and individual poverty, and Gillette and Reinhardt were similarly dramatic in describing the products of free competition as "ruinous rates and prices, inside corruption, watered stock, receiverships, and corporate ruin." Two years later, students who used Queen, Bodenhafer and Harper were reading that our system of economy had: "Tied our hands, paralyzed our activity, until we are poor in the midst of riches, destitute in a land of plenty."

Withers, in 1936, explained that depressions were essentially a phenomenon of economic systems which are organized to make profit. Despite the fact that the country had largely recovered from the depression by 1940, after expenditure of billions of dollars on relief and assistance, Ross proclaimed that the economic system was characterized by putting property above human life. In 1940, Elliot and Merrill described the situation as one of direct conflict between human welfare and the rights of business enterprise. Brown, in 1942, described individual competition as a myth and stated that: "The nearest approach to individualism that is opposed to collectivism is found in certain types of insanity."

Opposed to Advertising

Dr. Hobbs observes: "It is interesting to note that the high school texts are at least as critical of the economic system as are the college texts." His survey⁹ disclosed that all of the ten texts which discussed advertising took an outspokenly, unfriendly attitude toward this central institution of our free enterprise system.

Dr. Hobbs also stated:

Most of the texts make no attempt to explain the principles and operational factors which are involved in the functioning of a capitalistic economy in which there has traditionally been a large amount of individual competition, and where private enterprise has played a dominant role . . . and [it] appears to signify that the authors of the text are more concerned with presenting a particular point of view toward society than they are with presenting an impartial description of society.

Emphasis in sociology texts is markedly critical of private competitive enterprise and of capitalistic economy. Forty-eight of a

total of 63 definite statements about competitive enterprise emphasized defects of this aspect of our economic system. . . . Fifty-eight texts contain definite statements relating to competitive enterprise or capitalistic economy. Nine of these give either a neutral presentation or balance unfavorable statements with others which are definitely favorable. *Only six texts give relatively favorable emphasis to competitive enterprise and capitalism*, while the remaining 43 emphasize unfavorable features.¹⁰ [Italics added]

Effect on Youth

How effective have been the efforts of these pseudo-intellectuals to sell their theories of the new economics to our youth? We have seen that in less than three decades their doctrines have practically blanketed the secondary schools and colleges. A survey reported in the *American Economic Review* (December, 1950) declared that 80 per cent of college teachers questioned were using the new economics texts, which we can believe from a wealth of evidence at hand.

And yet these pedagogues, who have appropriated the once-proud word "liberal," are champions of philosophies which are directly opposed to the historic meaning of that word. John Locke, John Stuart Mill, Jeremy Bentham and other great liberals of the past have little in common with the leftist-liberals of today. "Historic liberals stressed the importance of the individual while the modern liberal is a statist," declared Lawrence Fertig. "Historic liberals insisted on the operation of the free market and the protection of private property as necessary for the preservation of political freedom. The modern liberal urges more state controls, and he is more concerned with collective action than individual freedom."

In *Away from Freedom*, Dr. V. Orval Watts compares the new economics with socialism and lists ten points they have in common.

Most of the victims of this education show an appalling ignorance of fundamental knowledge, including the basic economic principles of our Republic. Because it pertains particu-

larly to economics, one more survey is cited. Conducted by educators in Somerset County, New Jersey, among 900 graduates of local high schools, it revealed a surprising ignorance of free enterprise among 70 per cent of the students. Twenty-nine per cent believe that free enterprise means giving government officials the privilege of maintaining themselves continuously in office, and 17 per cent thought this a form of planned economy.

There is as much misunderstanding about industry's rate of profit. In reply to the question: "What part of the business sales dollar is net profit," 8 per cent of the students thought it was 5 per cent; 34 per cent said 10 per cent; 32 per cent said 15 per cent; and 13 per cent said 20 per cent was about the net profit of a corporation's sales dollar. Actually, between 1 per cent and 2 per cent of gross sales represents the net profit in leading American corporations.¹¹

Turning Out Socialists

Why have our schools and colleges so completely failed to provide a factual and accurate presentation of our American economic system? Dr. Henry C. Link gave his conclusions, after a survey of 5,000 people revealed that most of the college students polled favored government ownership and control of industry: "Our capitalistic system supports the largest, I will not say the greatest, educational system in history, but its lack of an adequate ideology encourages that system to turn out more and more Socialists who would destroy the very system which made their education possible."

The contents, or omissions, of most of the current courses on economics, political economy and sociology clearly reveal how a child "gets that way" when he or she exhibits loss of faith in our great free economy of free men. How could any child nurtured on such teachings be expected to develop a respect for our American system?

Economic freedom, of course, is not the only freedom, but it

is a main support of our Tripod of Liberty. The record of the past century is replete with instances of the tragic fate of peoples who have failed to comprehend the direct nexus between economic freedom and other individual liberties. If this underpinning is removed or seriously damaged, the Tripod will collapse and civil political liberties gradually will disintegrate.

Let us cite a single example—the loss of religious freedom. If the property of churches is owned by the government, how long does freedom of worship survive? The answer has been given repeatedly in the bitter experiences of sixteen nations which have fallen into slavery under Communist totalitarianism. Similarly, if a government owns the property of the press, radio, or other means of news dissemination, how long can a people be assured of freedom of speech, freedom of assembly and other cherished rights dependent on a free press? The answer has been given us not only in the record of the Kremlin but in the regimes of Mussolini, Hitler, Mao Tse-tung and other dictators. *The right to own property is the keystone of the arch of freedom.*

NOTES

1. *Away From Freedom* (Los Angeles, Calif.: The Foundation for Social Research, 1952), p. 1.

2. *Ibid.*, pp. 1-3.

3. *The Educational Reviewer*, Vol. I, No. 2, October 15, 1949.

4. *New York World-Telegram and Sun*, January 18, 1957.

5. C. W. McKee and H. G. Moulton, *A Survey on Economic Education* (Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, October, 1951), p. 7.

6. *Ibid.*, p. 17.

7. *American Taxpayers Association Bulletin*, Washington, D.C., November 12, 1946.

8. A. H. Hobbs, *The Claims of Sociology* (Harrisburg, Pa.: The Telegraph Press, 1951), p. 76.

9. *Ibid.*, Dr. Hobbs explains the scope of his survey:

"The attempt is made to examine the core of the sociology texts . . . 129 such texts were examined . . . representative statements averaged about 15 single-spaced pages . . . 4000 citations are involved . . . serious effort was made . . . to select excerpts which were repre-

sentative . . . claims contained in sociology texts constitute a biased presentation which is not justified on basis of scientific data . . . or method." (pp. 3-13)

10. *Ibid.*, p. 75.

11. Letter. Batten, Barton, Durstine & Osborne, Inc., New York, August 14, 1948.

CHAPTER XIV

Morals and Ethics

WHEN THE PROGRESSIVISTS expelled God from their philosophy of education, they also undermined standards of conduct based on spiritual influences in human relationships, generally honored for centuries. We have seen how our Republic was inspired by sturdy souls who yearned for a way of life based on their concepts of man's personal relationship with his Maker. They barred vicarious interpretations of any kind but created a civilization on the life of Christ and the precepts of the Holy Bible. This had been the spiritual source of Western civilization for centuries and was nothing new. What was new, however, was the Founders' unique idea of natural or inalienable rights.

The New Educationists repudiated these doctrines, regarding man solely as a physical being, influenced only by external stimuli or experiences. They naturally espoused the instrumentalist theory of denial of any fixed standards or permanent criteria to guide human conduct, although the value of an educational philosophy based on constant fundamentals has been recognized by scholars since the teachings of Socrates. In so doing, Dewey, of course, was quite logical, for if the only important factor in man's development is his immediate environment or activities, and these inevitably and constantly change, why bother with anything that occurred in the past? Of what

value are the eternal verities which have evolved with the human race? In this position, the Essentialists see a vital defect in the whole program of the New Education.

The Essentialists claim that there must be moral responsibility of man for his actions if civilization is to progress. They share the faith of the Founders that the nobility of the human personality, if properly developed and educated, can successfully combat the blind forces of nature and the miseries of men. They point to the history of civilization as indisputable proof of the existence of and value of "certain permanent criteria and standards of achievement, moral, intellectual, aesthetic and material, and of the proper balance of those standards. They would shape the curricula, the training and selection of teachers, and the methods of teaching accordingly."¹

In their philosophy of agnostic materialism, the New Educationists have ignored a major factor in the progress of civilization: a nation can rise no higher than the character of its people, and that character is governed by spiritual, not material, impulses. Separation of church and state in education was never meant to separate school children from God, nor from the standards of morals and ethics based on belief in God. Denial of sectarianism in public education does not necessitate a curriculum which directly, or indirectly, denies the vital influence of their God in the lives of men. Albert Lynd sums it up in the *Atlantic Monthly*, April, 1953: "... I am opposed to a philosophy of education which takes for granted the falsity of all gods. A non-religious curriculum may and should be quite compatible with an attitude of sincere respect for all religions. The philosophy of Dr. Dewey is categorically incompatible with such an attitude. . . ."

In adopting agnosticism as an approach, the modernists have attempted to introduce into education an ethical attitude which is built on shifting sands. William F. Buckley, Jr., describes the situation as he saw it at Yale University:

The teachings of John Dewey and his predecessors have borne fruit. And there is surely not a department at Yale that is uncontaminated with the absolute that there are no absolutes, no intrinsic rights, no ultimate truths. The acceptance of these notions, which emerge in courses in history and economics, in sociology and political science, in psychology and literature, makes impossible any intelligible conception of an omnipotent, purposeful, and benign Supreme Being who has laid down immutable laws, endowed his creatures with inalienable rights, and posited unchangeable rules of human conduct.²

How widespread is this condition was shown by Dr. A. H. Hobbs in his illuminating survey of the most widely used textbooks on sociology. Mr. Hobbs wrote: "Fifty statements in forty-five texts refer to the methods which sociologists believe should be used in education. Twenty of these statements recommend that curricula should contain much more emphasis on social science, and twenty recommend 'progressive' education as the proper method of teaching. Only eight authors contend that training in moral values and in social responsibility should be included as part of the educational method, while two admit that they do not know which method is most desirable."³

That only eight of forty-five texts most widely used in sociology courses contend that "training in moral values" should be stressed in the educational process is a shocking revelation. It reflects the insidiousness of the Progressivist educational philosophy which recognizes no absolutes or fixed standard of conduct and thus has no criteria for evaluating right and wrong, good and evil.

All of this poses a vital question: How can school instruction based on such a materialistic philosophy be expected to implant in the pupils principles which can safeguard them against self-indulgence and crime?

The answer is that it cannot. Former Senator Hendrickson of New Jersey reported the findings of a recent poll of high school and college students in New Jersey, conducted by Fairleigh Dickinson College of Rutherford. Included were 2,500 high

school students from 27 schools and 1,000 college students. This was the result: "Twelve per cent did not consider stealing particularly wrong. Nine per cent would not agree that even robbery was an act of delinquency. Fifteen per cent saw no traits of delinquency in destruction of property. Seventeen per cent saw nothing wrong in sex abuses. About seventy-five per cent 'brushed aside' lying and cheating as acts which are not considered delinquent. . . ." ⁴

Professor Warren L. Duncan, industrial co-ordinator of Fairleigh Dickinson, commented: "We see here that lying and cheating is a normal way of life. Certainly, this presents us with a challenge, especially when we hear the charge on every hand that you can't believe or trust a Communist. Perhaps we had better go back to the teaching of the Ten Commandments." ⁵ Similar conditions have been reported in all parts of the United States.

Apropos of Professor Duncan's remark, it is interesting to learn that a study of the world's leading religions reveals that certain truths and ethics are eternal and unchanging through thousands of years. Mr. George E. Sokolsky, in his column *These Days*, quotes the Los Angeles School Board on the universality of the Golden Rule:

Christianity: "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them; for, this is the law and the prophets."

Christianity: and Judaism: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thy self."

Buddhism: "Minister to friends and familiars in five ways: by generosity, courtesy and benevolence, by treating them as one treats himself, and by being as good as his word."

Confucianism: "What you do not like when done to yourself, do not do to others."

Hinduism: "Let no man do to another what would be repugnant to himself."

Judaism: "Take heed to thyself in all thy works. And be discreet in all thy behavior. And what thou thyself hatest, do to no man."

Sikhism: "As thou deemest thyself, so deem others. Then shalt thou become a partner in heaven."

Taoism: "Rejoice at the success of others. And sympathize with their reverses, even as though you were in their place."

In its outline of the subject "Faith," the Los Angeles School Board states: "Our boys and girls need to understand that no life can be complete without faith in God. We may not all define God in the same terms; but at least we can agree that faith in God means faith in a power greater than ourselves, and that is the important thing."

To what extent has this decline in school emphasis on spiritual and moral values increased juvenile delinquency? We know that it is a substantial factor but in fairness it must be said that there are numerous other factors. As to the prevalence and growth of crime among teen-agers, there can be no doubt for the evidence is conclusive. "Arrests of boys and girls under 16 jumped 41.3 per cent over the same period in 1955," reported New York's Police Commissioner Stephen P. Kennedy, in the *New York Times*, July 30, 1956. Arrests totaled 4,826 as compared to 3,416 last year. "Of the juvenile arrests, 2,687 were in the grade of major crimes as compared to 2,006 in 1955, an increase of 33.9 per cent. Of the juveniles arrested for major crimes, five were charged with killing human beings, eighty-two with rape, 357 with robbery, 868 with burglary, 362 with felonious assault and 533 with grand larceny of automobiles."

Lest one think that the figures of the metropolis are exceptional, J. Edgar Hoover finds the national condition equally alarming. In the *New York Herald Tribune*, of July 23, 1956, he said, "In 1955 one out of every thirty-five youths between the ages of ten and seventeen was arrested and 576,000 persons under the age of eighteen were taken into custody, an increase of 11 per cent over the previous year. The record shows that 42 per cent of all persons arrested for major crimes are persons

under the age of eighteen, and of that number more than one-half are under the age of fifteen."

Certainly our school leadership should not be blamed for conditions beyond their control but an educational system which neglects or undermines time-tested standards and ethics cannot escape responsibility for whatever fills the void so created in the youthful mind. Particularly, when the leadership shows no recognition of its mistakes but defiantly continues them.

NOTES

1. Michael Demiashkevich, *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education* (New York: American Book Co., 1935), p. 148.

2. William F. Buckley, Jr., *God and Man at Yale* (Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1951), pp. 25-26.

3. A. H. Hobbs, *The Claims of Sociology* (Harrisburg, Pa.: The Telegraph Press, 1951), p. 67.

4. Address. U.S. Senate, June 16, 1954.

5. For further material on callousness and indifference toward cheating, see also:

Max C. Otto, *Science and the Modern Life* (New York: The New American Library, 1949), p. 48.

American Education and Religion (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1953), p. 126.

Erich Fromm, *The Sane Society* (New York: Rinehart & Co., 1955), p. 174.

George F. Whicher, *Poetry and Civilization* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1955), p. 78.

Emotion or Reason

HUMANS ARE constantly torn by the struggle between the emotions and the intellect. This takes the form of an inner contest between the feelings, passions, and sentiments, on one side, and the power of the mind to reason, to think abstractly and to form logical conclusions, on the other. Generally it seems that our emotions pull us in one direction while the intellect warns of a wiser course. Often we hear it expressed, "My heart tells me to do so and so but. . . ." The "but" is the intellect counselling caution or a different course.

Qualities based on emotions, including love, charity, forgiveness and many of the noblest of human feelings, are "dictated from the heart," and are the refining influences of human existence. The heart must always be heard and may well prevail, but the head must govern if civilization is to progress in an orderly manner. In man's emotional self are such evil impulses as hate, lust, greed, envy, and prejudice—vicious throw-backs to his primitive past. They must be kept in check by the reason.

One of the most harmful teachings of the New Education is its emphasis upon the emotional instead of the logical way. Dewey writes:

Not knowledge or information, but self-realization is the goal. Literally we must take our stand with the child and our departure from him. It is he, and not the subject matter, which determines both quality and quantity of learning.¹

According to Dewey's philosophy, the Activity movement shall include only such subjects as are compatible with the interest of the child and of immediate, tangible value. This, of course, is a format of education based almost entirely on the stimuli of activity or experience, and must inevitably give full play to the emotions of the child.

There is an impressive body of educator opinion which deplores this overstress upon the emotional. While some programs of traditional education may have minimized the role of the feelings in the educative process, there can be no doubt that indulgence of the feelings is a poor preparation for the discipline and the acceptance of moral standards which are requisites of child training. Dr. Roelofs has stated the problem in *The Southern Review*, No. 2, 1939.

Our feelings are raw materials out of which either goodness can be fashioned, or evil. . . . The temporal capacity of the human organism to be eager and enthusiastic, to thrill to creative achievement, is decidedly limited. . . . Human beings just cannot thrill eight hours a day, nor six, nor four. . . . One of the worst features of Progressive Schools is just that atmosphere of eagerness and excitement which is among their proudest accomplishments. The eventual outcome is, for some, nervous exhaustion, for others, the defense of blase indifference. (p. 341)

Acceptance of the Progressivist doctrine has definitely not solved our problems: it has increased and aggravated them. It is the inevitable result, says Mortimer Smith, of a "philosophy of education . . . [that] teaches that there are no intellectual or moral standards of knowledge, that no subject is intrinsically of any more value than any other subject: in the end it reduces education to a vast, bubbling confusion, in which training in mechanical skills is put on a par with the development of mind and imagination, in which hairdressing and embalming are just as important, if not a little more so, than history and philosophy. . . ." ²

One of our gravest national problems is increasing juvenile

delinquency. While there are many contributing factors, an important one is the continuous impact of movies, radio, television and comic strips upon the mind of the modern child. Alan Keller in the *New York World-Telegram*, August 12, 1954, notes a 400 per cent increase in violence on children's programs during the past three years. Current entertainment is almost exclusively emotional in its appeal. No fair-minded person would charge the schools for the extracurricular activities of the pupils. But the schools are certainly at fault if they do not offer a more intelligent approach than the distorted view of life which beats in upon the child's mind when not in school. Far from discouraging this over-play upon the emotions, the schools which the New Educationists direct add to the emotional stimuli surrounding the young child. But it is the development of man's logic and his reasoning power that has given him his dominion over the earth.

"... Brains, unlike instincts, require a lot of training in order to function effectively," said Dr. Joel H. Hildebrand, "and man has to try to learn how to keep his emotions from taking over in matters that should be left to the intelligence . . . the primary function of schools, that of transmitting to youth something of the rich intellectual and cultural heritage of Western civilization, suffers under constant interference by evangelists' social theories and devotees of orthodoxies."³ To them should be added a fair sprinkling of psychologists.

Russell Kirk, in *A Program for Conservatives*, warns us of the consequences of this trend in modern education. He wrote:

The people who accept . . . the educational schemes, . . . which accelerate this decay of Reason among us may be ignorant of the grand tendency of their undertaking. . . . They think that they are imparting "adjustment" or "democracy" or "enriched appreciation" or some other abstract benefit to the rising generation. But in plain fact, they are doing all they can to deprive modern society of both true leadership and intelligent self-reliance. . . . These young people have been robbed of their true natural right to genuine instruction in the works of the mind. . . . And this

is only one of several ways in which the Deweyites have converted our educational institutions into so many weapons for a concerted assault on true Reason.⁴

In short, our New Education is superficial and earthbound, obsessed with social aims, emotional stimuli and curricula dominated by the social sciences. "But to the student who knows nothing but social science," writes Dr. Gordon Keith Chalmers, "man is known only by his function or participation in the group. If man himself is most notable because he is a member of a social institution, no matter how exalted the institution, he is already a slave."⁵

NOTES

1. Cited in *And Madly Teach*, by Mortimer Smith (Chicago: Henry Regnery Co., 1949), p. 23.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 24.

3. Address, "Intelligence Is Important," American Chemical Society, 1955.

4. Russell Kirk, *A Program for Conservatives* (Chicago: Henry Regnery Co., 1954), pp. 57, 63.

5. Gordon Keith Chalmers, *The Republic and the Person* (Chicago: Henry Regnery Co., 1952), pp. 130-131.

CHAPTER XVI

Discipline or Self Expression

WHAT IS MEANT by discipline in the life of a student? Does it mean a dictatorial attitude demanding blind obedience without appeal to reason, thus tending to destroy the spirit of a child? Does it require ignoring the rights, feelings and sensibilities of the child as an individual? On the other hand, does discipline include the development of a sense of responsibility under guidance; orderly procedure in the classroom; respect for authority and rights and feelings of others? And what of the scholarly disciplines—the concentration, perseverance and intellectual training so essential to the acquisition of knowledge, judgment and logic? Should not discipline of all kinds play a prominent role in any educational system?

The Progressivists do not think so. The very word “discipline” is anathema to them, since it conflicts with so many of their tenets and theories. Because of their reliance, for instance, on the importance of external stimuli, or activity, they have embraced in large measure the naturalistic discipline of Herbert Spencer who said in his volume *Education*: “When a child falls, or hits its head against a wall, it suffers a pain, the remembrance of which tends to make it more careful for the future; and by occasional repetitions of like experience, it is eventually disciplined into a proper guidance of its movements. If it lays hold of the fire bars, thrusts its fingers into the candle flame, or spills

boiling water on any part of its skin—the resulting scald is a lesson not easily forgotten.” (p. 122)

True, but will the child thus left to his own devices live to profit from such costly “discipline”? Can the child learn it is fatal to jump off a high building only by doing so? Must he learn that it is wrong to steal only by stealing? Morals cannot be learned by doing. Must he learn that it is dangerous to run before a moving automobile solely by trying it? If that were true, one half the human race would not reach maturity.

But the theory has other basic defects. Its discipline is based entirely on self-interest. The child does things that give pleasant sensations. He refrains from others, if still alive, because they are painful. This is purely a negative discipline—useful in training horses, dogs and other animals, but fatally defective in dealing with humans possessed of intelligence and a conscience. It completely ignores the moral aspects—the right or wrong of men’s motives and acts—the altruism and spiritual impulses which cause men to sacrifice life itself for a cause; to practice self-denial, generosity, patriotism and similar unselfish acts unrelated to the sordid materialism of Spencer and the Progressives.

One of the major indictments of the Progressivists is that positive discipline is almost completely ignored in their system. In their view discipline is an inhibiting or frustrating factor in the education of the child. The word itself is seldom used in the discussions of Progressives. It is their contention that methods evolved through centuries now are obsolete and must be replaced by those projected in their Activity Programs, including the Project Method, the Home Room and kindred activities. Except in the very young where development of interest is a first essential, these doctrines undermine disciplines in three main particulars: (1) opposition to traditional methods of teaching subjects in logical sequence, such as history as an unfolding panorama of life from one generation to another, (2) denial of fixed values, truths, procedures, or standards of spiritual, moral or ethical conduct, (3) elimination or neglect of subject ma-

terial of deferred value, including the liberal arts, possessing definite value in developing the scholarly disciplines.

Since the purpose of student discipline is the encouragement of both mental and physical practices which will aid in acquiring a sound education, let us see how the Activity Program affects these vital needs of education. In theory, the children are expected to find their work in problems of everyday life as they unfold when the teacher and the children meet in class. Ordinarily, this would be the time for introducing discipline, selected subjects and courses of instruction, but the Progressivists have different theories designed to afford the child full opportunity of "self expression" and to "learn by doing." In his article in *The Southern Review*, Dr. Roelofs explains:

Their [Progressivists] hope is that somehow through suggestion, guidance, study trips, and the like, teachers and children will move spontaneously and eagerly from whatever life problems happen first to appear, to those others which in fact are inseparable from economic abundance and the rest. Worries of parents, family quarrels, a hungry child, current problems confronting the community, will provide of themselves initial points of contact for the children, and feeling will do the rest. . . . The study of these will generate the study of all the auxiliary techniques required for a solution from milking a cow to the mathematics and managerial principles of large scale industry. Finally, genuine solutions, technical and moral will somehow emerge and at once be joyfully adopted. . . .

And what of discipline amongst these "happy guinea pigs"? Being "free from the tyranny of marks and credits, the repellent discipline of formal studies," they will rapidly move from problem to problem, "solving them all, eager, thrilled, happy and good. It is just too wonderful."

Unfortunately, life is not so simple. In the final analysis, the purpose of formal education is not self-indulgence but to prepare for after-school life. To assume that a child will do only things which please or entertain him, or to permit him to recoil

at an arduous task, is to let the spark plug of interest become the end rather than the means of education.

Under the Progressive system, if a normal boy does poorly in mathematics, he frequently is permitted to drop the subject, regardless of the fact that he may need the mathematical grounding acutely if, a few years later, he decides to study engineering or some other mathematics-centered profession.

Similarly, if a girl fails in history it is common practice for a superintendent to say to the teacher: "If Jane doesn't like history, find something she does like. Does she like to sing? Then give her some songs." Under the Progressive education formula any activity appears to be favored so long as it keeps the pupil busy and happy.

But there is no short cut to skill. There is no royal road to learning. The price of education is effort, concentration and work. Interest can and should indicate the direction, but entertainment can never take the place of mental effort and self-restraint, nor can it inculcate the mental attitudes so essential to success. Few have stated the case as clearly as Rousseau, an ardent champion of freedom for children:

Do you know the surest way of making your child miserable? Let him have everything he wants . . . in vain everybody strove to please them; as their desires were stimulated by the ease with which they got their own way, they set their hearts on impossibilities, and found themselves face to face with opposition and difficulty, pain and grief. . . . Their insolent manners, their childish vanity only draw down upon them mortification, scorn and mockery; they swallow insults like water; sharp experience soon teaches them that they have realized neither their position nor their strength. As they cannot do everything, they think they can do nothing. . . .¹

A school child today lives in an environment where he has wide scope for his destructive impulses. To avoid discipline because he is young, or until he can learn by experience, is to give him the unrealistic view of life described by Rousseau. In delay-

ing this essential part of education, the child is definitely handicapped, for the discipline must be learned, and the longer delayed, the harder it will be.

The Progressive program is based on the assumption that if authority and discipline were removed, the innate, natural goodness of our youth would assert itself and bring forth only good impulses and behavior.

An important aspect of discipline undermined by the New Educators is fundamentally scholarly or intellectual. It is discipline of the brain as a bodily function, or a tool of the intellect. One of the marvels of Creation is the human brain and its potentialities. But it is a lazy slave. For countless ages its main function was to stir itself only sufficiently to provide the material necessities of life. Development of a conscience and ability to reason are relatively recent acquirements, and are present in widely varying degrees amongst humans. This is shown by the striking differences in development, running the whole gamut from moron to genius.

The answer? No simple or single explanation, but we do know that the use of any bodily function markedly affects its development. The human brain is perhaps the foremost example of this truth. It resembles a cutting tool, which constantly requires sharpening. And how does one sharpen a tool—a scalpel or axe for instance? It must be abraded; it must meet resistance to test its metal. And so a stone is used. The brain, likewise, can be developed only by use; and can acquire incisiveness, tenacity, and other desirable qualities only by effort or special use.

Until the reign of the New Educationists, the liberal arts, certain classics and other studies requiring arduous concentration or "drill" were an essential part of courses of instruction. In meeting the challenge, a student developed mental stimulus and scholarly discipline. These were the abrasives which "sharpened" the brain and prepared it for its intellectual mission. The Progressives abandoned these sound procedures, with disastrous re-

sults already recounted by noted schoolmen, including the presidents of some of our leading universities.

"We must face the facts," says Dr. Bestor. "Up-and-coming public school educationists are *not* talking about substituting one scholarly discipline for another. They stopped talking about that years ago. They are talking—as clearly as their antipathy for grammar and syntax permits them to talk—about the elimination of all the scholarly disciplines.

"Can we afford to entrust to men who think and act like this, the power to direct the first 12 years of American schooling? . . . the years in which young men and women must learn to think clearly and accurately if they are to learn to think at all. Command of written English, foreign languages and mathematics—to say nothing of the abstract processes of analyzing, generalizing and criticizing—cannot be acquired in a year or two when a student or citizen suddenly finds himself in desperate need of them. . . . And these intellectual abilities *are* required . . . for . . . accurate thinking about science, about economics, about history and politics." ²

NOTES

1. As cited by Michael Demiashkevich in *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education* (New York: American Book Co., 1935), p. 311.

2. A. E. Bestor, *Educational Wastelands* (Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1953), pp. 58-59.

CHAPTER XVII

History or Contemporary Life

OF ALL THE ACTIVITIES of men, none has caused so many violent and conflicting emotions as their efforts to govern themselves. For their ideals and hopes of a better life, many have suffered grievously or given life itself; others have sought power for their own selfish ends and used it to enslave and destroy the liberties of their fellows.

In any age, we can see the whole galaxy of human virtues and human vices among those who seek the right to govern. In this eternal struggle, fortunes have shifted widely between the forces of light and darkness, hope and despair. For centuries at a time, the torch of liberty has flickered fitfully. Its apparent extinction has seemed to symbolize Dryden's famous couplet, "Truth forever on the scaffold, wrong forever on the throne," often called the saddest couplet in the English language. But always a fresh breeze of inspiration and courage has come to restore the expiring flame, and the torch of liberty has flared even brighter as in the Renaissance and our American Revolution.

The story of this unceasing struggle is the master theme of human history. For nearly 6,000 years, through trial and error, hope and fear, the human race has had the Divine inspiration to push forward, although only through countless blunders and pitfalls. Man, as the price of his progress, advances only by repeated mistakes. Sophocles described a wise man as one who,

with knowledge of the past, "anticipates what the future will bring." The world's greatest philosophers have invariably echoed the same truth. A wise man learns from the mistakes of others, but the fool can learn only by his own mistakes. The Founders of this Republic clearly understood these facts. The great charter of freedom which they bequeathed us is the measure of their understanding.

That is the great value of history in the march of civilization—not to live in the past but to use the past to illuminate the present and to safeguard the future. To have the past ever before us as a guide or as a warning. Certainly in no segment of our society is history so vital as in our schools and colleges. "Your students may hear and read of political extremists who lavishly throw into crowds all sorts of alluring though unreliable promises of an economic and political millennium, as well as venomous accusations against the existing order and against moderate political leaders," writes Demiashkevich. "Have the students read Aristophanes and they will see for themselves that many a slogan employed by the selfish vote-hunting friends of the 'humble and oppressed' has already been used by the Athenian demagogues."¹

Unfortunately, the New Educationists have basically different concepts of the value of history, and they have succeeded in establishing their policies in our schools and colleges. As we have dealt with this condition at length in earlier chapters, references here will be confined to the philosophies, or theories, underlying (1) their neglect of history and (2) their worship of contemporary events.

In general, their ideas stem from two main sources, one a political concept and the other a method of teaching:

1. The political concept is that our present form of society, based on a free economy of free men, has failed and a new social order of socialistic design should replace it. Since the lessons of the past (history) pertain to a form of society which is outmoded and about to be scuttled, they ask, why concern

ourselves with them? It is their contention that the time given to history (also geography and civics) could be more advantageously used if courses of instruction emphasized subject matter "especially selected" to prepare our youth for the new social order.

As we have seen in numerous references, that is the purpose of the social science courses, which are the core of the curriculum and the key to the political program of the New Educationists. In these courses which supplant history, geography and civics as separate subjects, reference to history is confined largely to material of "social significance" or otherwise believed to be of advantage to their purpose.

2. The teaching concept behind this sabotage of history springs from Dewey's Activity Program. "Learning by doing" is hailed as the only true education. Memory work, of which history is an outstanding example, is discarded or minimized.

The reader will readily observe the affinity between (1) the political and (2) the teaching philosophies and how one complements the other. Combined, they constitute the basic ideas underlying the social science and the mania for social studies which has pervaded our school system and left such gaping holes in a child's basic knowledge of history, geography and our form of government.

Commenting on the shocking deficiencies in history revealed by the *New York Times* Survey of College Freshmen (Chap. III) Mr. Hugh Fraser, then an official of the U. S. Office of Education and Chairman of the Committee on American History, declared in the *New York Times*, April 3, 1943:

Responsibility for the present appalling neglect of American history in the high schools and elementary schools of the nation must go to the social studies extremists. . . .

The pitfall they have stumbled into has been due to a failure to recognize that the structure of history does not lend itself to the technique of the social studies. And this failure has led to tragic results. . . .

The tragedy really began in 1924 in Denver, Col., when the Superintendent of Schools, acting on suggestions from Teachers

College, Columbia University, moved to substitute a course in social science for the then-existing courses in American history and geography. . . .

Illustrative of the extremes to which this apathy and indifference to the history of the United States has gone is the reply of a well-known social studies advocate who, when asked if he did not think the school children of America should have some knowledge of Thomas Jefferson, replied:

"Well, if there is anything about Jefferson that may be said to have a particular bearing on events today, I would say 'yes.' Otherwise not. ". . .

This anti-intellectual attitude, typical of these pedagogues, is contrasted with that of Nicholas M. Butler while president of Columbia University. In his *Annual Report* (1941), President Butler declared: "Almost everything which has taken place . . . has happened before. . . . One who really wishes to get a sound and scholarly viewpoint from which to look at our modern problems with intelligence must read and reflect upon the writings of those great philosophers and humanists who first discussed these problems and their causes . . ." (p. 28)

The *Times* articles were given first-page space and wide coverage for days. They were reprinted in pamphlet form and distributed across the nation. And what happened? No doubt many individual schoolmen or school boards made an effort to correct this inexcusable condition but little could be done if the system remained, and the social sciences continued to be the core of the curriculum.

But no reaction was perceptible at the top levels of national educational leadership, which was responsible for this condition. For instance, in 1948, *five years after* this sensational revelation, the New York State Education Board, following the Progressivist pattern, issued a syllabus for consideration in which the senior high schools would have a two-year history course, with "world backgrounds" so emphasized that the actual study of American history was limited to six weeks. In Buffalo the local

teachers looked askance at the State Board proposal. "Buffalo's academic high schools are not following—will not follow—the State Board's suggestion," said Frank J. Dressler, Supervisor of Social Studies. "Here in Buffalo we feel . . . that we cannot teach American history in one year. . . . In 1947 we finally expanded the course to 1½ years and intend to keep it that way."

Dr. Selig Adler, assistant professor of history, criticized the "scrambled egg" courses that try to teach everything instead of concentrating on American history. He said, "I think our schools in Buffalo are better than a lot of the others but the whole trend is away from actual history. If it continues, our high school pupils won't know any American history at all."

The social aims obsession, giving less and less history and more and more "world backgrounds" of social significance, results in a child getting a smattering of everything but an adequate knowledge of nothing. "Probably the greatest fallacy in the teaching of history today is this emphasis on contemporary problems," said Dr. John T. Horton, head of the history department of the University of Buffalo, in the *Buffalo Evening News*, December 13, 1948: "It seems to me that it is not so important to give our children the full background of each contemporaneous problem as it is to give them a thorough grounding in our own country, our history, our culture. . . . Our high schools should give them the facts of our nation's development, of our past problems and how successfully they were met. Then these students themselves will be able to understand the problems that eventually confront them on the basis of what's gone before."

Led by the *Buffalo Evening News*, sound educators and citizens who understood the significance of this move, promptly protested to the State Education Board and members of the State Legislature, as reported in its issue of December 10, 1948:

With only six weeks allotted to American history in the four years of high school . . . [the pupils] would emerge from the course with very blurred notions regarding the development of

American institutions, they contended. It would seem that the authors of this new program regard as fatuous the idea of the old schoolmen that pupils should be so firmly grounded in our philosophy of government, with pride of patriotism emphasized, that no wedging doubts could shake their faith in America. . . .

That is a fair statement of the average citizen's expectations from our public schools. It is, however, precisely what our children have been denied and will continue to go without under the program of the New Educationists.

The end result of this neglect of history is to cut off the present generation from its great American heritage. Beard, Rugg, and their "debunking" colleagues and professional detractors of our American form of government bring us perilously close to "being a people who inhabit this land with their bodies without possessing it in their souls." In the *New York Herald Tribune*, April 13, 1943, Walter Lippmann wrote: "When we read the writings of the early Americans we find that, unlike our own generation, the past was continually present in their minds as part of their own experiences. They were making a new government and for their own guidance, for knowledge of what to do, they drew not upon surveys of contemporary opinion and questionnaires, but upon precedent and experience."

Our New Educationists seem completely unaware that character is more than a surface condition. It must be strong to have convictions; its roots must penetrate deeply into the creative principles of the past; it must be nourished by the life blood of the ideals and traditions which have made us a mighty nation. After a severe windstorm, a few large trees will be found blown to the ground. On close observation these trees will be found to have very shallow roots. It takes the strength of deep roots for even a tall tree to withstand the gales and tempests that sweep the forest; and the higher a tree grows, the more likely it is to topple if its roots do not sink deeply into the ground. And so it is with humans. If their roots (convictions) are shallow, their

civilization, like the tree, will succumb to the inevitable strains and storms in the lives of nations.*

A knowledge of our history helps to strengthen faith in the foundations of our Republic. It portrays the good and bad of the past; the deadly parallels of ancient and modern demagogues; and the pitfalls into which men have fallen when they entrusted their liberties to men instead of laws.

If our young are to be denied this priceless perspective given only by history, can they attain a major objective of a liberal education—the disciplining of free minds? “The humane disciplines do not accomplish their work by preaching, nor yet by subtle insinuation,” writes Russell Kirk. “They teach the rising generation the meaning of great literature and the nature of elevated human character, and that is sufficient. So it is that, apart from the doctrines of religion, the best minds and hearts of every generation come to understand the bonds that join them with their ancestors and their posterity.”²

NOTES

1. Michael Demiashkevich, *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education* (New York: American Book Co., 1935), p. 201.

2. Russell Kirk, *A Program for Conservatives* (Chicago: Henry Regnery Co., 1954), p. 61.

* See Chapter XXII for the record of U.S. prisoners of war in Korea “brainwashed” by the Communists.

Individualism or Group Conformity

IN THE PROGRAM of the Progressivists, particular emphasis is placed on courses in what is called "social adjustment," or "life adjustment." These courses are designed to train the individual to conform successfully to group action and attitudes. Since social aims are the primary objective of the New Education, the proficiency of the pupil in such social adjustment courses is regarded as a major test of his education.

Dr. Bernard Iddings Bell explains where this belief is leading us: "To the Deweyites, a sound education is one which accustoms the pupils to discover group convictions and then conform to them. This is known as 'becoming socially adjusted.' By an act of faith, . . . they assume that group desire is certain to be *good* desire, that the group is always more trustworthy and wise than anyone within it. The idea of critical and corrective leadership by exceptionally equipped people is regarded as anachronistic."¹

John Dewey, in his *The School and Social Progress*, sees this aim as practically a sacred mission: "Every teacher should realize the dignity of his calling: that he is a social servant set apart for the maintenance of proper social order and the securing of the right social growth. In this way the teacher always is the prophet of the true God and the usherer in of the true kingdom of God."

To those familiar with Dewey's Godless philosophy, this statement is an enigma. Certainly it exalts the teaching profession, at least those who agree that social aims are primary and that individual desires should be subordinated to those of the group. In doing so, however, they exact a terrific toll from both the individual and society, since human progress is invariably the result of the action or ideas of exceptional individuals. The group or crowd are always followers. In a group one loses the characteristics of an individual and assumes those of the mass, a process which increases in direct ratio to the size of the crowd.

Getting along with one's fellows with self-restraint and mutual consideration is a desirable social acquirement. But this is not the same as the subordination of the individual pupil's ideas and desires to those of the group, which the Progressivists urge. Such teaching is not only contrary to the advancement of the race; it also breeds a hateful class-consciousness—an alien evil from which America in the past has been spared. It leads to the uniformity of a common intellectual mediocrity.

This "group" obsession of the Progressivists also takes the form of disapproval of competition in human affairs. There can be little doubt that this attitude derives from the Marxian formula: from each according to his abilities; to each according to his needs. Although Marx employed this as an economic rule, the New Educationists apply it in pedagogy. To them, the profit-motive is regarded as bad and competition undesirable. The logical consequence of this attitude is the attempted elimination of all forms of competition from the educational process. This results in grading by age groups instead of by ability, the elimination of or drastic changes in report cards, and the practice of general promotion regardless of proficiency. There can be no failures in Progressive schools.

Dr. Dewey explains in *My Pedagogic Creed*:²

I believe that the school is primarily a social institution. . . . The teacher's business is simply to determine, on the basis of larger

experience and ripper wisdom, how the discipline of life shall come to the child.

. . . All the questions of the grading of the child and his promotion should be determined by reference to the same standard. Examinations are of use only so far as they test the child's fitness for social life. . . .

In the maze of Progressivist theories, individual proficiency is penalized and individual inadequacy is rewarded. "This leveling doctrine is prominently featured in certain stages of socialism and communism. It rejects the validity of rewards according to deserts, no matter how ethical. It rejects the incentive of such rewards as an explanation of human inspiration, self-respect and productive action. . . ." ³

In referring to this educational trend as the "new illiteracy," Mr. William H. Whyte, Jr., in an article in *The Saturday Review*, declared: "Wherever it may be found and in whatever form, the new illiteracy is nourished by several articles of faith. The essence of them is this. First, the individual exists only as a member of a group. He fulfills himself only as he works with others; of himself he is nothing." ⁴ Mr. Whyte finds these ideas no longer radical; they are the mark of orthodoxy in many quarters.

In the New Education the child must think and act in terms of the group. Individualism, with its inevitable rewards or penalties and the desire to excel, is regarded as anti-social. "You can't make socialists out of individualists, so this group idea is the nucleus of the Progressive system," declared Rosalie Gordon in *What's Happened to Our Schools?* ⁵ "It means no child must be permitted to forge ahead of another—that would hurt the group. Therefore promotions are automatic—nobody is 'left back' because of poor work. . . . Graded report cards are out the window. Competition is taboo—it breeds rivalry . . . and that is anathema to 'the group.' It isn't long before the children get the idea that trying isn't worthwhile. And with the disciplinary lines slack or non-existent, it isn't long before naturally curious

children avid for new experiences turn to other and bizarre pursuits."

Fortunately, there are professors of economics who understand the harmful effects of sacrificing individualism on the altar of group conformity. Mr. Thomas J. Shelly, teacher of economics at Yonkers (New York) High School, writes:

As a teacher in the public schools, I find that the socialist-communist idea of taking "from each according to his ability" and giving to "each according to his need" is now generally accepted without question by most of our pupils. In an effort to explain the fallacy in this theory, I sometimes try this approach with my pupils:

When one of the brighter or harder-working pupils makes a grade of 95 on a test, I suggest that I take away 20 points and give them to a student who has made only 55 points on his test. Thus each would contribute according to his ability and—since both would have a passing mark—each would receive according to his need. After I have juggled the grades of all the other pupils in this fashion, the result is usually a "common ownership" grade of between 75 and 80—the minimum needed for passing, or for survival. Then I speculate with the pupils as to the probable results if I actually used the socialistic theory for grading papers.

First, the highly productive pupils—and they are always a minority in school as well as in life—would soon lose all incentive for producing. Why strive to make a high grade if part of it is taken from you by "authority" and given to someone else?

Second, the less productive pupils—a majority in school as elsewhere—would, for a time, be relieved of the necessity to study or to produce. This socialist-communist system would continue until the high producers had sunk—or had been driven down—to the level of the low producers. At that point, in order for anyone to survive, the "authority" would have no alternative but to begin a system of compulsory labor and punishments against even the low producers. They, of course, would then complain bitterly, but without understanding.

Finally, I return the discussion to the ideas of freedom and enterprise—the market economy—where each person has freedom of choice, and is responsible for his own decisions and welfare.

Gratifyingly enough, most of my pupils then understand what I mean when I explain that socialism—even in a democracy—will eventually result in a living-death for all except the “authorities” and a few of their favorite lackeys.⁶

NOTES

1. Bernard Iddings Bell, *Crowd Culture* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1952), pp. 132-133.
2. John Dewey, *My Pedagogic Creed* (New York: E. L. Kellogg, 1897), pp. 7-9.
3. *Report of Committee on American Citizenship*, New York State Bar Association, January 30, 1953.
4. Cited in *A Program for Conservatives*. Russell Kirk (Chicago: Henry Regnery Co., 1954), p. 231.
5. Rosalie Gordon, *What's Happened to Our Schools?* (New Rochelle, N. Y.: America's Future, Inc., 1956), pp. 16-17.
6. Letter to the Foundation of Economic Education, January 20, 1951.

CHAPTER XIX

Educated or Socialized

IN AN EARLIER CHAPTER we noted that the second stage of the revolution in education began in the early 1930's when the "hard" Progressives took command and decided to use the movement to create a new social order. Prior to that time Progressive Education at least was "child-centered" and, despite its fallacies and defects, gave first attention to the *education* of the child. It was not ideologically inspired. But the militant Frontier Thinkers had a far more ambitious objective—a vision of Utopia. Education was to be the vehicle to the goal, so the new-world-makers proceeded to introduce their concepts and courses into the schools. The emphasis, as we have seen, was on current problems to develop social consciousness through the social studies courses.

Dr. Arthur E. Bestor, who was a victim of "social stew" courses, writes of this important milestone in education:

The course in the social studies, and the more destructive programs that ensued, marked a turning point in progressive education. The label remained the same but the thing itself became appallingly different. Progressive education ceased to be an effort to accomplish more effectively the purposes which citizens, scholars, and scientists had agreed were fundamental. Progressive education began to imply the substitution of new purposes. Experts in pedagogy were feeling their oats, were abandoning their proper task of improving instruction, and were brazenly undertaking to redefine the aims of education itself.¹

Social Aims the Purpose

The predominant purpose of public education should be the "social aims" which have been generally neglected, Dr. William H. Kilpatrick tells us in *The Teacher and Society*.² In fact, only "lip service" has been given to the social function, so intent were "parents and local communities with immediate educational returns." According to his biographer, Kilpatrick is not troubled so long as the child is working at some self-propelling task and is wholesomely engaged in a social environment.*

In *The Teacher and Society*, Professor Kilpatrick finds that practical considerations are responsible for the many obstacles to serious consideration of the social objective. Among them is our free enterprise system which he terms "the rival educational influence of the surrounding economic system run, as it is, for private gain." Indeed, he has harsh words for the "tradition of business competition," although it has proved to be the spark plug of a standard of living the envy of the whole world. He states:

Many a youth fired with zeal for high ideals in home or school has found outside of these a very different world. He hears that "there is such a thing as being too honest," that "a man is not in business for his health." . . . Such a one often, . . . ends in "disillusionment." The world of competitive profit has proved too strong for him. . . . (pp. 40-41)

Now it should be remembered that in establishing social aims as the main purpose of education, these pedagogues were not chasing a phantom. They had a definite objective: to integrate the Master Plan outlined in *Conclusions and Recommendations*, financed by the capitalistic dollars left to his Foundation by Andrew Carnegie. If public schools were to be used for the political objective of building a new society, the first

* Many educators regard Dr. Kilpatrick as having "influenced more teachers and children than any person of this generation." Others accord Harold Rugg or George S. Counts first place.

step, obviously, was to make social aims the main purpose of education, so that the curriculum could be revamped and the necessary materials of propaganda inserted to sell this plan to the children and to the nation.

Soon the Frontier Thinkers and their leftist-liberal colleagues took up the cry and voiced it throughout the academic world. As we have seen, they developed an extensive program for the schools of America to "emphasize social aims" and thus to hasten the day of the new social order.

But did they perceive the very grave error of gearing fundamental education to "life adjustment" of many kinds? Mr. S. Gorley Putt tells us:

... instead of "adjusting" the content of education to the changing needs of society, our teachers must aim at producing a confidence in judgment that will be able to guide us in assessing our society, however it may change. It has been very wisely remarked that chance is only a by-product of character; it may be said that in educational matters, judgment and confidence bear a similar relationship.³

In general, the vast educational hierarchy gave either tacit or enthusiastic approval to a school program featuring the socialization, rather than the education, of our youth. For many reasons, organized opposition was difficult and the movement easily entrenched itself at all levels of education, from primary grades to colleges and teacher-training schools. In an appallingly large number of schools, it succeeded in dominating the curriculum, with the shocking results now apparent to all.

Dr. Bernard Iddings Bell gives us this typical experience of a teacher of his acquaintance:

What do we teach there? Scraps of literature and art, some unsystematic applied math, bits of history and geography—in fact, smatterings of almost all things, academic and otherwise. These we try to "integrate around vital central interests," such as how to date and mate and if possible avoid divorce; how to reform the City Hall and run the United Nations, how to plan cities,

how to provide adequate housing, how to solve economic problems. All this when the pupils are 15 years old.

We must teach the elements of reading and writing, too. The young ladies and gentlemen are supposed to have learned these down in grammar school, but few of them have fifth-grade facility, some even less.

We have no fixed curriculum, which is a bother. We make our curriculum up from week to week, sometimes from day to day, trying always to entice "pupil interest," and we do it with "pupil advice." The students run the show; we are their patient servants. . . .⁴

Today, the New Education is so deeply embedded in the American school system that an Essentialist teacher has difficulty getting a favorable assignment. Only those who have taken the numerous courses in pedagogy prescribed by the educational hierarchy are deemed worthy to take part in the socializing process.*

Now, who has authorized this group to change the very reason for existence of our public schools? We have seen the origin and purposes of public education in America.⁵ For generations it has grown and developed on the sound assumption that its main function was to *educate* the child. Its prestige has become so great that all states have enacted laws for compulsory school attendance. Until recent years, nothing would have seemed so incredible as that the basic purpose of the public school would be radically changed.

The change has come without the knowledge or approval of the great majority of our people. The politico-pedagogues arbitrarily have done it. They have been able to do so because the public apathy and trusting confidence in the school administrators have left the decision to the school professionals.

* For the "hotch-potch of subjects offered in our teacher-training colleges," see *And Madly Teach* by Mortimer Smith (Chicago: Henry Regnery Co., 1949), pp. 63-64. The overstressing of methodology at the expense of subject matter in such colleges is commented on in *Tales of a Teacher* by Beatrice S. Nathan (Chicago: Henry Regnery Co., 1956), p. 289, and in *So Little for the Mind* by Hilda Neatby (Toronto: Clarke, Irwin & Co., Ltd., 1953), pp. 73-74.

But what happens when the product of the Progressive class leaves school? A midwest high-school teacher gives this answer:

"Old-fashioned" schools follow the same system we find in colleges and in life: Those who are incapable, or unprepared, fail. Not so with the modern public school, the only institution this side of heaven that rewards *intention* as generously as it does accomplishment. "The new schools," says Dr. Harold Rugg, "... literally have no failures."

Let me explain how this beautiful sleight-of-hand is accomplished. Johnny is a very bright boy, but Bill is dull. Do we Progressive teachers grade them competitively . . . ? Not at all, for then Bill would fail, and the new schools have no failures. So we grade Bill against himself. If poor dull Bill is trying hard, and doing as well as he possibly can with his low I.Q., we give him a mark of "Satisfactory." . . .

The Progressivists think this tolerance a proof of their humanitarianism. But is it merciful or kind to send poor deluded Bill out into a world so little interested in what hell's paved with? . . . If Bill joins a construction gang and calculates how much weight a bridge will safely hold, would it matter to a trainload of Progressivists—on their way to a conference—whether Bill merely tried to figure right, or whether he actually did? ⁶

Once again it should be noted that many truly scholarly educators were opposing this unsound and anti-intellectual educational trend almost from its inception. For instance, Ann L. Crockett made this valiant attempt in 1940. Even earlier many parents and teachers foresaw the consequences of the New Education and attempted to alert the nation. But Dewey, Kilpatrick and a host of colleagues were determined to establish "the social as the dominant professed aim of American education." Well organized and intrenched behind the leftist-liberal ramparts on Morningside Heights, they pushed their program, regardless of the consequences to sound and fundamental education.

How their program was spread throughout the nation and woven into the fabric of educational processes has been shown

in earlier chapters. Public schools, created to educate our children, now subordinate this vital function to socializing them. But what about the home, the church, and all other elements of society devoted to the socializing process? Even if the school could socialize the child, what then? He still would have to be educated to satisfy our American standards. But perhaps, in the new society of the pedagogues, that will make little difference, and the "diminished mind" will be deemed a virtue!

NOTES

1. A. E. Bestor, *Educational Wastelands* (Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1953), pp. 46, 47.
2. *The Teacher and Society*, John Dewey *Yearbook* (New York: D. Appleton-Century Co., 1937), p. 41.
3. S. Gorley Putt, *View from Atlantis* (Lodon: Constable, 1955), p. 127.
4. Bernard Iddings Bell, *Crowd Culture* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1952), pp. 80-81.
5. See chapter "The American Public School Tradition."
6. Ann L. Crockett, *Saturday Evening Post*, March 15, 1940.

CHAPTER XX

Ancestry of the New Education

PROGRESSIVISM OWES MUCH of the prestige it once held to the fact that it bore the label of something "new." Americans eagerly respond to the new. Ours is a young country, with a new concept of government, new frontiers, constantly offering new opportunities to new citizens flowing in from all parts of the Old World. The word "new" has been of good omen for Americans.

Progressive Education, with the "new" label on its pedagogical merchandise, got off to a good start. It encountered little opposition until the public took a second glance at it and saw that it was not so new after all. An eminent educational philosopher, Dr. Michael Demiashkevich, late professor of education at George Peabody College for Teachers, explains:

. . . when Progressive Education (which is a term more vague and presumptuous than precise or modest) is given also the title of New Education, a gross historic inaccuracy is committed. There is nothing essentially new in the New Education, as any attentive student of the history of education knows. It is not only that the chief positions advocated by the New Education relative to the Activity Method are found in sum and substance, sometimes even textually, in the ancient and modern authors who in their time were the advocates of new educational methods. Omitting less known writers, such thinkers as Rousseau, Pestalozzi, Froebel and Tolstoy can be remembered in this connection.¹

But the core ideas of Dewey, Rugg, Counts, Kilpatrick, Bode and their colleagues go far deeper than the eighteenth century. Except for the strong influence of the doctrines of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, most of their theories are old, some having their origin in the Greco-Roman days. In the works of Plato, Aristotle, Sophocles and other ancient philosophers will be found the source of many of the doctrines the Progressivists have incorporated into their programs.

Having sold their ideas as new, the New Educationists could hardly be expected to publicize these facts. To point out that pet theories of Deweyism could be found in the behavioristic Greek philosophy of the fifth century B.C. would be disillusioning to their adherents. And their insistence on gearing educational programs to "change," typified in the writings of Rugg and Kilpatrick among others, can be traced to the works of Auguste Comte (d. 1857), Francis Bacon (d. 1626) and, still earlier, Heraclitus who in the sixth century B.C. uttered his famous dictum, "everything flows; it is impossible to step twice into the same river." He contended that, since everything changes constantly, change is the most important characteristic of human affairs.

Dewey's agnostic pragmatism in effect extended this ancient doctrine, declaring: "The human mind must limit its work to the experience derivable from tangible things, and must renounce all attempt at building knowledge on an *a priori* foundation."

To these theories we must ascribe the main features of the Progressivist program, including the Child-Centered School, the Project Method and the Activity Program. The naturalistic features, likewise far from new, were eagerly embraced by Lenin. They were incorporated in the Soviet educational philosophy as the inevitable result of the historical materialism of Marx and Engels.

The Progressivist thesis that the curriculum should favor courses of immediate rather than deferred value stems back to

the pragmatic philosophy of the ancient Greeks, first credited to the historian Polybius (d. 123 B.C.). The New Educationists, however, have given it a distorted twist. Their theory of opposition to our traditional dual concept of mind and consciousness derives from the behavioristic doctrine of the Greeks, Democritus (b. 480 B.C.) and Lucretius (d. 55 B.C.): "The nature of the mind and soul is bodily."

Some of the Progressivist theories on evolution and religion are rooted in the past. Diderot in the eighteenth century answered the question, "whither does man come," years before Lamarck, Darwin and Wallace announced their theories of evolution. Diderot summed up his naturalistic philosophy concisely when he said: "The real goal of life consists in the enjoyments it can furnish. Drinking good wines, eating delicate foods, resting in soft beds, this is what constitutes the sense of life. The rest is nothing but vain emptiness." However, this concept was old long before Diderot. It was Protagoras of Abdera, the outstanding Sophist, who said: "Man . . . is the measure of all things, of the existence of things that are, and of the nonexistence of things that are not."

As we have seen, one of the cardinal principles of the New Education is the establishment of social aims as the prime objective in education and the adaptation of school programs to that end. As a natural concomitance, there follows the downgrading of nationalism. These, also, are hoary tenets dating back to the Sophists (600-500 B.C.). When these journeymen tutors from neighboring older civilizations entered Greece, they introduced the idea that education was for the purpose of preparing pupils for social change. "Patriotism and nationalism were not Sophist interests. . . . The Sophists asked the student to accept nothing as true unless it became self-evident to him through the physical senses of sight, hearing, smell, taste and touch."²

Repeatedly in the course of history man has experimented with the Sophist formula for happiness and education, and always with evil results. It was this insidious philosophy which

undermined the character of the Greeks in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. It was a revival of the Sophist movement which ruined the moral fibre of the Romans after the Punic Wars, as analyzed by eye-witness historian Polybius. Despite its dreary record, this bankrupt and discredited doctrine has remained a pillar of the New Education for nearly three decades.

Even Dr. Charles A. Beard's theory of "economic determinism," as expounded in his book *An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution of the U.S.* which is a kind of source book of the debunking fraternity, was derived from the eighteenth century French philosopher Helvetius who declared: "Self-interest or egoism is the true and only motive for one's acts." The eighteenth century materialists, and even Karl Marx, could add little to that.

The Progressivist philosophies of both naturalism and instrumentalism bear the strong imprint of Rousseau who insisted on smashing tradition and doing everything contrary to custom. "The best education," said Rousseau, "consists in doing exactly the opposite of what has been done; do this and you will always be right." The efforts by the uncritical to follow this bad advice are responsible for many of the extremes of the New Education. In this concept, however, Rousseau was simply following the theories of many preceding thinkers, stretching in a long chain back to Antisthenes (d. 365 B.C.), who was the leader of the Cynics and their cult of the simple life.

One of America's best authorities on the New Education and a New York City school teacher for many years, Dr. Milo F. McDonald, discusses important eighteenth and nineteenth century leaders who have influenced modern education, and the doctrines for which they became noted:

1. *Froebel* (1782-1852). "Doing," as exemplified in 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, cooperative atmosphere should prevail in the kindergarten and throughout the whole educational process.

We learn by doing, and therefore constructive exercises and later trade training should constitute a vital part of the educational process in our guidance of the "whole child."

2. *Hegel* (1770-1831). A philosopher not essentially an educator, but interested in social problems.

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 education.

3. *Herbart* (1776-1841). 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. In 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 factor in the educational process. He is to lead the learner, not follow him.

4. *Marx* (1818-1883). 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.

5. *Pestalozzi* (1746-1827). 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 about us should be a major part of the educational process.

6. *Rousseau* (1712-1778). Education of the immature should follow nature.

We learn by doing.

Religion should have no place in the educational process.³

Although we have discussed only the highlights of this fascinating study, it is obvious that the ideas behind the New Education are *not* new. Many of its theories were vigorously proclaimed by intellectual leaders of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and an unsuspectedly large number of its tenets stem back to antiquity. The issue is ably summarized in *Educational Theory*, as follows:

From his [Dewey's] great wealth of knowledge, he assembled in a new and challenging pattern selected tenets of the Sophists, the Epicurians, Francis Bacon, Rousseau, Pestalozzi, Froebel and Herbart. To these were added the physical and learning techniques of Aristotle. . . . Deweyism was received professionally as a dramatic new product and immediately captured the imagination of a large segment of American educators. . . . To complicate the matter, Deweyism had become closely identified with the [Marxist] production-for-use-instead-of-profit movement. . . . (pp. 31, 32)

The only new ingredient in the New Education is the manner in which Dewey and his colleagues regrouped and integrated the doctrines of others. Interlarded with these concepts, they did introduce certain principles and methods of pedagogy which are unmistakably Progressivist in doctrine. Some of these border on the fantastic. Among them is the proposal to use the schools primarily to *reconstruct society*. Although far

from new, it is certainly a revolutionary concept of American education.

NOTES

1. Michael Demiashkevich, *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education* (New York: American Book Co., 1935), p. 123.
2. Charles W. Coulter and Richard S. Rimanoczy, *Educational Theory* (New York: D. Van Nostrand & Co., 1955), pp. 6, 7.
3. Milo F. McDonald, *American Education—The Old, The Modern and The "New"* (New York: American Education Association, 1952), pp. 30-31.



PART III





CHAPTER XXI

Socialism and Communism

WE HAVE SEEN in the foregoing that the New Educators, and particularly the Frontier Thinkers, have been strongly influenced by socialism, both in its Marxian and Fabian forms, in formulating their educational philosophy. It can be said that their program is a vestibule where the educational pragmatism of Dewey and the political collectivism of Marx interfuse.

However, the deceptive aspect of the New Education is that it scrupulously shuns the use of the socialist name. The most outspoken leftists of the cult, such as Dr. Harold Rugg, habitually and indignantly repudiate the designation "Socialist" whenever they are so described. In their parlance they are "Liberals" or "Modernists" or "Progressives." Under such disarming names they have worked assiduously for their new social order which is fabricated in the pattern of socialism. Like Earl Browder, who once described Communism as "Twentieth Century Americanism," they hawk their revolutionary academic ideas under the reassuring guise of our traditional democracy.

Once this fact is recognized, it should be pointed out that it is both incorrect and inept to characterize the New Educators as Communists, as some conservatives have done. Unquestionably, there are Communists who have played an important part in the transformation of our public school education. A formidable number of Communist teachers were uncovered in the New

York City public schools by operation of the Feinberg Act. It is the contention of this book that the leaders of the New Education are closely identified with gradualist socialism, not with Communism. To clarify the fundamental relationship between these two socialist wings, let us digress briefly to examine them.

Communism is popularly regarded as the big bad wolf and socialism as a fuzzy but harmless little lamb. Like all half truths, this is an extremely deceptive viewpoint, and a dangerous concept of the relationship of socialism to Communism. Deep differences do exist between the two collectivist movements but there are also striking similarities and unities. Actually, socialism and Communism are blood brothers: they may be described as having the same mother but different fathers.

As we attempt to unravel the misunderstandings which have grown up around this subject, we find a confusing public picture of socialism. Many causes and creeds have been a part of the genealogy of modern socialism. F. J. C. Hearnshaw,¹ a noted English authority, discovered 600 different definitions of socialism in usage in a score of nations. While the word itself is modern (first used in the nineteenth century), the roots of socialism go back to Plato, or earlier. Its ever-changing character was graphically described by a British educator: "Socialism is a chameleon-like creed. It changes its color according to its environment. For the street corner . . . it wears the flaming scarlet of the class war; for the intellectuals its red is shot with tawny; for the sentimentalist it becomes a delicate rose pink; and in the clerical circles it assumes a virgin white, just touched with a faint flush of generous aspiration."²

In an attempt to construct an overall picture of socialism, Hearnshaw isolated six basic principles which he found to be a part of all the separate versions of the creed. It proposes:

1. Exaltation of the community above the individual.
2. Equalization of human conditions.
3. Elimination of the capitalists.
4. Expropriation of the landlord.

5. Extinction of private enterprise.
6. Eradication of competition.

Let us examine Hearnshaw's six socialist tenets in the light of present problems.

POLITICAL

1. *The exaltation of the community above the individual.*

This ideal has always had the support of a great body of humanitarian opinion. Before socialism hardened into the Marxian mold, such various thinkers as Plato, Saint Simon, Fourier, Cabet and others subscribed to its broad purposes. The Marx-Engels school, formed in the 1840's, scorned the idealistic early socialists as "Utopians." Morris Hillquit, who belonged to the Marxian school, wrote that "the modern socialist movement has nothing in common with the utopias of Plato, Campanello and More . . . or early Christian practices."

In the United States there were more than one hundred Utopian colonization schemes which attempted to achieve socialism on a localized scale as a humanitarian undertaking. Most famous of these were Jamestown (1607); Plymouth, Mass. (1620); New Harmony, Ind. (1825); Fruitlands, Mass. (1842); and Brook Farm, Mass. (1847). In the decade 1840-1850, no less than sixty-seven socialistic "colonies" of various types briefly appeared and disappeared. All failed. Almost invariably, they were destroyed by their misconception of human nature.

Actually, these high-minded experiments failed because of their appeal to the noble instincts which, they believed, predominated in mankind. The Marxist form of socialism, which sprung from the Communist Manifesto of 1848, had a greater success because it courted man's baser instincts. It gave followers not intangible idealism but the more immediate reward of loot. By whooping up the hate-slogans of the class war, and by proclaiming the "expropriation" of the capitalists, it attracted a vast following of malcontents who were drawn by the prospect of something for nothing.

Hearnshaw says of socialism that "it was only its transformation from a scheme of mutual aid to a scheme of proletarian plunder that attracted to it the mob power which made it feasible and formidable."

SOCIAL

2. *The equalization of human conditions.* The leveling ideal has long inspired many minds. We find it enunciated by the prophets in the Old Testament. W. Graham, in his classic work on socialism, declares that the prophet Isaiah was the greatest of socialists. The early Christians, with their concern for the poor and the downtrodden, were regarded by some as practicing in primitive form, a society which, in the early nineteenth century, became known as socialism.

The adoption by socialists of Marx's Communist Manifesto in 1848 rang down the curtain upon this phase of socialism. Prior to Marx, socialism, while impracticable and of various forms, generally had a tincture of generous humanitarianism. After Marx, socialism became an appeal, not to justice, but to the appetite. Thereafter the stress was laid upon the conquest of power. "The socialist," says Harold Cox, "is not out to raise human nature. He is out to destroy capitalism, and for that end, he encourages or condones conduct which the world has hitherto condemned as criminal."

And it is true that the socialist movement still attracts many noble-spirited men and women by its professed ideals, but their idealism soon withers when it meets the hard and unprincipled materialism of the disciples of Marx and Engels. Contemporary socialism is dominated by the attitudes of Lenin who declared that "we repudiate all morality derived from non-human and non-class concepts." In such a creed, there is no place for ethics.

ECONOMIC

3-4-5-6. *Extinction of capitalists, landlord, private enterprise and competition.* Although Marx and his disciples have extruded

from socialism its idealistic content, they have replaced the ideals by an economic program shrewdly devised to attract a mass following. Hearnshaw explains the expediency which inspired Marx's redefinition of socialism. Discussing the old Utopian socialist ventures, he said:

As popular movements they were entirely ineffective, and as such they merited the scorn and contempt which Marx heaped upon them when (in the Communist Manifesto) he called them "castles in the air" and "duodecimo editions of the New Jerusalem."

Marx, in order to make socialism operative and effective, deliberately degraded these political and social elements, and at the same time subordinated them to those economic elements that had been emphasized by the early English socialists. . . . Above all, he rejected with disdain the fine but ineffective motive-power of his Christian and Utopian forerunners—viz., *altruism*. . . . He substituted for it the potent but base motive-power of primitive individualism—viz., *acquisitiveness*, with its implications of struggle, conquest, spoliation, dictatorship.³

In his restatement of the formula of socialism, Marx emphasized four "must" economic programs. These were, as stated, (1) elimination of the capitalist; (2) expropriation of the landlord; (3) extinction of private enterprise; and (4) eradication of competition. These were the goals or incentives calculated to attract the masses. "You reproach us," Marx says in the Communist Manifesto, "because we would abolish your property. Precisely so; that is just what we intend."

In the Manifesto, Marx elaborated the immediate steps which he proposed to further this end. They were:

1. Abolition of property in land and application of all rents of land to public purposes.
2. A heavy progressive or graduated income tax.
3. Abolition of all right of inheritance.
4. Confiscation of the property of all emigrants and rebels.
5. Centralization of credit in the hands of the state by means of a national bank with state capital and an exclusive monopoly.

6. Centralization of the means of communication and transport in the hands of the state, and nationalization of basic industries and all means of production.

Later, when socialist governments came to power in such countries as Great Britain, Sweden, Norway, Belgium, Australia etc., no attempt was made to carry out Marx's socialization program to the ultimate end specified in the Manifesto. It was recognized that, as a practical matter, a distinction should be made between large and small private enterprise units. Socialization was attempted only in the case of the large economic units. In Great Britain, for instance, the railways, the coal mines, the utilities and the steel industry. Even the most doctrinaire socialist recoiled from the idea of denouncing as "exploiters" such capsule capitalists as the carpenter contractor, the master plumber or the small shopkeeper who hires a few assistants. By a curious inconsistency, capitalism was found to be evil only in proportion to its size. Of course, this was the counsel of expediency.

The Socialism of Soviet Russia

Professing identical ideals and aims with the early socialists, the Communists have cleverly infiltrated all countries and exploited their ills, hatreds, fears, jealousies, inequalities and injustices. Skillfully avoiding armed conflict themselves, the tyrants in the Kremlin have used psychological warfare with unbelievable success. Their master strategy is to encourage the socialists to gain a foothold and then to await a favorable opportunity to seize their government by treachery from within. This was done to the Kerensky regime in Russia (Chapter XXII) and in numerous other countries now behind the Iron or the Bamboo Curtain.

Mr. F. D. Harper cites a pathetic illustration:

Jan Masaryk, the Czechoslovakian patriot, was called a great defender of freedom. But he said: . . . "Czechoslovakia must work out the synthesis between Russian socialism and Western liberty. . . . I'll go all the way with Russia—all the way up to one

point. Socialistic economics—ok. But if anyone tries to take away our freedom—freedom to think and say what you believe—the right to your own thoughts, your own soul. . . .”⁴

That was in 1946. On March 10, 1948, after living for a time under the socialistic economics, Masaryk plunged to his death. His suicide, if such it was, may well have been induced by the “realization of emptiness of his hope—that persons can live in liberty after they have given up economic freedom.”

It also illustrates the practical impossibility of genuine, doctrinaire socialism living a “peaceful co-existence” with Communism. As Social Democrats and similar socialist groups have learned to their sorrow, they inevitably are drawn into the Communist orbit when it suits the purpose of the Kremlin. That this is the official pattern of the Communists we learn from no less an authority that John Strachey, War Minister in the Socialist government of Great Britain, who said in his *Theory and Practice of Socialism*:

It is impossible to establish communism as the immediate successor to capitalism. It is, accordingly, proposed to establish socialism as something which we can put in the place of our present decaying capitalism. Hence, Communists work for the establishment of socialism as a necessary transition stage on the road of communism.⁵

NOTES

1. F. J. C. Hearnshaw, *A Survey of Socialism* (London: MacMillan and Co., Ltd., 1929), p. 35.
2. Ramsay Muir, *The Socialist Case Examined* (1925), p. 3.
3. F. J. C. Hearnshaw, *A Survey of Socialism* (London: MacMillan and Co., Ltd., 1929), pp. 47-48.
4. F. D. Harper, *Liberty—A Path to Its Recovery* (Irvington-on-Hudson, N. Y.: The Foundation for Economic Education, 1949).
5. As cited by Clarence Manion in *The Key to Peace* (Chicago: The Heritage Foundation, 1951), p. 94.

CHAPTER XXII

The Menace of Marxism

IN EARLY 1917, during a critical period of World War I, the German General Staff devised a shrewd scheme to relieve pressure on their Eastern frontier by fomenting revolution in Russia. At that time, Lenin was in exile in Switzerland. General Ludendorff arranged to have him transported into Russia in a sealed box car. When Lenin arrived in Russia, the Czar had already fallen, Alexander Kerensky became the provisional ruler of Russia. Kerensky was not a Communist but a socialist who established what he regarded as the "first Russian democracy."

One of the greatest hoaxes of history is the Communist myth that it was they who overthrew Imperial Russia. They did nothing of the kind. With German aid, they treacherously seized the unseasoned Kerensky regime months after it was established, and then set up their Communist despotism. Alexander Kerensky tells us:

The Bolsheviks took no part in that crucial event. Lenin and Zinoviev were in Switzerland. Trotsky was in New York, Stalin (at that time a minor figure) was in Siberian exile. . . . Lenin, Zinoviev and others arrived one month after the downfall of the Romanoffs—in the notorious sealed train provided by the German Kaiser for their journey. . . .

"Russia is now the freest country in Europe, where there is no oppression of the masses," Lenin declared publicly on reaching Petrograd. . . . The myth that the Bolsheviks overthrew Czarism

has been purposely spread in order to conceal their crime of having strangled the first Russian democracy. The Communists everywhere are today trying to seize power by the same cynical device which Lenin used in 1917, namely by posing as a "defender of people's freedom and of democracy."¹

This historical incident affords a classical example of the incapability of socialists or social democrats to maintain their regimes against a determined Communist element in their midst. Inevitably, the Communists use and exploit them until a favorable opening for treachery occurs. "The social democrats (Mensheviks and Social Revolutionaries) were trying to stand on an avalanche which they had themselves helped to start," writes Ivor Thomas, M.P. . . . "The October revolution could not have taken place but for the February revolution (Kerensky); the communists could not have come to power if the social democrats had not first paved the way."²

Actually, this seemingly minor incident of Lenin in the box car ushered in one of the supreme turning points of modern times, for it set the pattern of infiltration and treachery which brought undreamed-of success in subsequent world conquests. In the short period of thirty-seven years, two-fifths of the human race has become enslaved, and the end is not in sight.

The monster which now casts its sinister shadow over the liberties of men is the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Note that the name is Socialist—not Communist. At long last we now recognize Communism as a deadly menace to our civilization. But what about socialism? There is no similar public distrust and loathing of socialism. It is popularly considered as illusory or impracticable but not as a threat to our institutions. Is this attitude warranted? Or are we cherishing a delusion? We have seen that the New Educationists have been leading our children straight down the path to their new social order—a socialistic form of society. So parents can ill-afford to be confused on the relationship of socialism to Communism, since many countries already lie prostrate behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains and

others are teetering on the brink of despotism. More than one-half the land surface of the world has now succumbed to slavery.

Soviet Warfare Is Psychological

The ruthless methods by which the Communists continue their world conquest are now familiar to most of us. What is not generally understood, however, is the expertness of the Russians in waging the "cold" war to win their ends. The Soviet dictators have devised a new form of offense—psychological warfare—in which a nation is not conquered by force of arms from without but by force of ideas from within.

These ideas, furthermore, are not born of reason, nor of any spiritual influences of men, but are based on the sordid emotions of hate, envy, jealousy, and fear, spawned by the predatory and Godless Marxian philosophies. Communism has devised an amazingly effective system of infiltration and subversion, ever concentrating on the *minds* of men and avoiding the bullets, until it is ready for the final step of conquest, and even then a satellite does the job.

The principal shock troops of Communism, in this stage of its advance, are drawn from the intellectuals. A hard core of leaders is developed who are able to sell the Red ideas to the discontented and to the social misfits. This hard core is recruited largely from the fields of the arts, the sciences and the professions.* In the Harold Ware cell operating within our government, every one of the ten members, including Alger Hiss, was a college graduate. This, of course, is no reflection on higher education but shows the fallacy of the contention of many that Communism is purely a product of bad economic conditions. Although it thrives on bad social and economic conditions, in essence Communism is an intellectual disease.

* The appeal of Communism to persons in these fields is admirably explained in *The Anti-Capitalistic Mentality* by Ludwig von Mises (Princeton, N. J.: D. Van Nostrand & Co., 1956), pp. 15-25.

How the Reds Took a University

How effectively this procedure works was demonstrated during the Communist seizure of China, as related in *The Enemy Within*.³ At a certain stage of the Communist rebellion, while the Nationalist Chinese were still in power, the control of the 10,000-strong student body of the University of Peking became a Communist objective. At the time, there were only a few professional Communists, not more than thirty, infiltrated among the bonafide students. The method used by the Communists was to monopolize the "wall newspapers."

Wall newspapers, which are glorified bill boards, explain the authors, are a common feature of Chinese higher schools. Students avidly read these "newspapers." There were thirty such at the University of Peking. The Communists won control of nineteen. Students, particularly lower classmen, were deeply impressed by this display of Communism which greeted the eye on every hand on the campus. It became an unquestioned assumption that the Communists were the dominating element among the students. From this spurious assumption it was an easy step to the acceptance of Communist control by the student body.

In this instance, a comparatively small group of Communist intellectuals had outsmarted 10,000 people. This is typical of Soviet psychological warfare. Resort to armed force is only the last step in their campaign. Due to our failure to recognize this vital fact, the forces of freedom have been defeated on many fronts in this "cold" war. While our attention is fixed on artillery, submarines, warplanes, guided missiles and other weapons of war, the enemy concentrates on psychological methods—his war of ideas waged on diplomatic and "peaceful coexistence" fronts. In this warfare his 155 mm. guns are ideas, and the shells or bombs are the baser emotions and primitive passions which cause men to tear at each other's throats. If successful, this cam-

paign immobilizes the mightiest armaments. One Alger Hiss was more valuable than a million soldiers in the conquest of China.

With rare vision, a British general foresaw the coming of psychological warfare as early as 1926, when he wrote: "It is conceivable that the method of imposing the will of one nation upon another may in time be replaced by purely psychological warfare, wherein weapons are not even used on the battlefields . . . but instead, the corruption of the mind, the dimming of the intellect, and the disintegration of the moral and spiritual fibre of one nation by the influence of the will of another is accomplished." ⁴

Socialism Also Based on Marx

So far we have stressed only Communism. But what of socialism? Having a common final goal with the Communists, socialism makes an uncertain ally in the anti-Communist fight. A child even partially indoctrinated in socialism will inescapably have mental reservations when asked to detest Communism. That is why the presence of socialist-minded teachers in our schools is a threat to national unity in the anti-Communist cause. The socialistic pedagogue takes the child along the highway marked "Marxism," accepting many if not most of its social, economic and political doctrines. About two-thirds of the way along this route, teacher and pupil come to a fork in the road and the loyal teacher tells the child: "You must stop here. You should now turn to the right because the left fork leads to Communism." But all along the route the child has read signs, or heard from other travelers, that the principles and doctrines (Marxist) are worthy, and that the principal difference between Communism and socialism is the *means* to the end—the methods and technique of their respective leaders.

Is it not logical for the indoctrinated youth at this point to say: "Well, if this Marxism is a good thing but the Communist leadership is bad, let's not fall out over that. Let's throw the rascals out and carry on the job ourselves"? Particularly would

this reaction be reasonable if the youth's education had failed to stress the virtues of *our way of life*, leaving a void in loyalties as big as a barn door.

Education Devoid of Loyalty

In her sworn testimony Elizabeth Bentley revealed the part which education played in her becoming a Communist. She said:

When I became a Communist, I was finishing the last part of my Master's thesis at Columbia, the end of 1934 and beginning of 1935. I would say that my studies in Vassar had gotten me to the point where I was a complete pushover for Communism. I would say that that is the general tendency, not only in Vassar, but in a goodly number of colleges. . . .

I grew up to womanhood without becoming acquainted with the American government. . . . This fault, I think, runs all through our educational system.⁵

In commenting on this testimony the noted columnist, Dorothy Thompson, stated in the *Ladies Home Journal*, for October 1948:

What, then, did she mean by the statement that she had "grown to womanhood without becoming acquainted with the American government"? Obviously she must have meant that at no point in her education did she receive illumination of the American political philosophy enabling her to understand and appreciate the basic assumptions underlying our government and society; she had never, therefore, either clearly accepted or clearly rejected those assumptions. Hence she was unable to discriminate between what is compatible with loyal American citizenship and what is incompatible. She did not reject American democracy as, for instance, a well-trained Marxian theorist rejects it; she abandoned *it without even knowing that she was doing so*.

This explains why so many of our students are badly confused in their ideals and loyalties. Our New Education has failed them. In the Bentley and similar cases the victory went to Communism by default, there being no *positive* American

program to oppose it. The roots of loyalty were in shallow ground.

U.S. Prisoners of War in Korea

An impressive witness to this failure of the New Education to impart firm beliefs in our Republic was Major William E. Meyer, army psychiatrist, who recently completed a four-year study of the results of "brain-washing" of American prisoners of war by the Chinese Reds. Major Meyer interviewed personally more than 200 returned prisoners, and painstakingly examined the records of another 600. His object was to discover the basic reason why approximately one-third of all American soldiers captured in Korea succumbed to Communist propaganda to the extent of becoming Communists—styled "Progressives."

Dr. Meyer omitted from his inquiry those prisoners who were tortured physically. Only those who had been put under "psychological" pressure by the Reds were questioned. The prisoners were subjected to a stream of propaganda and suggestions alleging that the United States was responsible for the war, and extolling the superior motives and virtues of Communism. For the appalling results, Dr. Meyer directly blames the omissions of American formal education which, he says in his report, "is failing miserably."

Here are some of his comments on this subject: ⁶

... Q. Now, the other defect—the second one, I think—was education, that you mentioned. A. Yes. Q. Do you mean formal education? A. To a certain extent I do mean formal education.

Q. Such as the mental discipline of mathematics? A. No; I mean specifically education about the American democracy . . . if we fail to teach the duties and responsibilities of citizenship *primarily*, then, in my opinion, education is not meeting the first requirement of a democratic society. In other words, I feel our education must be directed first and continuously not just at the goal of becoming a happy person in a comfortable country, but at becoming an active, responsible, participating member of this

free society. Just being well adjusted so that you can have a wonderful time in our comfortable country simply isn't enough.

Q. Where does our education seem to be falling down? A. Again I can only retreat into things the prisoners themselves said. From these things it is tragically clear that the American educational system, fine as it is, is failing miserably in getting across the absolute fundamentals of survival in a tense and troubled international society. This failure needs to be publicized.

Not Taught American System

Q. Specifically, what educational lacks were shown? A. A returning prisoner often made references to the fact that he was given by the Communists a very intensive education about America, a Communist's viewpoint of history which evidently emphasized every possible defect in our development and our attitudes, and the soldier would confess that his own knowledge of the American system—of our history, our politics, our economics—was insufficient to enable him to refute this communist version, even in his own mind.

Q. You mean he just didn't know enough about his own country to argue back intelligently? A. Essentially, that is true. . . . More important to the prisoner's sense of security is his recognition of the falsity of their arguments, the lies. . . .

Q. And did you get the impression that these Americans' faith in their own country and its principles was so weak that it could be shaken by these Red Chinese in prison-cell interrogations? A. Absolutely. Not so much by the interrogations but by the formal education program in which everyone participated to a certain extent. This was done not by Chinese ranting and raving about the evils of America; they don't attack directly in this way, just as they don't attack religion directly. They merely purport to show you the side of it that you don't know, and they do this not with Communist literature; it is possible to do this with perfectly good American authors. . . .

No Knowledge of U.S. Constitution

Q. What about the soldiers' knowledge of the U. S. Constitution, its guarantee of personal freedoms, and the American system in general? Did the American prisoners seem to know and understand such things? A. Many of them didn't. Almost to a man

the returnees lamented their lack of actual information, knowledge, about our democratic system. Many of them, being relatively young men, had never actively participated in affairs of the community, had never been made aware of the protections and guarantees this Government affords its people, and the fact that these are so advanced over anything that is allowed in Communist countries.

Q. Weren't they taught this in school? A. Many of them said they weren't. Many of them said they didn't know. Q. Could the Army have made up these deficiencies in their knowledge as part of their training? A. I don't think so. We in the Army can, in part, remedy certain educational deficiencies, but very rapidly one approaches an overburden of education in the military, education which is not the responsibility of the defense establishment but the responsibility of parents and of teachers and of social organizations.

Q. In other words, the Army can't make up that deficit? A. Not without devoting a disproportionate amount of time to this kind of education. We still have to teach soldiers to be soldiers, to be expert with their weapons. . . .

Q. Do you think what we call good old-fashioned patriotism might have bolstered some of these soldiers in their resistance during captivity? A. I do, although this was not an idea that I entered the study with. It was an idea that so many returnees expressed in one way or another that it was an inescapable conclusion. . . .

Lack of Religious Convictions

A. . . . A number of people told us that they had resisted every overture of the enemy by invoking abstract, sometimes theological, convictions which had long been a part of their lives—

Q. Religious convictions, you mean? A. Yes. Our findings here were the same as our findings among combat soldiers who are faced with the constant problem of defense against battle fear. A really convinced religious person, be he a devout Catholic, or devout Orthodox Jew, or a member of a fundamentalist Protestant sect—whatever his religion, if it had been part of his whole life, if his family were organized along lines of religious training and the moral and ethical precepts of such training—such a man

often was able to defend himself and his principles with this armament.

Until we learn that the battle with Marxism, on both the Communist and socialist fronts, is a duel to the death in a war of ideas, with our heritage of freedom and opportunity at stake, we shall not overcome this enemy of liberty. To expect to make headway against Communism, while neglecting Americanism and permitting our youth to be indoctrinated with socialism, is about as sensible as a gardener who neglects the weeds until they have gone to seed, and who then chops off their heads.

In discussing the threats to our institutions of these two forms of Marxism, former President Herbert Hoover said: "Today the socialist virus and poison gas generated by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels have spread into every nation on earth. Their dogma is absolute materialism which defies truth and religious faith. Their poisons are of many sorts . . . the recruiting grounds for their agents are from our minority of fuzzy-minded intellectuals and labor leaders. . . . I have little fear that these Communist agents can destroy the Republic if we continue to ferret them out. Our greater concern should be the other varieties of the Karl Marx virus." Mr. Hoover continued: "Foremost among them are the socialists, who advocate constitutional methods. By so doing they allay many fears of some socialistic threats to our institutions. . . . The socialists prowl on many fronts. They promote the centralized federal government, with its huge bureaucracy. They drive to absorb the income of the people by unnecessary government spending and exorbitant taxes. They have pushed our Government deep into enterprises which compete with the rights of free men. . . . Every step of these programs somewhere, somehow, stultifies the freedom, the incentives, the courage and the creative impulses of our people."

Socialism the Bridge to Communism

"Beyond all this," said the former President, "there is proof in the world that the end result of socialism can be bloody Com-

munism. In the Iron Curtain states it was the *socialist intellectuals who weakened the freedom of men by destroying free enterprise. Thus they furnished the boarding ladders by which the Communists captured the Ship of State.*"⁷ [Italics added] The truth of Mr. Hoover's conclusion is seen in the history of socialist governments behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains.

Americans long have been extremely tolerant of socialism, principally because they did not regard it as a serious menace to their institutions. However, the Communist conspirators have consistently exploited socialism and used tolerance in others as openings for their purposeful activities. Tolerance is a virtue, but even a virtue can become a vice if carried to extremes. The close kinship between these forms of Marxism was forcibly stated by British Prime Minister Harold Macmillan, in London, on March 18, 1957:

There is no difference between Socialism and Communism except this: Socialism is soft, Communism is hard; Socialism is pink, Communism is red. Socialism gets you down bit by bit by a kind of anesthetic process. It might be called mercy-killing. Communism just knocks you in the head.

Free World Losing Psychological Wars

All over the world free peoples have been losing this war of ideas to Marxism. In many lands it is the war of Communism; in others, including the United States, the war is being lost to socialism. In many respects it is essentially the same war. Our children are fed the idea that our free economy has failed and must be replaced by a collectivist economy; that the capitalistic system is decadent ("a dying laissez faire must be destroyed"); that the profit motive is anti-social; that competition in all human activities is an evil outgrowth of capitalism which must be destroyed; that in devising our Constitution the Founding Fathers were motivated primarily to protect their own wealth; that our concept of inalienable rights of the individual is outdated; that there are no enduring moral laws, or fixed principles

of human conduct; that man has no soul, mind or reason as metaphysicians understand those terms; that nationalism is an evil while internationalism is a virtue; that humans learn only from experience; and numerous similar doctrines.

Need we look any farther to explain why so many of our prisoners of war in Korea became "Progressives" and cooperated with the Communists in their warfare against the United States? So in this world-wide war of ideas it is obvious that although Communism is the ultimate and mortal foe, socialism is the immediate and more subtle enemy. For underlying the basic philosophies of both is the economic tenet that private wealth must be destroyed. "The goal of Communism—as well as its twin brother socialism," wrote David Lawrence, in the *New York Herald Tribune*, February 23, 1955, "is to do away with the managerial class or to so weaken its spirit as to cause the whole private enterprise system to collapse. Confiscation is the eventual goal of socialism."

NOTES

1. Alexander Kerensky, "In Defense of My Country," *Plain Talk*, April, 1947, pp. 24-25.
2. Ivor Thomas, *The Socialist Tragedy* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1951), pp. 46-47.
3. R. J. DeJaegher and Irene Kuhn, *The Enemy Within* (New York: Doubleday & Co., 1952).
4. Gen. John J. Fuller, *Tanks and War* (London).
5. Hearings before the Committee of the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, May 13, 1948.
6. Reprint from *U.S. News & World Reports* (Washington), February 24, 1956.
7. Herbert Hoover, Address, West Branch, Iowa, August 11, 1954.

CHAPTER XXIII

Education or Indoctrination

IN URGING THEIR PROGRAM, the New Educationists pose another problem related to academic freedom—what is the line of demarcation between education and indoctrination? The question is important, because the charge of indoctrination is made by both sides. The New Educationists are accused of using our educational facilities to indoctrinate the young with Marxist and statist doctrines. Their reply is that the Essentialists, wherever they control the school systems, are teaching the status quo. In this controversy, who are the educators and who are the indoctrinators?

The dictionary defines indoctrination as “instruction in the rudiments and principles of any science or system of belief.” It defines education as “the act or process of educating: the impartation or acquisition of knowledge, skill or discipline of character.” Thus indoctrination is related to *belief*, while education is correlated with *knowledge* or the truth. But what is the truth in education? The fact that, in popular usage, indoctrination is generally regarded as suspect and dubious, while education is regarded as a constructive process shows the instinctive preference of our people to regard time-tested basic knowledge as truth.

But when we get into the actual teaching process, we find that many subjects do not allow such an over-simplified rule of

distinction. For instance, how can we establish norms of truth in the social sciences without giving substance to the charge by the New Educationists that we are engaging in "thought control" or forced conformity, or that we are indoctrinating pupils in traditional doctrines and principles? How can we arrive at an acceptable middle ground between the established values of the past and the fervent hopes for the future? It is a fine question.

The Dewey disciples, of course, deny the eternal verities of our civilization and place all faith in "activity" and experience. But even the most convinced New Educationists cannot deny that there is an irreducible minimum of truth which the child must learn from some source if it is to survive. There is basic, self-preservative knowledge, how to avoid accident or danger. Certainly, even the Deweyites would not contend that this be learned only by "experience" or "external stimuli."

There is behavioristic knowledge—consideration for others, respect for constituted authority and such accepted refinements as gratitude, generosity, tolerance and other attitudes which through the centuries have shaped human ideals. These must be imparted to the child by his teachers, or society will suffer. John Stuart Mill, in commenting on the fact that refinement must be taught, pointed out that "In sober truth, nearly all the things which men are hanged or imprisoned for doing . . . are nature's everyday performance . . . cultivated observers regarded the natural man as a sort of wild animal, distinguished chiefly by being craftier than the other beasts of the field; and everything that makes character was deemed the result of a sort of taming." ¹

If such character training cannot be stressed as an integral part of education, then the spirit—the life blood—is taken away from our great American concept of freedom. Regardless of our "changing times," humans must have standards for daily life, until better standards or norms have been evolved. Demiazhkevich cautions us: "teachers are among the trustees of the young

... this civilization cannot endure, free from disastrous, unnecessary upheavals, unless we strive to impart to the young a devotion to the permanent ideals on which all civilization rests."

Likewise, in the field of government and economics, men in their long struggle for existence and freedom through the millennia have developed many truisms. Accumulated from the sum total of human experience, they have given us standards by which to live wisely. These truisms found expression in the Constitution of the United States, the first charter of freedom adequately to protect the rights of an individual and to assure his opportunity for the "pursuit of happiness." Shall we call it indoctrination when the schools pass on to youth the priceless essence of this experience?

On the other hand, if our courses of instruction cite the results of political experiments and isms which have inevitably led to loss of freedom or point out economic credos with a long record of malign results, shall we call this indoctrination in favor of the *status quo* as some New Educationists contend?

Many liberal educators are in the habit of referring to our Republic as an "experiment," to be coupled with Soviet Russia as one of the two outstanding modern experiments in "democracy." Admittedly, the Founders advanced concepts of the inalienable rights of the individual which were regarded as unique in their time. But the ideals and principles which gave birth to these concepts were not new. They had been cradled in man's insistent urge to be free—one of the most ancient of human aspirations. They were not experimental.

In teaching American ideals, the schools also are bound by the provisions of the law. In almost all states, the statutes require the teaching of our principles of government in the schools. In New York, for instance, such teaching is made mandatory under Section 801 of the Education Law of the State of New York, and more specifically under Section 3204. The law requires instruction in "the principles of government proclaimed in the Declaration of Independence and established by

the Constitution of the United States." Not only are the New York schools warranted in considering such instruction as basic education, but they are in violation of the law if they do not.

We know that civilizations rise and fall without regard to their merit but with a definite relationship to the character of a people. Deweyism fails to recognize this truth. Can education in the essence of human knowledge be impartial? The New Educationists insist that this is impossible in teaching the social sciences. Dr. Counts wrote: "My thesis is that complete impartiality is utterly impossible and that the school must shape attitudes, develop tastes and even impose ideas . . . in the selection the dice must be weighted in favor of this or that." Dr. Rugg declared: "As we look upon life, so we teach. . . ." (Chap. VI)

Concededly, the idea of neutrality is untenable. We cannot teach in a vacuum. "If one tries to teach bare facts or statistics without imparting values," said Cecil B. DeMille, "all you succeed in doing is to convey the idea that values are unimportant and that in itself is a form of indoctrination. . . . Either you stand with freedom or you stand against it. Either you defend the basic rights of free men—or you undermine them by your very indifference. . . . Either you indoctrinate with our tradition of freedom—or you indoctrinate with the idea that the tradition of freedom does not matter very much."²

The laws of education cannot be divorced from the laws of life and the truly scholarly pedagogue will adjust his methods to this reality. If our schools do not teach our youth the basic principles of our American way of life, then other ideas of life will dominate their thinking, for nature abhors a vacuum.

For our school leaders to evade this responsibility is to abandon our youth to indoctrination by enemies of our republican form of government—to invite the poisoning of the well-springs of our democracy. When we impress our children with the ideals and principles of our immortal charters of freedom we are not indoctrinating them with nebulous theories or beliefs.

We are *educating* them in time-tested truths and knowledge of inestimable value to the human race if liberty is to survive.

NOTES

1. As cited in *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education*. Michael Demiashkevich (New York: American Book Co., 1935), pp. 372-373.
2. "Education for Liberty." Address, Ames, Iowa, May 15, 1952.

CHAPTER XXIV

Teaching the Teachers

WE HAVE SEEN that the philosophies underlying the New Education are a composite of Deweyism and Marxism. On the pedagogical and social theories of John Dewey and his colleagues there has been grafted the economic and political doctrines of Karl Marx and his disciples. The fact that most of these ideas are unsound—that they would destroy much of the precious heritage of the American past—does not detract from the fatal fascination they have for many academic minds.

As occasion has seemed to warrant it, we have alluded to theories of the Frontier Thinkers at Teachers College, Columbia University, the spawning ground of the movement. We believe, however, that due to its importance, an excellent summary of their doctrines is in order. Fortunately, we have an able description of the central core of the Progressivist philosophies as this observer saw them develop “at the summit.” The summary is from the pen of Thomas F. Woodlock, former member of the Interstate Commerce Commission: ¹

1. We live in a universe without final ends, forms or assignable limits, either internally or externally, of which continuous evolutionary change is all that can be predicted.
2. Man is as much a product of this process as are all other visible things, and is strictly continuous with nature. There is nothing transcendent to the visible universe and man's home is within it. His thinking is a pure product of experience and cannot

transcend it. There is no such thing as metaphysics, which is merely a collection of empty dreams and idle fancies. Man has no soul, mind or reason as meta-physicians understand these words. Ideas are merely plans of operations to be performed, not statements of what is or has been. They are merely hypothesis. Experience evolves new standards and values. All human affairs whether personal or associative are merely the projections, continuations, complications of the nature which exists in the physical and pre-human world.

3. God as a Being does not exist; He is merely that unification of ideal Values that is essentially imaginative in origin when the imagination supervenes in conduct. There is no such thing as religion in any sense of relation to God. Faith in the sense in which Western civilization understood it is impossible for the "cultivated mind" of the Western world today.
4. There is no enduring moral law of fixed principles. Morals are purely social. The question of "ought" is merely one of better or worse in social affairs. The only moral end is an abundant life shared by all, achieved by growth itself. There are no absolute moral standards; the moral and the social quality of conduct are identical. . . . There is nothing absolutely and unchangingly good.

How did such philosophies gain acceptance in leading educational circles? Was it because of sudden loss of confidence by the American people in a school system which had done so much to build up our nation? Was there public demand for this drastic change? The fact that the "entire nation is pocked with battlefields in the war against modern education"² effectively answers that query. Then how did a system which our people neither understood nor wanted impose itself on our schools? A few of the answers have been given in these pages, but it remains to examine briefly some of the agencies which spread these ideas far and wide through the national school system, namely the teachers' colleges and training schools.

Space will permit reference to only one, but the most important of all such agencies: Teachers College, Columbia University, supposedly the fount of all wisdom for ambitious teachers. Since its establishment about seventy-nine years ago, this insti-

tution on Morningside Heights has developed into the most powerful educational center in the United States, if not in the world. It has launched a wide variety of educational experiments, many of unquestioned value; and it has espoused numerous programs and courses which have grown out of the radical tendencies of its many leftist leaders. Particularly during the 1930's, Teachers College was a hot-bed of radicalism. Indeed, as late as July 23, 1936, there was an organ "published by the Teachers College and Columbia University's Units of the Communist Party."³ As the reader knows, however, our main interest is in the socialists or Marxists *not* under Communist influence. At that time Teachers College was swarming with socialists or statists, of various hues and descriptions.

A few of the more influential pedagogues were Dr. William H. Kilpatrick, who taught Philosophy of Education; Dr. Harold Rugg, Professor of Education; Dr. Jesse H. Newlon, Director of the Lincoln School; Dr. Goodwin B. Watson, Professor of Educational Psychology; and Dr. George S. Counts, Professor of Education. With others, they met periodically and became known as the Kilpatrick Discussion Group, in honor of their "elder statesman," who appeared on this scene at least a decade before Rugg and any of the others.

Without a planned program, the group met with regularity through the 1930's, discussing "every phase of our culture." Even by 1932, "we had become a fairly cohesive group," Professor Rugg wrote, "taking our stand together for the general conception of the *welfare state*. . . ." ⁴ [Italics added] Rugg frequently acted as chairman of these conferences.

The reader is already familiar with the philosophies of most of these educators, expressed on numerous occasions. Now, however, they were in vital spots, the source of trained teachers for the entire nation. Let us briefly examine some of the doctrines of two top leaders at Teachers College—Kilpatrick and Rugg.

In his book, *Education and the Social Crisis*,⁵ Dr. Kilpatrick castigates our American economic system. He writes:

Our present economic practice is, to state it baldly, that in any mill, after the laborers have been paid as little as it has been possible to pay them, all responsibility to them ceases. . . . (p. 11) The problem then is practical: how to break the stranglehold of a competitive system which requires men to work against each other to their real hurt instead of working together for their truer good—and teaches them so. . . . (p. 16) The now outworn business system has become anti-social in its effects. As shown above, it refuses to let technology serve as it might. . . . Business as business cannot on the old competitive basis take account of the various inhuman effects which it entails; dividends and regard for the human element cannot be reconciled. . . . (p. 82)

Dr. Kilpatrick then discusses the drastic revisions required in the curriculum if the school system is to “bring the new day,” (new social order) with which we are already familiar. He then continues:

“On the newer social basis we must make over our whole traditional system, elementary, secondary and higher. . . .” (p. 55) “More specifically, the school should give, eventually, say *one-third* of its time to avowedly socially useful activities. . . .” (p. 60) “Next, *another third*, possibly, of school time should be given to the study of social life and institutions. The beginning may be along two lines, one already made familiar by the unified social science approach of Dr. Harold Rugg. . . .” (p. 61) [*Italics added*]

With two-thirds of his time devoted to social aims, no wonder Johnnie can't read or learn arithmetic or acquire other fundamental knowledge. And so we find that Dr. Kilpatrick—the dean of the Frontier Thinkers—is on the same team with Harold Rugg.

But Harold Rugg, ardent, able and indefatigable, was active outside his social science courses for school children. At Teachers College, Rugg for many years taught a course called “Educational Foundation.” Its announced purpose was to develop “artist teachers” suitably prepared to carry out the program of the New Educationists. Study of the course reveals a radically

materialistic philosophy, a most reactionary feature being its denial of certain natural and inalienable rights of man. In a syllabus entitled *Educational Foundations* used in this course (1936) we find this comment:

In our day, however, social and ethical theory has repudiated the doctrine of natural rights and the absolute freedom based on them in favor of rights and freedom granted only as their consequences are seen to warrant it. . . . We accordingly now think that rights and institutions and freedoms—all—derive their just authority from the way they work when tried. . . .

It is exactly on this point that discussion is now directed in this country. Some who profit by the old arrangements wish to maintain things as hitherto, and so invoke their outmoded "natural" rights to uphold the now hurtful freedoms they wish to exercise. Others demand thoroughgoing change. (p. 58)

By thus denying that individuals have any rights save those granted them by the state, the radicals at Teachers College struck directly at the foundation of our liberties—the doctrine of natural rights, the basic concept of our Constitution. This syllabus explains why they have done so. The reason, said Rugg, is that "our hangover 18th century answers are inadequate to meet the rottenness in our social, political, and financial life."

Kilpatrick and Rugg were important leaders but by no means exceptional in their leftist-liberal viewpoints. Many of their colleagues in Teachers College were of like mind. Under their leadership, the acquisition of *knowledge* in the Progressive schools became a relatively minor consideration.

And what of the teachers who, for decades, have beaten a path to Columbia University for advanced training, but often found themselves immersed in propaganda courses favoring anti-intellectual or un-American principles? Naturally, there was little inclination on their part to question the Progressivist gods on Morningside Heights, since an antagonistic attitude toward an official point of view would not be helpful in obtaining a

higher degree in pedagogy, an *essential* to advancement under the New Education.

For better or worse, just how far-reaching was the influence of Teachers College? "With 100,000 alumni, TC has managed to seat about one-third of the presidents or deans now in office at accredited U.S. teacher training schools," wrote James C. G. Conniff. "Its graduates make up about 20 percent of all our public school teachers. Over a fourth of the superintendents of schools in the 168 U.S. cities with at least 50,000 population are TC-trained. Roughly 84,000,000 people live in those cities. Their children—*your* children—to the number of a good 10,000,000 are thus from nine to three each day under the influence of Teachers College, Columbia University."³

As an indication of how far the "production line" of leftist doctrines had proceeded in most of our eighty teacher-training schools as early as 1935, we refer the reader to the results of a questionnaire⁶ by Dr. A. B. Raup, Teachers College, addressed to 2,000 members of seventy teacher-training institutions in the United States, posing questions to ascertain whether they favored "traditional conservatism in education in thought and practice," or the philosophy of experimentalism as held by Dewey, Kilpatrick and the naturalistic school of education.

Dr. Geoffrey O'Connell, who tabulated and classified the results of that survey stated: "This table shows us that about 50 per cent of these teachers favor, generally speaking, the naturalistic viewpoint. This means that about half of the instructors engaged in preparing future American teachers are familiar with and approve the naturalistic doctrines of Dewey, Kilpatrick and others."⁷ That was two decades ago and there is ample proof that these philosophies have penetrated far more deeply in teacher-training during the intervening years.

Of equal importance in the spread of the New Education is the establishment of a most comprehensive system of training and licensing for teachers to fit them for the movement. "Not

all who teach," writes Dr. Roelofs, "not even all who teach teachers to teach, accept this new doctrine; but those who do have captured control of most of the prominent schools of education, notably Teachers College at Columbia University. These men and women, through the system of training and licensing . . . have thus an unusual opportunity to propagate their ideas and to further the appointment of their most eager converts to positions in the public schools. All these leaders and converts are militant, energetic, with the fervor of fanatics."⁸

Slowly but surely over the years the program of the New Educationists became entrenched in our educational system. In accordance with the Master Plan, Rugg and other leftist-liberals wrote courses of instruction for schools. Courses for teachers were devised to sell them the philosophies, and in turn, to sell the children and the community. Teachers' colleges cooperated by making similar courses mandatory for those seeking advanced degrees. Qualifying teachers are rated as specialists in the social sciences and favorably recommended for advancement. It is a program cleverly designed to bind the new teachers coming out of the colleges to the Progressivist ideas by ties of self-interest and ambition.

Dewey's part in this revolution in education was vital for he first breached the walls of Essentialist education. ". . . Despite his [Dewey's] own unquestioned intellectual stature and integrity," wrote Albert Lynd, "his educational doctrines have opened in our schools a door wide enough to admit a legion of pedagogical boon-dogglers. . . . In actuality, by the testimony of their own vapid utterances, the typical graduates in Education today are the least fitted of any group in the community to assume the responsibility for re-creating its cultural aspirations."⁹

NOTES

1. *Wall Street Journal*, December 27, 1940.
2. Dean Ernest O. Melby, *American Education Under Fire* (New York: 1951), p. 7.

3. James C. G. Conniff, "The Teachers College Story," *American Legion Magazine*, June, 1953, p. 22.
4. Harold Rugg, *That Men May Understand* (New York: Doubleday-Doran & Co., Inc., 1941), pp. 155-156.
5. William H. Kilpatrick, *Education and the Social Crisis* (New York: Liveright, Inc., 1932).
6. *Bulletin* No. 10, U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C., 1933.
7. Geoffrey O'Connell, *Naturalism in Education* (New York: Benzi-ger Bros.).
8. *The Southern Review*, Vol. V, No. 2, Autumn, 1939.
9. Albert Lynd, *Quackery in the Public Schools* (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1953), pp. 207-208.

Leadership of the New Education

THE FRONTIER THINKERS were keenly aware of the fact that any program which wishes to succeed in America must enlist the support of the opinion leaders of the country. Perhaps the most frightening feature of the whole New Education movement has been its unerring ability to win to its support the people who count in American education. Its primary appeal has been made not to the profession as a whole but to the educational hierarchy.

The leadership strategy of the Frontier Thinkers was spelled out in the Master Plan, *Conclusions and Recommendations*:

3. As often repeated, the first step is to awaken and consolidate leadership around the philosophy and purpose of education herein expounded—leadership among administrators, teachers, boards of trustees, college and normal school presidents—thinkers and workers in every field of education and the social sciences. Signs of such an awakening and consolidation of leadership are already abundantly evident: in the resolutions on instruction in the social sciences adopted in 1933 by the Department of Superintendence of the NEA at Minneapolis, and by the Association itself at Chicago: in the activities of the United States Commissioner of Education during the past few years: and in almost every local or national meeting of representatives of the teaching profession. (p. 145)

It was from this huge educational field that these pedagogues proposed to draw their leaders, but their grand plan was even

more ambitious. They realized that effective leadership to sell the program must come from outside the profession—from popular writers, publishing houses, book reviewers, newspapers, library groups, etc.

The frequently heard jibe that the Frontier Thinkers were merely impractical, fuzzy-minded dreamers found sharp refutation in the surprisingly practical way in which they pursued the nation's opinion arbiters. The publicity plan which they followed was also a clever one. It comprised two main attacks on national public opinion:

1. Abuse and public discrediting of all, within and without the teaching profession, who actively opposed their objectives, including the tactics of the smear.
2. Loud and intensive civil liberties campaigns to defend teachers who attempted to introduce the New Education program into the schools in defiance of local or official opposition.

This emotional exploitation of the civil liberties, or "academic freedom" (Chapter IX), issue has been a principal stock-in-trade of these new-world-makers in their wooing of public support during the last three decades. What has happened was foreshadowed in *Conclusions and Recommendations*: "In order that the individual teacher, out of loyalty to this supreme ideal of the social science instruction, may be protected against the assaults of ignorant majorities, heresy-hunting minorities, and all self-constituted guardians of public morals and thought, the profession as a whole must make provision for the review of controversies, thus arising, by trained specialists competent to pass judgment upon the scholarship, subject matter and manner of presentation in question." (p. 133)

And also: "in the case of unfair or unwise dismissal the profession must be prepared to conduct energetic and appropriate inquiries and, by resort to the courts if necessary, see that justice is done, damages assessed and reinstatement achieved." The assumption here is that the teacher in trouble and his protecting organization will be the sole judges of what is unfair and

unwise, and of what constitutes justice in such cases. The paramount interest of the public is ignored.

It is this feature of the Master Plan which the National Education Association appears to be following by its intrusion into many local controversies. A striking recent instance was the sending of a committee to Houston, Texas, where its interference was resented and its mission a failure. That these politico-educators are prepared to ride roughshod over opposition in such dismissal controversies is shown by their admission in the Master Plan that "there is every reason for believing that this period of adjustment will be marked by struggle and uncertainty. . . ."

The success of the New Educationists in winning high level support for their program has been striking. They have won the partial or total backing of a veritable network of important national organizations in the educational and cultural fields. Concerning a single one of these bodies, the American Council of Learned Societies, Norman Dodd¹ has told us that it comprises 24 constituent societies, including the American Historical Association. Another, the Social Science Research Council, comprises 7 societies. Yet another, the American Council on Education, includes 79 constituent members, 64 associate members and 954 institutional members. These influential organizations all have close ties with the richly endowed foundations.

But it is inside the professional educational organizations that they have won their most influential following. The teachers' organizations have such an inherent public interest that it is a distressing fact that they have allied themselves so closely with the special interest of the New Educationists. Particularly, this is true of the National Education Association which, with its half-million active and its close-to-a-million affiliated members, is the most authentic voice of the public school teacher.

The NEA is today the active leader in the struggle to fasten the "modern" philosophy and teaching techniques on the American school. It has largely taken over the fight formerly spear-

headed by such radical organizations as the Progressive Education Association and the John Dewey Society. Since 1940, when it officially championed the New Education, the NEA has borne the brunt of the fight.

Not that the average public school teacher, who pays his dues into the NEA as his official professional organization, has consciously adopted its educational philosophy. He has simply gone along trustingly with his officers. The capture of the NEA and its powerful publicity machinery by the leftist-liberal faction was accomplished by winning over the controlling NEA officers. As in all organizations, the NEA permanent secretariat is in a position to shape and direct virtually all organization policies, regardless of the annual conventions. Throughout the 1930's, the Progressivists skillfully and successfully wooed these officials. In this effort they had the powerful assistance of Dr. Willard E. Givens, who became the executive secretary of the NEA.

The John Dewey Society and the Progressive Education Association (later, the American Education Fellowship) were the pioneers and spearheads of this drive. During the years of their leadership, they broke down many formidable barriers to the advance of their credo. But they had the weakness of all self-proclaimed propaganda organizations—they aroused suspicion and counter-opposition among unconvinced educators. What was needed, the New Educationist leaders recognized, was a more important and non-controversial name under which to carry on their crusade. The most effective name for this task was that of the NEA. In the 1934 NEA Convention, the leftist-liberals scored a monumental victory in the adoption by the NEA Department of Superintendence of a declaration, *Education for the New America*, which called for socialization of the "credit agencies, the basic industries and [the] utilities." Dr. Givens chaired the reporting committee.

After this first crash-through, the activities of these leaders were pointed more and more toward the use of the NEA as

the sounding board of the movement, while the John Dewey Society and the Progressive Education Association gradually receded into the background. In this strategy the Progressivist leaders were showing rare wisdom. Incorporated under federal charter by an Act of Congress in 1906, the NEA enjoyed tax exemption and a commanding influence over the educational policies of the nation. It won this status because it was recognized as a semi-public institution, serving as the voice of the great body of American teachers. In allying itself with the New Educationists, the NEA abandoned this honored status and allowed itself to become the spokesman of a special group. Instead of reflecting the interests of the public as a whole, it began to make propagandic war against the portion of the public which disapproved the New Education and its aims. It allowed its prestige to be used to further a program which had been conceived by men and women who disbelieved in many traditional ideals and principles of our Republic.

Fortunately, the dissident teachers began to hit back with organized action. In 1938, Dr. Milo F. McDonald, for many years the principal of a New York City high school, formed the American Education Association, the expressed aims of which were to "emphasize the need of restoring worthy standards to the public school systems of New York." With a leadership of public school teachers, the AEA has grown steadily during the past nineteen years.

Also in 1938, a group of parents who had seen what was happening organized in New York the Guardians of American Education, Inc., with Augustin G. Rudd as chairman and Alfred T. Falk, E. H. West and Alice Butterfield, vice-chairmen. Its purpose was that of:

An independent organization dedicated to preserving the principles of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States in our schools and colleges . . . a non-profit, non-political and non-sectarian organization.

Seeing that the social science program was the key to the New Education, the GAE carefully analyzed and evaluated the courses of Dr. Harold Rugg, at that time used in thousands of schools. Their findings appeared in the 45-page booklet *Undermining Our Republic* (1940). One booklet and a press release, featuring Rugg's attack on advertising, were sent to every daily newspaper in the United States, and otherwise widely distributed. Its effect was little short of sensational—a combination of amazement and indignation. Subsequent printings brought the total to 100,000 booklets, including 25,000 distributed by Roscoe Peacock, of Naples, New York.

Many other individuals and organizations participated in this campaign to save our public schools from the New Education. The Advertising Federation of America issued a study by Alfred T. Falk pointing out misstatements in a Rugg textbook, *An Introduction to the Problems of American Culture*. In this book Rugg attacked advertising as an institution (Chapter VII). The National Association of Manufacturers Educational Commission, headed by Dr. Ralph W. Robey, in December, 1940, completed an exhaustive analysis of nearly 600 social science textbooks and released its critique to the country.¹

Through a resolution passed (1938) by the Willaim Bradford Turner Post, No. 265, of Garden City, New York, the American Legion became interested in the subject and directed its National Americanism Commission to conduct an investigation. Upon receiving its report, the Commission launched a nationwide campaign to alert all posts. It supported this drive with a series of scholarly booklets entitled *Rugg Philosophy Analyzed* (1941). These were supplemented with many hard-hitting and well-documented articles on the New Education appearing in the *American Legion Magazine*, which has maintained its vigorous fight for sound public school education up to the present time. Many patriotic societies, led by the Sons of the American Revolution, and scores of veterans', civic and business organizations enlisted in this cause.

All of this cumulative activity aroused school boards and citizens throughout the nation to a realization of what was happening in the classrooms of America. Protests multiplied and Progressivist-slanted textbooks were removed from hundreds of schools. These developments caused consternation among the New Educationists who appealed to the National Education Association for help.

War on the Dissenters

On February 24, 1941, in response to a petition from educators, Dr. Donald Dushane, president of the NEA, announced the appointment of a committee to investigate criticisms of textbooks, teachers and school systems; to study the groups conducting attacks; to discover the source of their funds, and to take appropriate action against them. A substantial fund was granted the committee for its activities. At first Dr. Dushane's announcement was greeted with hope by those who were concerned over the Frontier Thinkers' maneuvers in education. It was anticipated that the NEA, in the interest of its good name, would make a fair and painstaking probe of the whole movement. But disappointment was in store.

The committee Dr. Dushane appointed turned out to be the Commission for the Defense of Democracy Through Education—the so-called Defense Commission. Instead of investigating the very obvious causes of revolt, the Commission addressed itself to scathing attacks upon the citizens who had raised the issues. The Commission became a "defense" organization, not for "democracy through education," but for the militant New Educationists who were engaged in undermining the very foundations of our system of public education. With the passing years, this Commission assumed a more unqualified position in support of the Progressivists.

In July, 1950, Dr. Harold Benjamin, chairman of the Commission, issued his brazen *Defense Bulletin* No. 35. This bulletin could appropriately be called the NEA's war communique, since

it describes public opposition groups as "the enemy," and bristles with bellicose and offensive statements throughout. Some revealing passages from the *Bulletin* are:

Your Defense Commission is a kind of educational reconnaissance troop, and it has a combat-intelligence report to give you tonight. It is the estimate of the Commission that a general attack on public education in the United States is now being organized. The enemy is trying our line with a number of local, probing raids, attempting to find out where we are weak or strong, testing his methods of attack, recruiting and training his forces, building up his stockpiles, filling his war chest, and organizing his propaganda units.

It is important to note that Dr. Benjamin shrewdly describes the attack on the New Educationists as an attack on "public education," the assumption being that those who disapprove the aims of this cult are against public education itself. In logic this trick is known as the device of the transposed subject.

In a call to battle against the "enemy," the Commission chairman then uttered these crackling words:

The enemy in this campaign that seems to be impending is stronger than he looks. If we get our combat team together, however, get the information it needs for its decisions swiftly and accurately before it, even a stronger army than this one would make hardly more than a ripple in . . . our advance.²

This is truly an amazing document. The NEA, supposedly an objective public organization, is made by Dr. Benjamin to announce a new offensive in the war on millions of Americans. As an example of this war, Dr. Benjamin cited the controversy over Dr. Goslin which had arisen in the school system of Pasadena, California. It was a poor illustration for the Commission's purposes.

The Pasadena Story

So much misinformation has been published in the national magazines about the Pasadena incident that an accurate summary

of what actually happened would be in place. In 1948, the Superintendent of Schools of Pasadena, California, retired and was replaced by Dr. Willard E. Goslin. An ardent Progressive educator, Dr. Goslin quickly set himself to the task of remaking the Pasadena schools. As his consultant, Dr. Goslin called in Dr. William H. Kilpatrick, of Teachers College, Columbia University, one of the major prophets of "modern education." Together they worked out a plan to make Pasadena schools a paragon of Progressivism.

A committee of Pasadena parents described this audacious attempt as follows:

Dr. Kilpatrick proposed that our children "learn what they live" by means of an experience curriculum. To our astonishment he stated that there is to be no subject matter as such, and no set program of instruction. There would be no periods of the day devoted to the teaching of subjects. In fact, reading, writing, spelling, grammar, arithmetic, history, etc. aren't to be taught separately at all. Instead, the children are to select what they like as projects upon which to work.

With this new approach to teaching go the proposals of avoiding any system of marks or report cards. There would be no examinations. There would be no promotion as such. It was suggested that children remain with a given teacher for a few years, working on classroom projects which grew from the pupil's own interests. This would give rise to incidental learning rather than imposing upon the child any systematic learning of basic skills and fundamental education.³

This fantastic program, together with a bond issue to finance it, was presented to the people of Pasadena in a special school election. The issue was searchingly discussed. The Progressivist plan was voted down by the electorate by the decisive count of 22,210 to 10,032. After this repudiation, Dr. Goslin's contract was not renewed. The whole issue was one of home rule in education and should rightly have been of no concern to outsiders. However, this rejection of the New Education touched

off the vicious attack of the NEA Commission, characterizing the good citizens of Pasadena as "the enemy."

Los Angeles Also Rejects the New Educationists

Meanwhile, in the neighboring city of Los Angeles, an especial point of infiltration by the Progressivists, the School Board began to wake up to what was happening. The Board conducted a survey which disclosed some uncomfortable facts. It found that after a thorough try-out of Progressive Education in Los Angeles, these were some of the end-products:

Eighteen per cent of 11,000 juniors covered in the questionnaire didn't know how many months there are in a year.

Sixteen per cent don't know how many three cent stamps you can buy for seventy-five cents.

Five per cent failed to answer correctly the question, "What is one half of seventy?"

Fifty per cent did not know how many United States Senators are permitted from each state. . . .

Three per cent couldn't tell time.

The test was given to all students with an IQ of 75 or higher. Parent groups have criticized the school system's use of "progressive educational methods." ⁴

When the Los Angeles School Board attempted to correct this intolerable situation, it became the target of vitriolic attacks by the ruling New Education group in the NEA. Like the people of Pasadena, the Los Angeles Board became an "enemy of public education." Anyone who attempts to criticize or oppose these crusading educators becomes *ipso facto* an enemy to be smeared and denounced by the Defense Commission or by other belligerent outfits.

The type of propaganda which the NEA supports to discredit the Essentialists is seen in the booklet *American Education Under Fire—The Story of the Phony Three-R Fight* (1951) by Dr. Ernest O. Melby of New York University. This book-

let was sponsored by the National Commission for the Defense of Democracy Through Education, the National Education Association, the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, NEA, the American Education Fellowship, and the John Dewey Society.

In this booklet, Dr. Melby uses such smear expressions as "book burners," "cheaters of children," "those who want to destroy the course of education," "dishonest and destructive," "the professional enemy," etc., to describe his opponents. By implication he attempts to convey the impression that the fight against the revolution in education is inspired by certain religious denominations.

Another monograph emanating from the NEA which resorts to an attack on opponents is the article, "They Sow Distrust," one of a series authored by Robert A. Skaife, field secretary of the NEA Defense Commission.⁵ This article lists as "fronts" some of the organizations which have opposed the Progressivists and declares categorically that they could become "as dangerous as the Communist groups." Mr. Skaife cites a booklet issued by one of these organizations (the Guardians of American Education) as having been advertised or promoted by the *subversive* press. Coupled with the listing of this organization as a front, the implication is unmistakable that the loyalty and patriotism of this group are questionable, although its leaders had openly and unqualifiedly fought Communism since 1933. Despite the obvious unfairness of Mr. Skaife's article, it was reprinted in huge quantities and distributed widely.

Yet another example of the same technique is the NEA leaflet, *Danger! They're After Our Schools*, issued in 1952 from NEA headquarters in Washington by the Defense Commission, and sponsored by the usual interlocking NEA commissions and collaborating societies. The object of this leaflet is to fasten the label of "enemies of public education" upon all who disapprove Progressivism. It describes the activities of the *Essentialists* and some of their leaders in the following terms:

. . . this is a malicious campaign. It claims as its victims the children and the future of the nation. . . . It has one aim—the destruction of modern education. . . . “For some selfish or subversive reason, they do not want the American people to become too well-educated,” explains Edward M. Tuttle.

- confirmed subversives who want to destroy free public education in order to undermine our democratic way of life.
- unreasonable parents who try to blame all their children’s shortcomings on the schools.
- racketeers who . . . milk unsuspecting citizens.

The many outstanding and courageous members of the teaching profession who have opposed this reactionary and unsound program are dismissed contemptuously as “disgruntled teachers who have not kept abreast of the latest educational methods and attempt to justify their own shortcomings.” Included also is this slur on all the patriotic movements which have fought against the New Education: “Look behind the patriotic-sounding names and examine the records of individuals and groups attacking our public schools.”

The NEA does not halt with the issuance of its own polemic publications in its attempt to silence the Essentialist opposition. In numerous instances the NEA has given its powerful cooperation to authors who have written slanted articles on education in national magazines; and it has aided in widespread distribution of reprints.

A needed antidote to this NEA literature was the series of eyewitness accounts by Howard Whitman published by *Collier's* magazine (1954). Mr. Whitman, a journalist of high standing, did not content himself with an official NEA version of the school controversy, although he carefully studied its documents and pronouncements. Mr. Whitman spent eight months in the field painstakingly accumulating factual data on the American schools. His findings contrasted sharply with those of the NEA. He found a deplorable condition of wrecked discipline, soft and

inadequate education and overstress of social studies, etc., throughout the country.

In some places Mr. Whitman saw a condition of actual controversial terrorism against those who spoke out against the NEA-favored programs. In an address he declared:

"Second to the seriousness of debates over education," he declared, "came the revelation to me, as I went from city to city, of a rather frightening trend . . . the muzzling of critics. . . . I have found throughout the United States that people who dared to stand up and criticize the public schools did so, ladies and gentlemen, *at their peril*. . . . Moreover, I have received scores of letters from teachers who said they dared not sign their names because it would be their professional careers if they did. I have received hundreds of letters from parents who said they dared not raise their voices in their own communities because of the reprisals which would be taken against them; they would be smeared; they would be accused of being 'enemies of the public schools.'"

Howard Whitman summed up his impressions by stating:

I have heard everywhere the label of "enemy of the public schools" plastered upon people who want only the *improvement* of the public schools. . . . The critics I met . . . were not enemies of the public schools. They did, however, oppose a group in this country which has attempted, and to a great extent succeeded, in controlling the public schools and in dominating them with a philosophy that does not represent all the American people and, in my opinion, does not represent even a near majority of them.⁶

The condition which a fair-minded observer like Whitman discovered is largely the fault of the NEA. The NEA could have conducted an ethical fight in the American tradition against those who disagreed with it, had it chosen to do so, in 1941, when it appointed the Defense Commission. Instead, it chose to place the statement of the case in the hands of intemperate men who turned the whole debate into a disgraceful smear. It condoned the nation-wide campaign of intimidation and abuse against rank-and-file teachers and parents. The NEA declined to make the balanced inquiry into both sides of the Progres-

sivist debate which the nation had a right to expect from an influential public institution.

Because the NEA leaders have chosen to become partisans in this school controversy, the task of those who championed sound education is immeasurably harder. For the fact must be faced that the NEA represents immense mobilized power in educational circles. It is organized in every state and major community. Its contacts lead into all important segments of our society. It maintains a powerful lobby in Washington, and in most of the state capitals. With an estimated annual income of \$5,000,000 at the disposal of a small army of capable men and women, trained in public relations and having close contact with numerous vested interests in the educational industry—which is next to the largest in the nation—the NEA has, in effect, become a giant monopoly, with power to intimidate and punish those who get in its way. The New Educationists acted astutely when they snuggled under the wing of the NEA and persuaded it to fight their battles.

But the NEA itself has not fared as well. It has felt obliged not only to defend an anti-intellectual and defective educational program but also has engaged in a "war" on a large segment of the American people.

NOTES

1. *Abstracts of Social Science Textbooks* (New York: National Association of Manufacturers, December 31, 1940).
2. *Eighth Report*, Senate Investigating Committee on Education, California Legislature, 1951, pp. 93-96.
3. Catherine Hallberg and Louise H. Padelford, "The Pasadena Story," *Congressional Record*, July 26, 1951.
4. *New York World-Telegram*, November 26, 1951.
5. *The Nation's Schools*, January, 1951.
6. "Speak Up, Silent People." Address, National Education Program, Searcy, Arkansas, April 14, 1954.

The Influence of Foundations

THE AMAZING ADVANCE of the New Education is due largely to the fact that it has been generously underwritten and subsidized by money. Paradoxically, the money has been capitalist money. It has been the money of huge, tax-exempt foundations.

Few would question that a foundation, carefully administered and dedicated to some worthy purpose, is a praiseworthy American institution. The dedication of our great fortunes to the doing of good is an inspiring spectacle, for they have enriched the quality of life the world over.

Nevertheless, it is only too obvious that foundations have made some major mistakes. Because their administrative staffs are usually recruited from the colleges and learned bodies, most foundations have a tendency to take an academic and sometimes naive view of American life. They have frequently been victimized by scheming men with ulterior motives. It is symptomatic that the Institute of Pacific Relations, while it was under pro-Communist influence, obtained from two top foundations, the Rockefeller Foundation and the Carnegie Foundation, the huge total sum of approximately \$1,800,000. It cannot be forgotten that the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace elected Alger Hiss as director at a time when his pro-Communist dossier was in the hands of the FBI; and such unseasoned foundations as the Fund for the Republic have underwritten a

whole series of anti-anti-Communist activities. The foundation record bristles with such blunders.*

The New Educationists have profited richly from this foundation responsiveness to the leftist-liberal approach, only a sampling of which can be cited in this volume. One of the most glaring instances was the financing, by the Carnegie Corporation, of the study by the American Historical Association which culminated in the Master Plan of the Progressivists, discussed in this book.

The history of this grant is a curious example of the irresponsibility of some of the foundation money-givers. The project was authorized in 1926, and the study stretched out over a period of six years ending in 1932. First and last, the Carnegie Corporation allocated \$340,000 to the undertaking. Its revolutionary *Conclusions and Recommendations* was made public in 1934. In view of the fact that this volume was the spark which ignited most of the New Educational events which followed, it would not be an inaccuracy to say that the Carnegie Corporation financed the beginning of this movement in America.

That the Corporation was proud of its part in this blue-print for socialism is shown by the statement from the report of its president (1934): "both the educational world and the public at large owe a debt of gratitude both to the [American Historical] Association for having sponsored this important and timely study in a field of peculiar difficulty, and to the distinguished men and women who served on the Commission."

Despite the use to which the leftist educators put this grant in projecting the revolution in education, the Carnegie Corporation to this date has expressed no regret. On the contrary Charles Dollard, president, recently declared: "The worst that can be said is that the authors not only reported this trend but appeared to accept it cheerfully. What they were accepting was

* Alger Hiss was also a director of the Woodrow Wilson Foundation, the World Peace Foundation, the American Institute of Pacific Relations, the American Peace Society and the American Association of the United Nations.

not socialism—it was the New Deal.”¹ But the facts are that this project was started in 1926 and *completed before the New Deal took office*.

“*Building America*” Textbooks

Another venture into highly debatable territory by the foundations was the financing by the Rockefeller Foundation of the *Building America* textbooks to the tune of \$50,000. This series was sponsored by the Department of Supervision and Curriculum Development of the NEA when it “absorbed” the Society of Curriculum Study on March 1, 1943. The textbooks were originally issued in separate units like a magazine. Later they were bound together and issued as a textbook for seventh and eighth grade pupils.

Of this curious textbook series, an investigating committee of the California Senate declared . . . “the *Building America* books to be unfit for use in our schools.” The committee alleged that the texts included the writings of fifty authors who had known Communist-front affiliations. In a statement issued by the Sons of the American Revolution, of California, the series was described as a “subversive publication in that it undermines principles essential to our form of government.”²

And yet with that inexplicable dichotomy that one so often encounters in the egghead mind, *Building America* was “adopted” by the NEA and financed by the Rockefeller Foundation.

Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences

Three funds, the Rockefeller Foundation, the Carnegie Foundation and the Russell Sage Foundation, combined to grant \$600,000 to finance the preparation of the *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*. This publication has had a profound influence upon educators. It is the final authority to which appeal is made regarding any question in the field of the social sciences.³

Alvin Johnson, who was selected as associate editor of the

Encyclopedia by the foundations, has admitted that three of his sub-editors were socialists or Marxists. With an irresponsibility surprising in a work of such ostensible scholarship, preparation of some of the most important articles in the book on radical movements was assigned to notorious partisans of those movements. No apparent attempt at objectivity was made in the controversial sections. And yet this misleading book carried in its preface the sponsorship of the American Economic Association, the American Historical Association, the American Political Science Association, the American Sociological Society and the National Education Association.

Citizenship Educational Courses

One of the most questionable undertakings of the foundations was the Citizenship Educational Project which was administered by Teachers College, Columbia University. The facts are reported by Frank Hughes in the *Chicago Tribune*, August 12-16, 1951. To finance this project the Carnegie Corporation granted \$1,417,550 to Teachers College during 1949-1951. The Carnegie grant played directly into the hands of the ambitious leftist-liberals at Teachers College.

Although it was packaged as a teacher-aid project, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the "Citizenship" program was consciously designed to further thought-control among high school and grade school pupils. The project centered around the preparation of a kit of materials for use by civics teachers, including a file of 1,046 index cards. Each card contains a summary of the position of a book or pamphlet on social, economic or political issues, upon which Americans are divided in their opinions, to guide the teacher in presenting such problems to his or her class. The inevitable consequence of such an approved card index was to hand to the teacher a predetermined list of the books which pupils should be urged to read on controversial subjects.

Seldom, if ever, have responsible educators advanced a scheme

fraught with such possibilities for censorship and book black-listing. This is true regardless of the conservative or radical inclinations of the reviewer, because the prestige of the school supports the opinion. It places before the impressionable teenagers in the schools an official public school line on controversial national issues.

B. Carroll Reece, chairman of the House Committee of the 83rd Congress to Investigate Tax-exempt Foundations, had this to say about the card index:

... it is slanted toward the Left. . . . Examination of the 1950 card file shows that the great majority of books and other items selected for summary and annotation are leftist, liberal and internationalist in their viewpoint. . . . Actually there are only about two dozen cards [out of a total of 1,046] which refer to material that is conservative in outlook. . . . Thus, the teacher who uses this card file has very few items to contrast against the liberal, left-wing and internationalist items. In addition, leftist materials . . . are most often annotated as "factual" and the few rightist materials are most often annotated as "opinionated."⁴

A revealing example of the slanted nature of the card index is found in the glaring contrast between the two cards which referred to the conservative *Chicago Tribune* and the card which referred to the New Deal *Louisville Courier Journal*. The cards which summarized books attacking the *Tribune* referred to the newspaper as "like Russia, big, totalitarian, successful, dominated by one man" and stated that it has "caused the supplanting of political boss rule by an 'ultra-respectable and ultra-reactionary newspaper' that is not beholden to anyone except its owner or the financial interest that controls it." The card dealing with the *Courier Journal* lauded the way in which its publisher, Mark Ethridge, helped establish the "right moral climate" for Kentucky. It says: "All changes point toward a greater Kentucky whose citizens can justly be proud of their achievement in making it a better place to live."

Dr. William S. Vincent, director of the project, was asked

"where the authors and sources were which counteracted the outpouring of left-wing doctrines," wrote Frank Hughes. "Actually, there is a very light sprinkling of references to conservative materials—perhaps 25 cards out of the files of 1,046. . . . Dr. Vincent was handed a list of more than thirty books, most of them recent and popular which contain factual and devastating indictments of New Deal foreign and domestic policy, of socialism and of communism and its infiltration into American government. He could find only two . . . on the revised card file." ⁵

The use of Carnegie Foundation money to finance such a stacked leftist project is certainly something to make the outspokenly anti-socialist Andrew Carnegie turn over in his grave.

NEA-conducted Project

The Reece Committee turned up an incredible grant of \$17,500 by the General Education Board in 1940 to the National Association of Secondary School Principals and the National Council for the Social Studies, both divisions of the NEA. The grant was to finance the preparation of several teaching units which would provide teachers with source material on social problems.

Despite the highly controversial nature of the subject, the two NEA bodies assigned the preparation of the unit on *The American Way of Business* to Oscar Lange and Abba P. Lerner. Lange is reported to be an official of the Red Government in Poland. Lerner is a well-known socialist. Together, the authors turned out a unit which was a subtle attack upon free enterprise. And yet these two NEA bodies saw nothing unethical in turning over the treatment of our American capitalist system to two leftists who were hardened disbelievers in capitalism. The product of their labors was then offered to public school social science teachers as their officially-approved teaching guide.

Grants to Educators by Large Foundations

The size of the financial support the foundations have given to organizations which have cooperated with the New Education-

ists can be envisaged by a tabulation of some of the totals. Including only six of the largest foundations (the Carnegie Corporation, the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, the Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, The General Education Board, the Rockefeller Foundation and the Ford Foundation), the partial totals are as follows:

<i>Associations Receiving Grants</i>	<i>Period</i>	<i>Amount</i>
American Council on Education	1920-1952	\$ 6,119,700
American Historical Association	1923-1952	574,800
American Council of Learned Societies	1924-1952	5,113,800
National Academy of Sciences (including National Research Council)	1915-1952	20,715,800
National Education Association	1916-1952	1,229,000
Progressive Education Association	1932-1943	4,257,800
Social Science Research Council	1925-1952	11,747,800
<i>.Specific University Grants</i>		
Teachers College, Columbia University	1923-1952	8,398,176
Lincoln School-Columbia University	1917-1952	6,821,100

From 1902 to 1950 the Rockefeller Foundation and the General Education Board gave a total in excess of \$256,553,493 to universities and colleges and \$33,789,569 to individual fellowships. Although these are two of the largest foundations, their wealth is only a fraction of the vast resources of the tax-exempt foundations. Rep. B. Carroll Reece reported to the 83rd Congress: "There are presently some 7,000 foundations with assets in excess of \$10 billion and with an annual income in excess of \$300 million."

Most of these eleemosynary institutions are little known to the public, but of six leaders distributing huge wealth, we have the aforesaid definite information of educational grants, the field in which this study is interested primarily. The millions that filled the coffers of the Progressive Education Association, the NEA, and other organizations, directly or indirectly, have supported the costly failure known as the New Education. The reader is already familiar with the objectives and major activities

of the PEA, yet it received a total of \$4,257,800 from these foundations in eleven years. And the NEA, in the midst of its "war" on a large segment of the public, received \$1,229,000.

Of the \$8,398,176 allotted to Lincoln School, how much went to support Harold Rugg's social science courses, then being developed but later removed from hundreds of schools? Rugg has boasted of Rockefeller aid "for nine years" at that time.

Teachers College of Columbia University, a veritable incubator for leftist educators and their schemes, received \$8,398,176 from these sources. Its activities and those of other organizations in behalf of the New Education are recounted in earlier chapters.

But what of funds to aid the opposing side in this vital controversy? Although all these millions have been forthcoming freely for the leftist-liberal causes, has anyone heard of a substantial grant from leading foundations to protect the basic principles of our American way of life? Take the Essentialists, for instance. They have been ignored and their appeals have been in vain.

This favoritism to leftist educational causes is no oversight. Such has been the fact for decades in leading foundations. That it represents bad judgment and irresponsibility on the part of the administrators of these huge tax-exempt organizations is obvious. But to many it is far more serious. They see a real threat to the future of our Republic in this huge wealth at the disposal of many who have demonstrated their enmity to many of our most cherished ideals and principles, particularly our free economy of free men. At any rate, this golden stream to leftist causes has created a truly fantastic situation: Tens of millions of capitalist dollars have been used to undermine or destroy the economic system which gave them birth!

NOTES

1. *Proceedings*, Special Committee to Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations, U.S. House of Representatives, 83rd Congress, 1954.

2. *The Betrayal of America*, California Society, Sons of the American Revolution, pp. 1-2.
3. Hearings, Special Committee to Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations, U.S. House of Representatives, 83rd Congress, 1954.
4. *Report*, Special Committee to Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations, U.S. House of Representatives, August 3, 1953.
5. *Chicago Tribune*, August 13, 1951.

CHAPTER XXVII

Parents and Teachers

IMPLICIT IN THE writings and statements of the New Educationists is the design of centralizing policies and procedures of our public school system, with themselves charting the course. Already far advanced, continuation of this trend could reduce the role of the people largely to that of approving the recommendations of the teacher administrators and to raising the money for the school establishment. Such a limited role, of course, is contrary to our highly successful traditional policy of home rule of our schools. It would shrivel the authority of local school boards, which is precisely what is desired by some of these pedagogues, who have shown that they have no confidence in the competence of Americans to run their own schools. In keeping with this design is the insistent effort to get the federal government to subsidize public education, with the threat of eventual federal control.

Nicholas Murray Butler, while president of Columbia University, foresaw this trend in 1921 and warned the Columbia trustees against it. "A school system that grows naturally in response to the needs and ambitions of a hundred thousand different localities," he wrote, "will be a better school system than any which can be imposed upon those localities by the aid of grants of public money from the federal treasury, accompanied

by federal regulations, federal inspections, federal reports and federal uniformities.”¹

The hostile attitude of some New Educationists toward school boards reveals the real animus behind their disarming declarations. Note the following statement by a committee of Progressive Educators:

Even the tax-payers have no special claim on the schools; they are but the tax-collectors of society; ultimately school revenues come from all who labor by hand or brain. This the teachers should never forget. Their loyalty, therefore, goes to the great body of the laboring population—to the farmers, the industrial workers and the other members of the producing classes of the nation. They owe nothing to the present economic system, except to improve it; they owe nothing to any privileged caste, except to strip it of its privileges.²

The Master Plan, under the heading “The Redistribution of Power,” more cautiously expresses the same idea. “The ordinary board of education . . . with the exception of the rural district board, is composed for the most part of business and professional men; the ordinary rural district board is composed almost altogether of landholders . . . in both instances, its membership is apt to be peculiarly rooted in the economic individualism of the 19th Century.”³

To overcome this existent situation, the Master Plan proposes: “. . . the teaching profession as a whole will have to organize, develop a theory of its social function and create certain instrumentalities indispensable to the realization of its aims.” Nothing could be more transparent than this plan of action which has been supported by the educational hierarchy since 1934.

And what are the “certain instrumentalities” to be created? Certainly the National Education Association’s “combat teams” which operate widely throughout the nation fall within this category. Other “instrumentalities” have been set up to “bring the teachers and parents closer together.” To expedite this, the

NEA has set up another committee to coordinate NEA activities and contacts with lay groups.

Dr. Glenn E. Snow, the chairman of this committee, described the project in a magazine article:

Among our closest partners are three national organizations—the National Congress of Parents and Teachers (PTA), National School Boards Association, and the National Citizens Committee for the Public Schools.⁴

Dr. Snow was specific in his designation of the groups which the NEA regarded as the enemy. "Tax-paying groups organize to reduce taxes," he wrote. "Super-patriotic groups organize to protect principles of government and personal and group interests. Such forces frequently interfere with the *sacred right* and duty of teachers in a democracy to teach the truth as they see it." [Italics added]

In allying itself with such community-centered organizations as the eight-million-member Parent Teachers Association, it will be seen that the NEA could muster strong local support for its announced "war" (Chap. XXV) on opponents of its programs. At the same time, the PTA itself has been carefully shorn of the power to make trouble for the New Educationists. The by-laws of the National Parent Teachers Association declare that "local units . . . shall not seek to direct the administrative activities of the schools or to control their policies." The tiny, and easily controlled, group in charge of National and State PTA Congresses "has practical power to manipulate the entire organization."⁵

In practice, most local PTA's have become little better than rubber stamps of the school administrators. Their meetings are dominated, not by parents, but by teachers, who carefully channel all discussion away from controversial issues. When some local PTA bodies in California and Indiana attempted to act in defiance of this teacher-controlled policy, they were quickly reminded of the by-laws and their protests were ruled out of order. One high school teacher frankly described the current

situation: "[the PTA] has had its teeth skillfully pulled by the teachers, who have convinced the parents that they must not interfere with curriculum and have had an ambiguous rule to that effect put into the by-laws of the PTA." ⁶

A particular target of the New Educationists is the local board of education. There has been a steady trend over the years in the direction of the subordination of the boards to the teachers and their organizations. This trend has been accelerated, in many instances, by the indifference of the boards which have voluntarily abdicated their authority to the teachers.

A former teacher at Princeton and Harvard, and a school board member, Albert Lynd, described the result of such abdication: ". . . Make your own investigation. You will find that your school system is esteemed 'good' by the professionals to the extent that their board gives lamb-like assent to their edicts." He cited as a glaring example of the intrusion of the teachers on board functions the Planks IV C-3 and IV C-4 which were placed in the 1949 platform of the NEA. These read: "School budgets should be prepared by the school superintendent and adopted by the board of education. . . . Lay boards should be guided by the recommendations of professional educators."

In his penetrating book, *Quackery in the Public Schools*, Mr. Lynd also points out:

Whether you like it or not, the Education bureaucracy has relieved you of all basic decisions about the aims and methods of the schooling in your town. The professors at the center of the system, who have been elected by nobody, control the qualifications of your teachers by fixing them in terms of their own course offerings . . . an ambitious young administrator in a small town would be a fool to spend much time trying to find out what the parents and citizens would really like. . . . He will move along much faster in the profession if he performs so as to draw the favorable attention of the pundits in some influential School of Education. (p. 37)

The present gulf between the lay boards and the teaching profession is a direct consequence of the emphasis which the

schools are now placing upon preparation of youth for a new social order. Since most school boards cannot be expected to share this objective, they present an obstacle in the pathway of the leftist-liberal educators. The majority of teachers have no such ideas.

So long as the schools confined themselves to the imparting of sound, basic knowledge which would prepare the pupil for a useful role in existing society, the proficiency and teaching skill of the teacher were the main consideration of parents. In such schools, relations between the lay school board and the educators were largely frictionless. The board members were cognizant of the life problems which school graduates would face, and they clearly understood the tasks of the teachers in their classrooms. The determination of the school curriculum was regarded as a community responsibility. Lay board members had no hesitation in exercising overall authority. In such schools, the teacher was very close to the community in feelings and interests.

How different is the situation in a school which has accepted the New Education program! In such a school, the teacher is trained to think, not in terms of community standards, but in terms of standards which have been handed down to him from some such Parnassus as Columbia University, or similar advanced teacher-training centers.

"By accepting the unfounded pretensions of so-called professors of education," wrote Dr. Arthur E. Bestor, "we have permitted the content of public school instruction to be determined by a narrow group of specialists in pedagogy, well-intentioned men and women, no doubt, but utterly devoid of the qualifications necessary for the task they have undertaken. These pedagogical experts are making decisions that involve considerations far outside the realm of pedagogy. They are deciding, not merely *how* subjects should be taught . . . under the guise of improving the *methods* of instruction, they have undertaken to determine its *content* as well. They are usurping a function that belongs to the learned world as a whole."⁷

Dr. Howard Roelefs points out that, in exalting method over actual knowledge of subject matter, the Progressive schools of education have created a system under which their own graduates have a virtual monopoly of public school positions. Knowledge of the Progressivist method is obtainable only in the teacher-training courses in such schools. "This gives to the Schools of Education a strangle hold over the licensing of teachers," Dr. Roelefs writes. "A single fact is sufficient to exhibit the extent and character of their control. The great majority of instructors and professors in our colleges and universities, the staffs of the Schools of Education excluded, are in practice, debarred from teaching in the public schools."⁸

Their debarment is not the result of lack of teaching ability, which they possess in recognized measure. It is simply the result of their lack of certain credits in pedagogy, which have been set up as an occupational requirement by the educational hierarchy. One high school teacher, Ann L. Crockett, tells us of the educational equipment of her own superintendent—a product of the New Education:

My own superintendent's academic equipment is typical; it is only roughly that of a college freshman. The remainder of his 200 credit hours are in courses in administration and theory. He is a Ph.D.; his doctoral thesis, an imposing piece of scholarship, examines into the Optimum Window Area for a classroom of twenty-five pupils in the Junior High School. He knows nothing about English, the languages, the humanities, or sciences. But he can and does tell us teachers exactly what methods to use in teaching all these subjects.

And the teacher goes on to ask some extremely pertinent questions:

How many of us would employ a physician who had spent one year studying the diseases of the body and six more on How to Approach the Patient? How can my administrator, so trained, be expected to examine critically, to evaluate intelligently, the newest movements in education? He doesn't; he can't. Yet he is responsible for the education of 25,000 children in our city. And

there are thousands of his classmates and near-classmates, with his identical training, spread throughout the country. Because all education in the professional sense is piped from Teachers College of Columbia University, school administrators are as similar in their professional equipment as so many West Pointers.⁹

The anti-intellectualism of this cult is expressed in the pious cliché "We teach boys and girls, not subjects." One superintendent of schools in a large city assigns teachers to subjects they have never studied so that they will become "child-centered" not "subject-centered." How can a teacher develop a student's interest in a subject the teacher has never learned? "If . . . the student never experiences an intellectual awakening, and even if he never learns to read or count," declared Dr. Joel H. Hildebrand, "that, too, is said to be all right if only he is 'living richly.'"

The conclusions which flow from these facts are inescapable. Teaching, in this era of the social aims, has become over-professionalized. The new policies in many cases have set the teachers apart from their neighbors, or from the parents of their pupils. The teacher who has accepted the New Education has become a sort of torch-bearer of a sacred mission. He has come to conceive of himself as one above the control of the lay public, as Dr. Snow has suggested. (Chap. XXVII).

Fortunately, this is not true of all or even of a majority of our teachers. Not all of our schools by any means are dominated by the New Education, although most have felt its influence in some degree. Many fine educators have fought the anti-intellectual trend and come off with at least "half a loaf." The excellent results in their schools are a fitting tribute to their common sense and scholarly courage. The teaching profession is made up of average citizens imbued with the American spirit and unaffected with the delusions of grandeur which we meet in the Frontier Thinkers and their ilk. They recognize that the public schools belong to the community and not to the teachers. Unfortu-

nately, the voices of most of them are drowned out by the omniscient pretensions of the "modernists."

The New Educationists have prevailed primarily because the average well-intentioned layman is unprepared to meet them on their own terms. They have grabbed the educational ball and run away with it while the rest of the members of the American team are still debating what is to be done. It has been the victory of a compact, strong-willed minority against a confused and controversially inexperienced majority, most of whom are fatally lethargic.

Howard Whitman, after his eight months tour of our country as a *Collier's* reporter, summed up the situation tellingly. He said:

I believe that in every community of the United States, Americans must stand up and make known to their school superintendents and their boards of education that they believe in the philosophy of the American way and the values upon which it is based, and that they believe so, ladies and gentlemen, without apology; that they believe openly and forthrightly . . . that the way of freedom and the way of progress is through the fundamental virtues and values of the free enterprise system; that they believe in competition; that they believe in hard work; that they believe in solid achievement; that they believe, perhaps most of all, in individualism.¹⁰

It is apparent that the New Educationists distrust the competence of the American people in matters of education. We see it repeatedly in the Master Plan and through these pages, either frankly stated or implied. These pedagogues contend that they should guide the destinies of our public schools without interference from lay citizens. Only in meeting the costs of the school plant will they concede the prior rights of parents. This attitude, of course, strikes directly at the vital principle of home rule in the education of our children. President Eisenhower has ably explained the basis of this respected American tradition:

. . . A distinguishing characteristic of our nation—and a great strength—is the development of our institutions within the con-

cept of individual worth and dignity. Our schools are among the guardians of that principle. Consequently . . . and deliberately their control and support throughout our history have been—and are—a state and local responsibility. The American idea of universal public education was conceived as necessary in a society dedicated to the principles of individual freedom, equality and self-government. . . .

Thus was established a fundamental element of the American public school system—local direction by boards of education responsible immediately to the parents of children and the other citizens of the community. Diffusion of authority among tens of thousands of school districts is a safeguard against centralized control and abuse of the educational system that must be maintained. We believe that to take away the responsibility of communities and states in educating our children is to undermine not only a basic element of our freedom but a basic right of our citizens. . . .¹¹

From the standpoint of a lifetime of teaching, Raymond Moley stressed the same principle, in *Newsweek*, September 29, 1941: "To a greater extent, our schools are being taught by professionally trained men and women. This is a great gain. But there remains a constant need for lay influence in the schools. A salutary check upon over-professionalization must be furnished by the non-professional members of school boards, by boards of trustees of colleges . . . by parents themselves. . . . We need professionally trained teachers and administrators. But we also need the vigilance of the average citizen. That is the way of democracy—expert service and non-expert control."

NOTES

1. Nicholas Murray Butler, *The Government's Reach for Education*, American Affairs Pamphlet, National Industrial Conference Board, Inc., New York, 1921.

2. *A Call to the Teachers of the Nation*, Committee on Social and Economic Problems, The Progressive Education Association (New York: John Day Co., 1933).

3. *Conclusions and Recommendations* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934), pp. 128-129.

4. *Journal*, National Education Association, November, 1950.
5. "A Bill of Grievances" (National Society, Sons of the American Revolution), p. 8.
6. Mrs. W. Jackson, "Has Your School Gone Fancy?", *Country Gentleman*, December, 1940.
7. A. E. Bestor, *Educational Wastelands* (Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1953), p. 43.
8. Howard Roelefs, *The Southern Review*, Autumn, 1939.
9. Ann L. Crockett, *Saturday Evening Post*, March 16, 1940.
10. "Speak Up, Silent People." Address, National Education Program, Searcy, Arkansas, April 14, 1954.
11. *New York Herald Tribune*, February 9, 1955.

CHAPTER XXVIII

Over the Horizon

SINCE THE BIRTH of Christ, two hundred billion people have lived on this earth but less than one billion of them have experienced freedom as we have known it in America, points out John T. Flynn.¹ Only one-half of one per cent have enjoyed rights similar to ours. No reflection gives us a greater sense of the incalculable value of our heritage. Central in this system of American freedom is our public school system which has been a tower of strength to our way of life. It has been the link which has bound each new generation to the tradition of our free past.

But where the Experimentalists have captured our public schools, the emphasis is no longer on our American heritage. The changes which they have urged have not been aimed at the improvement of the quality of traditional education, but at its replacement. Russell Kirk gave this penetrating evaluation of the New Education:

A system of education in which respect for the wisdom of our ancestors is deliberately discouraged, and an impossible future of universal beneficence taken for granted; . . . a system in which religion is treated, at least covertly, as nothing better than exploded superstition . . . ; a system in which all the splendor and drama of history is discarded in favor of amorphous social studies; a system in which the imaginative literature of twenty five centuries is relegated to a tiny corner of the curriculum, in favor

of adjustment; . . . a system in which the very tools to any sort of apprehension of systematic knowledge, spelling and grammar, mathematics and geography, are despised as boring impediments to "socialization"—why, is it possible to conceive of a system better calculated to starve the imagination, discourage the better student, and weaken Reason? ²

On analysis, the modernist system is found to be far more than the pragmatic-instrumentalism of the Deweyites. We see an amalgam of Dewey's pedagogical and social philosophy and many economic and political doctrines of Marxism fused into the concept of the new social order. In general, the evil effects of this program may be seen in two categories: (1) Unsound political attitudes; (2) Neglect of basic knowledge.

Political Attitudes

For many years our teachers and children have been taught by Beard, Rugg, Mendenhall, Counts, Kilpatrick, Watson and others to look with suspicion on their American heritage and with hope to theories and philosophies which repudiate it. In place of our tradition, they have advanced the dangerous doctrine that progress lies in the direction of an increasing centralization of political authority and in acceptance of the collectivist economy of statism. In this they have flouted the warning of George Washington that government "like fire, is a dangerous servant and a fearful master."

The challenge which the educators have advanced between individualism and statism is the central controversy of all times. Basically it is an historic struggle between the concept of government by laws and government by men. "[It was] the rule of law or limited government," wrote Ludwig Von Mises, "as safeguarded by constitutions and bills of rights . . . that brought about the marvelous achievements of modern capitalism. . . . It secured for a steadily increasing population unprecedented well-being." ³

The truth, which the New Educators seek to discard, is that the schools have failed if they have not succeeded in imparting to the young an understanding of the meaning of this American historic past. Nothing could be more dangerous than to allow our children's education to be contaminated by the cynicism and materialism of people who are contemptuous of our free traditions.

"Teachers and writers of textbooks should consider the instruction of the young in the real ideals of the American Revolution," points out Felix Wittmer, "as opposed to the violent doctrines of the European variety, too often peddled as the same thing. . . . This confusion of definitions is partly responsible for an ideological confusion which has led to continual increase of Government power and the decrease of personal freedom. In the name of an ill-defined 'democracy,' we have permitted the Trojan horse of foreign socialism to enter the American community. We have surrendered more and more personal rights to an ever-growing central government. . . ." ⁴

The New Educationists like to revive the tired allegation that Essentialists offer a reactionary doctrine unadapted to the needs of a changing age. The charge is, of course, a hollow one. It is grounded in that old fallacy of so-called liberal thinking which mistakes "change" for "progress." It ignores the obvious truth that change itself can be reactionary and retrogressive when it discards the proven good for the dubious new. In education, as in other fields, changes which seek to improve the methods of imparting sound instruction are truly progressive. On the other hand, if the changes involve the uprooting of principles of proven value, then they are not in the tradition of liberalism but of reaction.

"The practical issue," declared Professor Mortimer Adler, "is whether democracy is to be preserved by a true conception of education, or whether education is to be ruined by a false conception of democracy."

Neglect of Basic Knowledge

Disquieting as the ideological mistakes of the New Education may be, its most inexcusable failure has been its inability to teach. Its schools are turning out armies of young men and young women who lack even a working knowledge of their own language. Our public education hitherto has always accepted the obligation to give its pupils a solid grounding in the reading, writing and spelling of the English language, even in the days of the one-room, one-teacher school. Such mastery of English was considered prerequisite to the understanding of our principles and ideals. During the past three decades this aim has gone by the board. The New Education has fallen down badly in its task of providing the basic tools of learning. It is doing no service to public education to "play down" this appalling condition. Responsible friends of the public schools realize that clean-up and not cover-up is needed.

There have been many impressive witnesses to this current sickness of the schools. Howard Whitman, in his *Collier's* series, called attention to the 1948 report of the National Society for the Study of Education, furnishing additional evidence that "a surprisingly large number of high school and college students are seriously deficient in many of the basic aspects of reading."⁵ President Harold W. Dodds of Princeton complained recently of the "watered-down quality of basic learning which our youngsters are getting."⁶ Professor Harry J. Fuller, of the University of Illinois, has declared: "I have sadly observed the shrinking knowledge of spelling, arithmetic, English, grammar, geography, history and sciences in our freshmen."⁷ Professor Leland Miles, of Hanover College, tells of an experience in a prominent junior high school in southern Indiana where a teacher has been giving the same spelling test twice a week for a year, and where only one-half his class have yet passed the examination. "Have the elementary teachers been concentrating on developing the kiddies 'total personalities'?", he asks.⁸ Fur-

thermore, the condition is not improving—it is getting worse. In the New York City High Schools, where Progressive Education has been entrenched since 1940, it was found that the number of retarded readers of common English in the freshmen classes mounted from 25 per cent in 1938 to 34 per cent in 1947.

Because of this failure of “modern” education to do an effective job, parents in great numbers have been forced to seek other means of educating their children. Families which for generations have thought only of public schools are now using private schools of various kinds in steadily increasing numbers. For 1955 the total enrollment in non-public schools is estimated at 4,400,000, approximately 12 per cent. In many states the percentage is far greater: New York, 25 per cent; New Jersey, 21 per cent; New Hampshire, 25 per cent; Illinois, 22 per cent; Massachusetts, 23 per cent; and Rhode Island, 28 per cent.

After paying steadily mounting public school taxes, the tuition in a private school is a heavy burden to most families. In a frantic desire to give their children a firm foundation of learning, numerous expedencies are undertaken. Here is a striking example of the efforts of a Texas parent, as the advertisement appeared in the *New York Times* for July 8, 1956:

MY JOHNNY CAN'T READ

I am a desperate parent of three children caught in the snarl of progressive education. John, 12, and two girls, 9 and 7 all have normal IQ's but can't spell cat. I want a competent, experienced, New England-schooled teacher to assume full charge this coming year in lieu of school. This will include planned recreation and trips as well as school work. Live with us or alone. Car available. Man preferred. Salary open and expenses paid. Best references required. I expect top results. Job can include next summer. J. E. J., 4707 Lawther Dr., Dallas, Texas.

A major cause of this unbelievable condition is the irresponsible spirit of experimentation of the New Educators, and their positive antipathy for the lessons and experiences of the past.

They worship at the shrine of "change." To them, all that is new is worthy; all that is old is suspect if not worthless. For instance, they have fastened upon the schools a new system of teaching the child to read. This is the system of word reading—of memorizing whole words—which has replaced the time-tested phonic system of learning the separate sound of each letter.

"Before the invention of the alphabet there was only picture writing," . . . explains Rudolf Flesch in his book, *Why Johnnie Can't Read*.⁹ "As soon as people had an alphabet, the job of reading and writing was tremendously simplified. Before that, you had to have a symbol for every word in the language [as the Chinese do to this day. . . . Now, with the alphabet, all you had to learn was the letters. Each letter stood for a certain sound, and that was that. To write a word—any word—all you had to do was to break it down into its sounds and put the corresponding letters on paper."

After 3,500 years of human experience in learning to read and write and spell by this simple method, the Experimentalists have suddenly discovered that this is all wrong. Under their impulsion, we have reverted to the Chinese system of memorizing one word after another. As Mr. Flesch points out, "reading isn't taught at all. Books are put in front of the children and they are told to guess at the words or wait until teacher tells them . . . they can't even learn to spell properly because they have been equipped with mental habits that are almost impossible to break."

Such an anti-intellectual approach to reading necessarily leaves psychological scars on many pupils. They suffer from frustration when they find themselves unable to read, write and spell their own language adequately, or when they encounter ridicule. Oliver LaFarge tells us what he observed after teaching under-graduates from Western states who were preparing for college entrance.

"In a class of thirty," he writes, "at least fifteen will dread what they call 'essay exams.' An essay exam is anything requiring

written answers, as against checking off multiple choices or true-or-false statements on a prepared sheet. . . . A major examination question, calling for several pages of answer, is a pure horror. . . . It is painfully clear when one reads their exams. *They can't write.*"¹⁰

Ironically, although an expressed goal of the modernists is to avoid the frustration of children, their teaching methods are bringing acute frustrations to many pupils, and thus contributing to juvenile delinquency. Judge Samuel S. Leibowitz, of the Kings County Court, has commented on this.¹¹ He found that a markedly increased number of teen-age high school students "who can't read or spell" have appeared in the court in recent years. This indicates, he believes, that many youngsters, unable to compete scholastically with their fellow students, vent their frustration in aggressive behavior. "In other words, if the youth can't be a hero among his fellows by virtue of his educational attainments, then he will attract attention by insubordination and worse," the judge said. As a remedy he suggested "overhauling our entire modern, educational philosophy."

The present condition in public education has no parallel in our nation's history. The situation is dominated by a pedagogical hierarchy, which is interlinked by a network of interlocking groups and affiliations. It is impervious to criticism and sits in arrogant judgment of its own acts and policies. It is, in effect, a giant educational monopoly, with the inherent evils and weaknesses which are the concomitants of monopoly.

Because the subject is involved and technical, it is not easy for the layman to intervene effectively. A few educators have spoken out fearlessly against the New Educationists, often with disastrous consequences to themselves. The dissenters have, in most cases, been no match for the self-righteous and militant anti-intellectuals who have wrought such havoc in our schools. An example of the plight of these courageous schoolmen is seen in the experience of Frank Richardson, Chairman of the Biology Department of the University of Nevada, who protested the

elimination of entrance standards at this university, and later distributed reprints of an article critical of the New Education, *Aimlessness in Education*, by Dr. Arthur E. Bestor. *Time Magazine* (June 15, 1953) tells us that Richardson received a summons to report to the office of President Minard W. Stout and was told that he should mind his own business "and stop being a buttinsky all over the campus." On June 3, 1953, Richardson was dismissed from his position because of these activities. On appeal to the courts, the Supreme Court of Nevada rendered a decision in favor of Richardson who was then reinstated. This case is illustrative of the widespread intolerance of many New Educationists not only in public schools but in many of our colleges as well.*

Samuel E. Morison analyzes this amazing condition:

The worst situation for academic freedom occurs in universities where professional pedagogues, especially graduates of Columbia Teachers College (fruitful mother of neo-Deweyism and other educational quackeries), have obtained an influence outside their own department.

I venture to say that professional educators are the greatest enemies not only to academic freedom but to academic excellence in the United States today. No one who has not read some of the stuff printed in educational journals would believe the nonsense that these people write, or the horrible jargon in which they express themselves, or the shabby mediocrity of their minds. Through the national network of teachers' colleges and university departments of education, these pitiful pedagogues are placing an octopus-like clutch on the independent professors and scholars, by working on university administrations to prescribe not only what professors shall teach, but how.

If these gentry had their way, nobody could profess an academic subject without having taken a degree in educational "method," and every professor of arts and sciences would be given a syllabus and list of references by the Department of Education, dictating

* See *Collectivism on the Campus* by E. Merrill Root (New York: Devin-Adair Co., 1956), for similar experiences of other Essentialist educators. For the opinion of the Nevada Supreme Court, see *State vs. rel. Richardson, Board of Regents*, 70 Nev. 347 (1954).

what he should say in each lecture, and what each student should learn.¹²

What happened in New York is symptomatic of the situation generally. In 1954, the *Daily News*, stung by the teen-age acts of violence and vandalism which were becoming almost a daily occurrence in schools in the metropolis, launched a sweeping investigation of the condition and its causes. The investigation disclosed an alarming breakdown in school discipline, accompanied by a shocking drop in teaching results. Each article in the series was accompanied by a straw ballot on which the reader could express his opinion concerning Progressive Education.

There was an overwhelming vote against the "modernist" ideas. In the final *Daily News* tally in answer to the question, "Do you favor Progressive methods of teaching?", 40,143 voted "No" against only 348 voting "Yes." If the New York school authorities were aware of the fact that the largest metropolitan newspaper had discovered nearly unanimous disapproval of their course, their actions did not indicate it. The schools reopened in the fall with no changes in this program. The Progressivists brazened it out in contemptuous disregard of New York public opinion.

Revolt of the Colleges

Hope of improvement lies in developing an enlightened leadership among patriotic citizens who will actively expose and oppose this fundamentally unsound program of education and support the scholarly educators. Fortunately, the ranks of these Essentialists are steadily growing. Their influence is being felt importantly in the communities which now are fighting back. They are still the underdogs but the Progressivists are losing prestige rapidly throughout the nation. As awareness of the problem grows, the ideas of the true schoolmen, such as Arthur E. Bestor, are gradually winning public support. In his book

Educational Wastelands Dr. Bestor points out the crux of the problem:

"As a result of the intrusion of the pedagogues into curriculum-making, the schools are being more and more completely divorced from the basic disciplines of science and learning. Intellectual training, once the unquestioned focus of every educational effort, has been pushed out to the periphery of the public school program. Into the vacuum have rushed the 'experts' from state departments and colleges of education: the curriculum doctors, the integrators, the life-adjusters—the specialists in know-how rather than knowledge." (pp. 43-44)

Something approaching revolt by the colleges has been building up against "tossed salad" and "bargain basement" education, says Fred M. Hechinger,¹³ and leadership in the Essentialist cause is definitely on the increase. For instance, the University of Minnesota, by faculty vote of 161-82, restored the foreign language requirement for a liberal arts degree, "the thirteenth college to move in that direction." And the University of Illinois announced that its course in "remedial rhetoric" would be dropped because "the University can no longer afford . . . to try to teach college students what they should have been taught earlier." The University reports that almost 30 per cent of last year's freshmen were deficient in basic writing, grammar, spelling and punctuation. Many do fine work, but "we get some freshmen who can't even spell the name of the high school that gave them a diploma," declared Dr. Charles W. Roberts of the English Department. This leading university has given notice that it will no longer make up for the high schools' failings.

The experience of the University of Illinois is duplicated by that of Columbia University Law School, one of the largest in the country. In his *Annual Report* (June 30, 1956) Dean William C. Warren said:

". . . the inability of college graduates who come to us to read and write—are maladies of epidemic proportions . . . the legal profession is not alone in its afflictions, . . . business, sciences, and par-

ticularly medicine and engineering suffer no less." The Dean emphasized that "Command of the art of writing is indispensable to . . . distinction, . . . in our school the student's record and rank depend entirely upon some species of written work—an examination, a report or a seminar paper. (pp. 3, 4, 5)

In trying to overcome this fatal defect in the fitness of a prospective lawyer, Dean Warren "confessed to a sense of frustration." He suggested remedial courses to teach these college graduates the reading and writing they should have learned in public elementary and secondary schools.

An Essentialist Program

In contrast to the New Educationists, the Essentialists have a consistent point of view. Briefly summarized, it includes the following definite educational convictions:

1. The primary purpose of the public school is to educate the child to live intelligently under the existing American society rather than to train him for participation in some putative future socialist society.
2. School policies and curricula should recognize broad moral standards or criteria, and emphasize facts instead of fads. Verities tested through centuries of human experience must be honored.
3. The Essentialists disapprove the practice of making social science the core of the curriculum since it means the downgrading of history, geography and civics, with the consequent narrowing of education. They contend that the neglect of mathematics and the liberal arts seriously handicaps the student for higher education.¹⁴
4. They deplore the New Educationist contempt for the past, and preoccupation with the contemporary. They reject the concept that only change is important.
5. They insist upon policies which stimulate intellectual rather than emotional aspects of the educational process.
6. They expect public school courses to reflect faith in the basic political and economic philosophy of our Republic—the free economy of free men.

7. They expect school administrators to emphasize discipline, hard work, self-reliance and pride of accomplishment.
8. They desire teachers trained in subject matter, rather than those top-heavy with theoretical pedagogy. They believe that the question "what to teach" has priority over "how to teach."
9. Parents have an unimpeachable right to criticize any part of the educational process.
10. They expect teachers to recognize the fact that the public school system is based on home rule. In no sense is it the responsibility of the federal government; the corollary of this is that the first loyalty of the teachers should be to the community that employs them.

In accordance with these ten broad principles, Essentialists favor the following methods and policies for the guidance of our public schools:

1. Reading to be taught in the early grades, with emphasis upon phonetics.
2. Cursive writing to be taught, starting in the third grade, with emphasis on drill.
3. Spelling to be taught as a subject, in conjunction with reading, with emphasis upon phonetics.
4. Basic arithmetic to be taught in the first seven grades, with less reliance upon outside material aids.
5. History, civics and geography to be taught as separate subjects.
6. The essentials of grammar and the structure of English to be taught in the early grades.
7. Schoolbooks should be provided for all pupils, with home use permitted, and greater use of written essay-type examinations should be made.
8. A reasonable amount of homework should be required, and parents should be encouraged to supervise home study.
9. There should be monthly report cards, based on alphabetical or numerical grading. Promotion should be determined primarily by proficiency.
10. Courses should be provided which will give the child an understanding and appreciation of the basic principles underlying our heritage of freedom and opportunity.

Although far from complete, the Essentialists believe that the adoption of these overall principles and methods will assure an American public school system which will produce a socially responsible and high-minded body of citizens.

White House Conference on Education

Many parents expected that this objective would be advanced by the recent White House Conference on Education. Conferences in each state stirred the fond hopes that at long last an important public agency would face squarely the critical problems pertaining to the quality and effects of the New Education and render to the nation a factual and forthright report. On the other hand, there were fears that the hierarchy responsible for this condition would wield sufficient influence to cause the Conference to sidestep these deeper issues and concentrate on a drive for federal aid to public education. Unfortunately these fears became realities. Senator Nelson S. Dilworth of the (California) Senate Committee on Education, a delegate to this Conference, reported that:

None of the many speeches . . . were in any way critical of any phase of modern education except . . . for giving too little financial support. The one topic . . . that should have provoked the most lively discussion . . . dealt with what our schools should accomplish and the content of the teaching program.

All table Chairmen for the first report were selected by the Conference Staff. As the table Chairmen automatically were the only ones to go up to the higher tables to prepare the final report, dissent was effectively muzzled.

No motions were permitted from the floor. One delegate tried . . . and was ruled out of order. The assembled 1800 delegates were thus rendered impotent and effectively silenced.

The Conference thus avoided the vital problems which have alarmed a nation. It brought forth a series of platitudes, with which everyone can agree, to impart a better understanding of our "democratic way of life." This set of goals could be "com-

pletely achieved and yet result in a group of young people who would not be just badly educated but in fact not educated at all," states the *Wall Street Journal*, December 1, 1955. The one ingredient that is missing from the agenda is the most important of all—*emphasis on learning*. The Conference stressed skills, particularly in work habits, in behavior, in use of leisure time, and in getting along "at home" and abroad. The editorial continues: "The purpose of studies in the social sciences is not, we think, simply to instil an appreciation of the democratic way of life, as this report would have it. The purpose ought to be learning in history and political philosophy . . . a deep understanding of that way of life. . . . But to say that these things are the major goals of education, as this report does, is to pervert the whole purpose of education."

There is now in Congress a bill to provide more than two billion dollars in federal aid for a public school building program. Since the law requires federal supervision and approval of the expenditure of public funds, the ugly specter of federal interference or eventual control of public education looms on the horizon, regardless of assurances given in pending legislation. No Congress can bind a future one. True friends of the public school wish to keep its plant and equipment adequate for its invaluable role. They want it administered by a competent and well-paid staff. But even these considerations, important as they are, should not obscure the fact that the *quality* of public education must be our *first* concern. The size and strength of the temple are important but what goes on within its walls is vital.

In avoiding this scholarly position, the 1955 White House Conference on Education failed of an outstanding opportunity of service to our people. A somewhat similar position has been taken by lay organizations interested in public schools, including the Parent Teachers Association, the National Citizens Committee for the Public Schools and The Advertising Council. All have emphasized the material needs of our schools while adroitly

sidestepping other vital issues. By objectively facing the facts, these organizations could have done much to correct an intolerable condition in education. But in seeking to avoid a controversy at all costs they have, in effect, thrown their influence in support of the leadership responsible for this condition.

An observation which continues to baffle those who have labored for years to alert our people to this situation is the amazing fact that intelligent and patriotic parents who have acquired a sound education themselves will tolerate much less in the education of their children. Furthermore, these substantial citizens, who defeat overwhelmingly candidates for public office who espouse Marxist or socialist causes, are seemingly indifferent to the indoctrination of their sons and daughters in the self-same philosophies in their schools and colleges.

Perhaps John Temple Graves has offered the best clue to this enigma. In commenting on the alarming loss of faith in our institutions, he placed the blame on the subtleness of socialism masquerading as democracy. In the *New York World-Telegram and Sun* of December 21, 1954, he said:

A greater killer has been socialism. Not Communism, but its pale sister who doesn't know the facts of life—socialism. The socialism . . . which forgets ethics and the individual for the state. The socialism which gives us social-minded preachers who neglect God and men for "society." The socialism which persuaded so-called progressive educators to forget education for mere vocation and group-mindedness, and to propose liberty for babies even as a social-minded state created slavery for grown-ups. This socialism is a far greater home menace than out-and-out communism, for it is respectable, legal, not capable of being jailed or deported by the FBI or hounded down by Congressional committees.

What You Can Do

"If we intend to survive," declared Dr. Joel Hildebrand, University of California, "we shall have to strengthen the hands of those school teachers and administrators everywhere who are opposing the degrading of education to the levels of the nursery

and the school of charm. It is understandable that school officials who have never had any intellectual experience in their lives should try to compensate for this by denying the reality of intellectual discipline, but such persons should not be determining educational policies. They should be replaced by *educated* men and women."

Dr. Hildebrand suggests that citizens use their influence in favor of education designed to develop to their full capacity our natural resources of native intelligence. He recommends certain things we can do:

1. Get yourself elected to school boards.
2. Insist that the school superintendents and principals employed be persons whose education has not been limited to "Education."
3. Work for higher salaries for *efficient* teachers.
4. Work for special recognition of those teachers who have been notably successful in instilling into their students a zest for intellectual achievement. . . .
5. Combat state requirements for teacher certification that specify pedagogy at the expense of understanding of the subjects to be taught.
6. Insist that the primary function of the school does not end with the problems of children, but is to assist young people to become intelligent adults.¹⁵

In an age when the whole world is convulsed with conflicting concepts and locked in a death struggle between the forces of liberty and tyranny, while education is rapidly becoming universal, it is apparent that the destiny of any nation is closely linked with the public education of its youth. But where are we heading? A staff report in the Scripps-Howard newspapers states: "The alarming admissions of failure of American education to prepare youth to live and work in the atomic era are commonplace today. . . . Shortages of science and engineering graduates, high school students' lack of interest in mathematics and 'hard' courses, too few adequately trained teachers—these are undisputed facts."¹⁶ A special Senate Committee has

heard testimony that our greatest danger is the loss of the race in science with the USSR.

For more than three decades it has been apparent that we were entering rapidly an age featured by great advances in mechanization, electronics, dynamics, chemistry, physics, etc. Marvelous inventions and developments are constantly lifting the burden of production and service from the backs of men and adding to their comforts and welfare. The rate of this progress depends on the trained minds of specialists—engineers, chemists, physicists and various scientists capable of crashing the barriers to further progress of civilization. For years our great corporations have spent large sums through advertising and other means, pleading for youth with basic qualifications to accept splendid opportunities. But their efforts have been largely in vain. They continue to get only a trickle of qualified graduates capable of meeting essential but reasonable standards.

Why? Because such graduates are coming out of our colleges and universities in constantly *decreasing* numbers. Despite a huge increase in enrollment the total of these graduates has actually decreased in recent years. Leaders of industry are forced to enter the business of education in order to supply the shortage, despite the billions spent on our educational system.

The main reason, of course, is set forth in this book. The New Education has gone completely off the track. In its obsession with "social aims" and the remaking of society through the educational processes, it has bent all policies to shape curricula to that end. Courses in fundamental knowledge have been shamefully neglected, including mathematics, chemistry, physics and similar subjects sorely needed in this modern age. Today over one-half of our high schools *have no courses in chemistry and physics!* And we have already noted the tragic results from neglect of basic mathematics. Instead, the curriculum has been heavily loaded with "social aims," vocational and "adjustment" courses.

Subjects which develop scholarly disciplines and ability to

reason, like mathematics, the cornerstone of logic, are definitely subordinated to the pattern of the New Education. In their cloistered towers at Teachers College, Columbia University, and elsewhere, the leadership of American education did not regard this knowledge as necessary. At the very time when it was obvious to all that the world needed more and more of these specialists, the New Educationists contrived to change our public school system so that it would produce fewer and fewer. With propagandists instead of real schoolmen at the helm, our schools actually are embarked on an anti-intellectual program.

General Leslie Groves, war-time atomic administrator, aptly summarized the condition in a single sentence: "Our educational system has shown itself incapable of meeting the challenge which has arisen to confront it."

It often has been said that the United States has a rendezvous with destiny. If so, is not each generation the trustee of an heritage born of the struggles, courage and vision of those who lived before? Are we not charged with the obligation of safeguarding our blessings and opportunities for those who follow us? Unless we experience a speedy realization of the part education plays in that destiny, that appointment probably will be kept for us by the New Educationists and the hapless pupils whom they have miseducated. Dr. Harold Rugg said: "Thus through the schools of the world, we shall disseminate a new conception of government—one that will embrace all the collectivist activities of men. . . ."

Is that to be the fate of this great Republic, built on the ideals and principles of a free economy of free men? Is that what Americans want? We may well ponder the important truth uttered by Earl Browder, when he was General Secretary of the Communist Party: "Who wins youth wins the future America." While the New Educators remain at its helm, public education is leading our Republic to a rendezvous which may prove to be a catastrophe.

NOTES

1. John T. Flynn, *Epic of Freedom* (Philadelphia: Fireside Press, 1947), p. 17.
2. Russell Kirk, *A Program for Conservatives* (Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1954), p. 64.
3. Ludwig von Mises, *Planned Chaos* (The Foundation for Economic Education, Inc., 1947), pp. 65-66.
4. Felix Wittmer, "Our Revolution Was Not a Socialist One," *Saturday Evening Post*, August 18, 1956.
5. *Collier's*, November 26, 1954.
6. *American Magazine*, January, 1954.
7. *The Scientific Monthly*, January, 1951.
8. *The Phi Delta Kappan*, January, 1954.
9. Rudolf Flesch, *Why Johnnie Can't Read* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1955), p. 4.
10. Oliver LaFarge, "We Need Private Schools," *Atlantic Monthly*, February, 1954, p. 54.
11. *New York Herald Tribune*, November 21, 1954.
12. Samuel E. Morison, *Freedom in Contemporary Society* (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1956), pp. 129-130.
13. *New York Herald Tribune*, May 13, 1956.
14. The extent to which modern education has neglected courses in scientific and technical knowledge is revealed by Rear Admiral Hyman G. Rickover, U.S.N. In an address to the Sixth Thomas Alva Edison Foundation Institute (November 21-22, 1955), he said: "Nearly half of our high schools offer little or no instruction in physics, chemistry, or in mathematics beyond introductory algebra. The percentage of high school pupils who today study scientific subjects is indicative of this:

	1900	1950
Physics	23	4
Chemistry	10	7
Algebra	52	27
Geometry	27	13"

15. Address, American Chemical Society, September, 1955.
16. *New York World-Telegram and Sun*, April 28, 1956.

Index

- Academic freedom, agitation for, 114-124
 - communist demand for, 116-118
 - progressivists' interpretation of, 118-123
 - in Teachers College, 281-282
 - term defined, 114
- Activity school program, 21, 172, 183, 200, 229
 - in New York City, 102, 278
 - in Soviet Russia, 33-38
- Adams, John Quincy, 142
- Adler, Mortimer, 276
- Adler, Selig, 185
- Advertising, opposition to, 84-87, 160
- Advertising Council, 287
- Advertising Federation of America, 246
- Agnostic materialism, 143-144
 - (See also Instrumentalism; Pragmatism; Secularism)
- Aimlessness in Education*, 281
- Almack, John C., *quoted*, on academic freedom, 119, 122
 - Moscow summer school, 57-58
 - neglect of history, 32
 - soft and hard progressivists, 23
 - Soviet schools, 45
 - The Social Frontier*, 27-28
- American Association of College and University Professors, *quoted*, on academic freedom, 122
- American Civil Liberties Union, 8, 115
- American Council of Learned Societies, 243
- American Council on Education, 243
- American economic system survey, 162
- American Education Association organized, 245
- American Education Fellowship, origin of, 28
 - post-war policy, 134
 - socialistic program adopted, 89
- American Education Under Fire*, 250-251
- American Historical Association, Carnegie Corporation grant, 45, 52, 62, 256
 - commission on social studies, 45-46, 50
 - reports, 25
- American history, debunking of, 39-42, 72, 76-77, 80-81, 186
 - ideological use of, 43
 - ignorance of, 92-93, 99
 - in Buffalo schools, 185
 - neglect of, 183-187
 - teaching of, 93, 97
- American Legion investigation, 246

- American prisoners (*see* Korea)
 American Revolution (*see* War of Independence)
American Way of Business, The, 260
America's March Toward Democracy, 80-84
Anti-Advertising Propaganda in School Textbooks, 85
 Antisthenes, 202
Arbella, 10
 Aristotle, 200
 Arithmetic, ignorance of, 98, 100-101
 Armed forces (*see* United States armed forces)
 Army and navy students survey, 98
 Army Special Training Program (ASTP), 99
 Articles of Confederation, 140
 ASTP (Army Special Training Program), 99
Away From Freedom, 161
- Bacon, Francis, 200
 Bacon, Leonard, 11
 Barnes, Ralph W., 36-37
 Beard, Charles A., 39, 202
 disillusionment of, 63
 influence of, 41, 186
 member, commission on social studies, 46
 Beatty, Willard W., 48
 Beck, James M., 138-139
 Bell, Bernard Iddings, 188, 195-196
Bending The Twig, purpose of, vii-viii
 Benjamin, Harold, 247-248
 Bentham, Jeremy, 161
 Bentley, Elizabeth, 221
 Bestor, Arthur E., *quoted*, on anti-intellectualism, 107, 281, 282-283
 curriculum, 268
 social studies, 25, 193
 Bible reading, 11-12
 Bill of Rights, ignorance of, 94-95
 study of, 93
- Blodgett, Ralph H., 157
 Boards of education, hostility toward, 265, 267-268
 Boston school committee, 123
 Bradford, William, 150-152
 Brameld, Theodore, 134
 Brameld draft, 134-135
 Bredvold, L. I., 97
 Brewster, William, 11
 Brookings Institution survey, 74, 156-157
 Browder, Earl, 209, 291
 Buckley, William F., Jr., 166
 Buffalo schools, 184-185
Building America textbooks, 41, 257
Building a Science of Society for the Schools, 71, 87
 Burke, Edmund, 139 *fn*
 Butler, Nicholas Murray, *quoted*, on humanities, 184
 home rule, 264
 progressive education, 31
 Butterfield, Alice, 245
- Call to the Teachers of the Nation, The*, 48-50, 120
 Capitalism, survey on, 162
 Carnegie Corporation grants, to American Historical Association, 45, 52, 62, 255-256
 citizenship educational project, 258
 Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 255
 Carroll, Charles, 40
 Casey, D. E., 157-158
 Cavallaro, Joseph B., 142
 Central Executive Committee decrees, 35-36
 Chalmers, Gordon Keith, 174
Changing Countries and Changing Peoples, 83
 Character training, 14, 104-105, 165-170, 229
 Charters, W. W., 55
 Chase, Harry W., 55
 Chase, Stuart, 136

- Chemistry courses, 289-292
- Chidsey, Alan L., 99
- Child-centered school, 21, 200, 270
- China, communist conquest of, 219-220
 fliers in, 100
- Church of England dissenters, 10-11
- Cicero, 92
- Citizenship educational project, 258-260
- Civics, card index for, 258
 ignorance of, 94-95
 teaching of, 93-95, 97
- Civil rights (*see* Teachers)
- Cold war, 218-220, 226
- College speech conference, 110-112
- Colleges, revolt of, 282-284
- Colonists, New England, Biblical
 principles of, 11-12
 educational system of, 12
- Columbia University Law School, 283
- Commager, Henry S., 122-123
- Commerce and Industry Association
 survey, 109
- Commission for Defense of Democracy Through Education, 247-248, 250
- Commission on Social Studies, 45-46
- Communism, and academic freedom, 115-118
 China conquest, 219-220
 college conference discussion, 110-112
 intellectual appeal of, 218
 psychological warfare, 218-220, 226
 and socialism, 209-215, 217, 220, 225-227, 288
- Communist Manifesto, 95, 211-214
- Comte, Auguste, 200
- Conclusions and Recommendations*, Carnegie Corporation grant, 45, 52, 62, 256
 excerpts from, 50-52, 241
 Laski comment on, 136
 published, 50, 52, 62
 reveals master plan, 25, 27, 50
- Congress of the Confederation, 140-141
- Conquest of America*, 79
- Constitution of the United States (*see* United States Constitution)
- Constitution of the United States, The*, 139
- Constitutional rights (*see* Teachers, civil rights)
- Conventions (*see* National Education Association; Progressive Education Association)
- Counts, George S., member, commission on social studies, 46
 member, Institute for International Education, 55
 member, policy committee, 48
 quoted, on capitalism, 47-48
 pedagogical impartiality, 231
 Institute for International Education, 45
 new social order, 47
 Soviet economy, 46-47
 recantation, 63
 teacher, 235
- Cowling, Donald J., 147
- Cox, Harold, 212
- Crockett, Ann L., 107, 197
- Culture and Education in America*, 72
- Curriculum, control of, 87-89, 120, 159, 268
 scientific courses, 289-292
 revision, 92, 94, 97, 106, 166
- Danger! They're After Our Schools*, 251-252
- Dare the School Build a New Social Order*, 47
- Darwin, Charles, 20, 201
- Davidson, Carter, 147
- Davis, Jerome, 137
- Day, Edmund E., 46
- Debunkers, cult of, 39-42, 72, 76-77, 80-81, 94, 115, 186
 source book, 39
- Defense Bulletin*, 247-248

- Defense commission, 247-248, 250
 Demiashevich, Michael, *quoted*, on
 duty of educators, 130, 229
 new education, 199
 religion, 143
 value of history, 182
 DeMille, Cecil B., 231
Democracy and The Curriculum, 18
 Democritus, 201
 Depression, economic, 61-62
 DeTocqueville, 145
 Deweyites, basic doctrine of, 20, 229
 hard and soft, 23-24, 43-44, 88-89, 91
 influence of, 173-174
 political objectives, 6, 24-25
 (See also Progressivists)
 Dewey, John, disciples of, 23-24, 33,
 88, 91, 229
 father of progressive movement, 19,
 239
 instrumentalism, 19-20, 31, 143, 165-
 170, 202
 last years, 63
 member, Institute for International
 Education, 55
 member, League for Industrial De-
 mocracy, 63, 136
 naturalism, 20, 175-176, 200, 229, 238
 philosophy of, 135, 171-172, 188-190,
 200
 sources of, 199, 205
 religion, 22, 143
 Yearbook, 18-19, 26
 Diderot, Denis, 201
 Dilworth, Nelson S., 286
 Discipline, theory of, 175-180
 Dodd, Bella, 116-117
 Dodd, Norman, 243
 Dodds, Harold W., 277
 Dollard, Charles, 256
 Double taxation, 157
 Douglas, William O., 143
 Dressler, Frank J., 185
 Dryden, John, 181
 Duggan, Stephen P., 55
 Duncan, Warren L., 168
 Dunning, John R., 101
 Dushane, Donald, 247
 Economic depression, 61-62
 Economic freedom, 148-149, 161-163
*Economic Interpretation of the Con-
 stitution of the United States*,
 An, 39
 Economic revolution, 154-163
 Economics, new, 154-163
Economics, An Introductory Analysis,
 155
 Economics instruction, of armed
 forces, 157
 in colleges, 155, 161
 survey, 74, 156-157
Economics: Principles and Problems,
 157
 Economics texts, 155-161
 Economic system survey, 162
Education, 175
 Educational associations, grants to,
 261
Educational Foundations, 236-237
Educational Manual, 158
 Educational revolution, 3-9, 15-16, 25,
 32
 opponents of, 130
 second stage, 50, 88-89, 135-136, 159,
 193
 Educational survey, of army and navy
 students, 98
 Commerce and Industry Associa-
 tion, 109
 High School Teachers Association,
 105-106
 by industry, 162
 Los Angeles School Board, 250
New York Times, 92-94, 96-97, 183-
 184
 Purdue Opinion Panel, 95
 Roseville (California), 101
 Transcription Supervisors Associa-
 tion, 103-105
Educational Theory, 204
Education and the Social Crisis, 235

- Educationists (*see* Progressivists)
 Education Law of the State of New York, 230-231
 Education leaders, philosophy of, 202-204
 Eisenhower, Dwight D., 271-272
Elements of Economics, The, 155
 Eliot, Charles W., 141
 Elsasser, Albert, 98
Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, 257-258
Enemy Within, The, 219
 Engels, Friedrich, 200, 225
 Engineers, deficiency of, 101, 289
 English instructors poll, 98
 English language, ignorance of, 98, 103-105, 277, 283-284
 Essentialists, *defined*, 6, 130
 doctrine, 130
 moral philosophy, 166
 policies, 285
 principles, 284-285
 rising prestige, 282
 Ethical poll, 167-168
 Evolutionary theory, 20

 Fairleigh Dickinson College poll, 167-168
 Falk, Alfred, 66, 85-86, 245-246
 Faxon, George R., 123
 Federal Aid Bill, 287
 Feinberg Act, 210
 Fertig, Lawrence, 155-156, 161
 Fine, Benjamin, 62 *fn*, 92-93, 96, 102
 I Thessalonians, v
 Five-Year Plan, 82-83
 Flag salute, 68
 Flanagan, Hallie F., 56
 Flanders, Ralph E., 6-7
 Flesch, Rudolf, 279
 Flying Tigers, 100
 Flynn, John T., 274
 Foundations, influence of, 255-263
 Fox, Mary, 137
 Fraser, Hugh R., 93, 183
 Froebel, Friedrich, 202
 Froebelian principles, Dewey's use of, 19-20
 positive value of, 29-30
Frontiers of Democracy, 26-28
 Frontier thinkers, cult of, commission on social studies, 45-46
 definition, *quoted*, 39
 educational theories, 33, 94, 233-234
 leadership strategy, 242-254
 rise of, 39-60, 91
 social aims, 42-43
 (*See also* Progressivists)
 Fuller, Harry J., 277
 Fund for the Republic, 255

 Gemmill, Paul F., 157
Genesis of the New England Churches, 11
 Geography, ignorance of, 96-97, 99
 teaching of, 76, 97
 Gibbons, Cardinal, 130
 Givens, Willard E., 52, 54, 244
 Golden Rule, 168-169
 Gordon, Rosalie, 190
 Goslin, Willard E., 248-249
 Graham, Frank P., 55-56
 Graves, John Temple, 288
Great Technology, The, influence of Beard upon, 41
 quoted, 89
 summary, 66-70
 Greek philosophers, 200-201
 Griswold, A. Whitney, 109
 Groves, Leslie R., 100, 291
 Guardians of American Education, 245-246

 Halloran, Raymond F., 106
 Hancock, John, 40
 Harold Ware cell, 218
 Harper, F. D., 214
 Harper and Brothers chart, 159
 Hartmann, George W., 26
 Harvard College, 12
 Harvey, Trusselle, 105

- Hearnshaw, F. J. C., 210
 Hechinger, Fred M., 283
 Hegel, George Wilhelm, 203
 Helvetius, 202
 Hendrickson, Robert, 167
 Henry, Patrick, 132
 Heraclitus, 200
 Herbart, Johann, 203
 Hicks, Hamilton, 66 *fn*
 High School Teachers Association
 survey, 105-106
 Hildebrand, Joel H., 173, 270, 288-289
 Hillquit, Morris, 211
 Hiss, Alger, 218, 220, 255
 Historic liberals, 161
 History, neglect of, 76, 182-187
 value of, 182
 (See also American history)
*History of American Government
 and Culture*, 81
History of Plimouth Plantation, 150-
 152
 Hobbs, A. H., 74, 144, 159, 167
 Holland, Pilgrims' sojourn in, 11
 Holmes, Oliver Wendell, 124
 Home rule, 121, 133, 249, 264, 271-
 272
 Hoover, Herbert, 225-226
 Hoover, J. Edgar, 169
 Hopkins, L. Thomas, 53-54
 Horton, John T., 185
 Houseman, William, 95
 Hughes, Frank, 258, 260
 Hughes, Langston, 62
 Hutchins, Robert M., 56, 118, 121
 Huxley, Thomas, 20

 Illiteracy, 101, 103-110
Income and Employment, 155
 Individualism, 188-192
 Indoctrination, system of, 76-87, 225,
 228-232
 Industrial economics survey, 162
 Institute of International Education,
 44-45, 55-56, 61
 advisory council, 55-56
 Institute of Pacific Relations, 255
 Instrumentalism, 19-20, 31, 143, 165-
 170, 202
 (See also Agnostic materialism;
 Pragmatism; Secularism)
 Intercollegiate Socialist Society, 63, 69,
 136
 Intourist, Inc., 55-57
*Introduction to Problems of American
 Culture*, An, 82, 246

 Jansen, William, 32
 Jenner, William E., 123
 John Dewey Society crusade, 244
 John Dewey *Yearbook*, 18-19, 26, 194
 Joyner, Conrad, 111
 Juvenile delinquency, 167-170, 172-173,
 280, 282

 Kandel, I. L., 56
 Kapterev, Professor, 34-35
 Keller, Alan, 173
 Kennedy, Stephen P., 169
 Kerensky, Alexander, 216
 Keynes, John Maynard, 155
 Keynesian revolution, 154
 Kilpatrick, William H., as editor, 26
 educational philosophy, 235-237
 member, commission on social stud-
 ies, 46
 Pasadena story, 249
 social aims, 194
 Kilpatrick discussion group, 235
 Kindergartens, Froebelian, 14-15
 Kingsbury, Susan, M., 56
 Kirk, Russell, *quoted*, on Deweyites,
 173
 humane disciplines, 187
 new education, 274-275
 pragmatism, 20
 Korea, American prisoners in, 28, 222-
 225, 227
 Kramer, Charles L., 155

 LaFarge, Oliver, 279
 Laidler, Harry W., 63

- Lamarck, Jean, 20, 201
 Lange, Oscar, 260
 Laski, Harold, 136-137
 Lawrence, David, 227
 League for Industrial Democracy, 63,
 69
 object of, 136
 officers, 136-137
 Leibowitz, Samuel S., 280
 Lenin, Nickolay, 34, 212, 216-217
 Lerner, Abba P., 260
 Liberal arts, undermining of, 109
 Liberals, historic, 161
 Lincoln, Abraham, 148
 Lincoln School, experiments at, 62, 66
 grants to, 62, 262
 Link, Henry C., 162
 Lippmann, Walter, 42, 186
 Locke, John, 161
 Los Angeles School Board, *quoted*, on
 Golden Rule, 168-169
 survey, 250
 Lovett, Robert Morse, 136
 Loyalty oaths, 123
 Lucretius, 201
 Ludendorff, Erich F., 216
 Lynd, Albert, *quoted*, on boards of
 education, 267
 Dewey, 135, 239
 educational fundamentals, 29
 pragmatism, 30-31
 religion, 166
 stenographic illiteracy, 104
 term *progressive*, 28
- McCluskey, Neil G., 17
 McConnell, Francis J., 136
 McDonald, Milo F., forms American
 Education Association, 245
 outline of educators, 202-204
 quoted, on atheistic socialism, 31
 Dewey, 19-20, 31
 progressive education, 108
 Magazines, progressivists', 26-28
 Mann, Horace, 14
- Manpower, engineering, 101
 Marconi, Guglielmo, 141-142
 Marx, Karl, and Dewey, 143, 233
 naturalism, 20
 philosophy of, 203, 225
 quoted, on religion, 22
 socialism of, 211-214
 utopian ventures, 213
 Marxism, menace of, 216-227
 and socialism, 220-221
 in teachers' colleges, 44, 200
 Masaryk, Jan, 214-215
 Massachusetts colonists, Biblical prin-
 ciples of, 11-12
 educational system, 12
 Massachusetts Supreme Court, 123
 Master plan, financed, 45, 52, 62, 256
 genesis of, 45-46
 implementation, 75, 194
 leadership strategy, 241, 243
 published, 50, 52
 redistribution of power, 265
 revealed, 25, 27, 50-52
 Mathematics, navy failures in, 97-98
 neglect of, 100, 289-292
 Mayflower, 10
 Mayflower Compact, 140
 Meiklejohn, Alexander, 136
 Melby, Ernest O., chairs policy com-
 mittee, 134
 John Dewey *Yearbook*, 26
 quoted, on activity school, 22 *fn*
 writes booklet, 250-251
 Mendenhall, James E., 74
 Meyer, William E., 222-225
 Miles, Leland, 100, 277
 Mill, John Stuart, 161, 229
 Moley, Raymond, 272
 Morality survey, 167-168
 Morgan, Theodore, 155
 Morison, Samuel E., 281
 Moscow University summer school,
 55-58
 Murrow, Edward R., 56
 My Pedagogic Creed, 189

- National Association of Manufacturers Educational Commission, 246
- National Citizens Committee for the Public Schools, 287
- National Education Association, academic freedom resolution, 119
 champion of new education, 243-254
 defense commission, 247-248, 250
 government bulletin, 42-43
 grants to, 260
 1934 convention, 52, 55
 proceedings, 54
 1938 convention, 58
 polemic publications, 250-252
 social science teaching guide, 260
- Naturalism, 175-176, 200, 202, 229, 238
 origin, 20
 positive value, 29-30
- New education (*see* Progressive education)
- New Educational Fellowship, international conference, 59-60
 1947 convention, 62
 policy statement, 63
- New educationists (*see* Progressivists)
- New England colonists (*see* Massachusetts colonists)
- Newlon, Jesse H., and John Dewey
Yearbook, 26
 director, Lincoln School, 235
 member, commission on social studies, 46
 member, policy committee, 48
- New Russia's Primer*, 45
- New social order, design of, 132-137
 main features, 133
 socialistic pattern, 134-137
- Newspapers, socialization of, 58-59
- New York Daily News* straw ballot, 5, 282
- New York State Board of Education, history syllabus, 184
 textbooks approved by, 4
- New York State Education Law, 230-231
- New York Times* survey, 92-94, 96-97, 183-184
- Nimitz, C. W., 97-98
- Oath of allegiance, 68
- O'Connell, Geoffrey, 238
- Osborn, Gardner, viii
- Osborn, Mrs. Gardner, viii
- Pamphlets, NEA, 48-50, 120
 social science, 62, 66, 71
- Parents, indifference of, 288
- Pasadena, 249
 recommendations to, 289
 revolt of, 7, 121, 245-246, 282
 rights of, 123
 and teachers, 264-272
 Texas, 278
- Parent-Teachers Association (PTA), 266-267, 287
- Pasadena story, 5, 248-250
- Peacock, Roscoe, 246
- Pestalozzi, Johann, 203-204
- Physics courses, 289-292
- Pilgrims, educational system of, 11-12
 leaders, 11
 migration, 10-11
 persecution, 10-11
 sojourn in Holland, 11
- Pitt, William, 138
- Plato, 200
- Plutarch, 149 *fn*
- Plymouth Colony socialistic experiment, 150-152
- Political freedom, 145-148
- Pope, Alexander, v
- Pragmatism, 20, 30-31, 200
 (*See also* Agnostic materialism; Instrumentalism; Secularism)
- Prentis, H. W., Jr., 142
- Private school enrollment, 278
- Program for Conservatives, A.*, 173
- Progressive*, term discredited, 28, 32, 222, 227
- Progressive Education*, 26
- Progressive education, activity pro-

- gram, 21, 33-38, 102, 172, 183, 200, 229
- basic doctrines, 20-21, 233-234
- character training, 14, 104-105, 165-170, 229
- chronological history, 61-62
- communist influence, 115-118
- curriculum (*see* Curriculum)
- devoid of loyalty, 221-225
- educational leaders' philosophy, 202-204
- emotional emphasis, 171-174
- group conformity, 188-190
- instrumentalism, 19-20, 31, 143, 165-170, 202
- master plan, 25, 27, 45-46, 50-52, 62, 75, 194, 241, 243, 256, 265
- naturalism, 20, 29-30, 175-176, 200, 202, 229, 238
- neglect of sciences, 101, 289-292
- in New York City schools, 102, 278
- objective, 64, 88-89
- organizations opposing, 245-247, 282
- origin, 19-20, 43
- parental revolt against, 7, 121, 245-246, 282
- positive values of, 29-30
- pragmatism, 20, 30-31, 200
- public concepts of, 17-18
- results of, 7, 91-113, 250, 277-284, 289-292
- sources of, 199-205
- surveys of (*see* Educational survey)
- in Soviet Russia, 33-38, 45, 116, 200
- straw ballot on, 5, 282
- system of indoctrination, 76-87, 225, 228-232
- Progressive Education Association,
 - crusade, 61-62, 244-245
 - established, 43
 - grants to, 261
 - joins New Educational Fellowship, 59
 - name changed, 28
 - 1934 convention, 53-55
 - 1935 convention, 56
- magazines, 28
- policy committee, 48
- Progressivists, and academic freedom, 117-123
 - disillusionment of, 63
 - dominance in schools, 5, 87
 - hard, 43, 44, 88-89, 91
 - leadership, 26, 39-60, 63-73, 88-89, 132, 275
 - magazines, 26-28
 - neglect of history, 182-187
 - organizations, 21, 43, 58, 243-245
 - philosophy, 20-21, 33, 94, 233-234
 - policies, 21-22
 - political objectives, 6, 24-25, 42-44, 88-89, 91, 146, 183-184, 194-195, 201, 275-276
 - social aims, 194-196
 - socialistic program, 132-137, 209
 - soft vs. hard, 23-24, 89, 91
 - textbooks, 4, 41, 62, 66, 71-72, 74-89, 144, 155-161, 167, 257
 - theory of discipline, 175-180
- Project method, 21, 200
- Propaganda vehicles, 26-28
- Protagoras, 201
- PTA (Parent-Teachers Association), 266-267, 287
- Public education (*see* Public school system)
- Public school, first, 12
 - kindergartens, 14-15
 - New York City, 102, 278
 - scientific courses, 289-292
- Public school system, character training in, 14, 104-105, 167-170, 229
 - established, 12
 - progressivists in, 5, 87
 - religious background, 12-13
 - revolution, vii, 3-9, 15-16, 25, 32, 50, 88-89, 130, 135-136, 159, 193
 - secularism, 143-145, 165-170
 - state-control policy, 13-15, 133, 271-272
 - tradition, 10-15
- Pupil's Workbooks*, 75-77

- Purdue Opinion Panel, 95
 Puritan migration, 10-11
 Putt, S. Gorley, 195
- Qua, Stanley F., 123
Quackery in the Public Schools, 135
 Quarles, Donald A., 101
- Radio, socialization of, 58-59
 Ranney, Omar, 54
 Raup, A. B., 238
 Ray, Alpheus W., 101
 Reading, teaching of, 279
 Reece, B. Carroll, 259, 261
 Religion, freedom of, 141-145
 Remedial courses, 283-284
 Report cards, 189-191
Report of the Commission on Social Studies, 45-46
 published, 50, 52, 62
 (See also *Conclusions and Recommendations*)
- Revolution (see Educational revolution; Economic revolution)
- Richardson, Frank, 280-281
 Rickover, Hyman G., 292 *fn*
 Roberts, Charles W., 283
 Robey, Ralph W., 246
 Rockefeller Foundation grants, to
 Lincoln School, 62
 to Rugg, 262
 for textbooks, 257
- Roelofs, Howard D., 18, 172, 177, 239
 Root, E. Merrill, 111-112, 281 *fn*
 Roseville (California) survey, 101
 Rousseau, Jean Jacques, 178, 202, 204
 Rudd, Augustin G., 66, 245
 Rugg, Harold, activities of, 65
 as debunker, 41, 72, 75-77, 80-83, 186
 director, League for Industrial Democracy, 136-137
 disillusionment of, 63
 educational foundations course, 236-237
 grants to, 62, 262
 at Lincoln School, 62, 66
 member, commission on social studies, 46
 philosophy of, 65-73, 236-237
 quoted, on advertising, 84
 collectivism, 89, 291
 frontier thinkers, 39
 indoctrination, 87
 "new America" campaign, 53
 New Educational Fellowship, 60
 United States Constitution, 80-81
 social science courses, 62, 72 *fn*, 262
 social science pamphlets, 62, 66, 71
 textbooks, 4, 41, 62, 66, 71-72, 74-89
- Rugg-Mendenhall system, 74-89
 indoctrination, 76-78, 87
 working tools, 75-77
- Rugg Philosophy Analyzed*, 246
- Russell, William E., 121
 Russell Sage Foundation, 257
 Russian engineers, 101
- Samuelson, Paul A., 155
School and Social Progress, The, 188
 School boards, hostility toward, 265, 267-268
- Scientific courses, lack of, 289-292
 Secularism in schools, 143-145, 165-170
 Secular schools, rise of, 13-15
 Separatists (see Pilgrims)
- Service trainees, deficiencies in, 98-99
- Shafer, Paul W., 134
 Shelly, Thomas J., 191
 Skaife, Robert A., 251
 Smith, Mortimer, 172
 Snow, Glenn E., 266
Social Frontier, The, 26-28
 Socialism, and communism, 209-215, 217, 220, 225-227, 288
 basic principles, 210-211
 Christian, 212
 contemporary, 212, 214
 Marxist form, 211-214
 Soviet, 214-215
 utopian colonies, 211, 213
 (See also New social order)

- Social Reconstruction*, 77
 Social science courses, aim of, 42-43
 Brookings Institution survey, 74, 156-157
 "core" of educational program, 3-4, 25, 87-89, 92, 93, 108, 159, 182-183
 NEA teaching guides, 258-260
 origin, 62
 Rugg-Mendenhall system, 74-89
 Social science pamphlets, 62, 66, 71
 Social Science Research Council, 243
 Social science textbooks (*see* Textbooks, social science)
 Sociology textbooks survey, 74, 144, 167
 Socratic doctrine, 130, 165, 200
 Sokolsky, George E., 168
 Sons of the American Revolution, viii, 246
 Sophist doctrine, 201-202
 Sophocles, 181, 200
Soviet Challenge to America, The, 46
 Soviet Russia, central executive committee decrees of, 35-36
 cold war, 218-220, 226
 five-year plan, 82-83
 progressive education in, 33-38, 45, 116, 200
 socialism of, 214-215
 Speech conference, 110-112
 Spencer, Herbert, 20, 175
 Sproul, Robert G., 117
 State schools, rise of, 13-15
 Stoddard, George D., 26
 Stokes, Helen Phelps, 136
 Strachey, John, 215
 Stout, Minard W., 281
 Summer schools, Moscow University, 55-58
 Surveys (*see* Educational survey).
 Tarshes, Lorie, 155
 Tau Kappa Alpha conference, 110-112
 Taxation, double, 157
 Taxes, textbooks on, 157-158
Teacher and Society, The, 26, 194
 Teachers, citizenship educational project, 258
 civil liberties, 121-124, 242-243
 communist, 116-118, 209
 debarment, 269
 dissident, 8-9, 88, 107, 184-185, 191, 197, 245, 252, 280
 licensing of, 238-239, 269
 NEA guide, 260
 socialist-minded, 220
 teaching of, 233-239
 Teachers College, academic freedom at, 281-282
 center of progressive movement, 87, 234-235
 grants to, 262
 influence of, 31, 238
 pedagogues, 235-237
 Teachers' Union, 117
Teacher's Guides, 75-77
 Teachers' Union, 116-117
 Teacher-training schools, progressive movement in, 87-88, 238-239
 Technical training, deficiency of, 101, 289-292
 Texas parent, 278
 Textbooks, economics, 155-161
 financed by Rockefeller Foundation, 257
 for navy personnel, 98
 secularism in, 144
 social science, 4, 41, 62, 66, 71-72, 74-89
 sociology, survey of, 74, 144, 167
 on taxation, 157-158
 for U.S. armed forces, 158
 Thayer, Albert H., 98
Theory and Practice of Socialism, 215
 Theory of evolution, influence of, 20
 "They Sow Distrust," 251
 Thomas, Ivor, 217
 Thomas, Norman, 137
 Thompson, Dorothy, *quoted*, on Bentley case, 221
 Soviet education, 37

- Three R's, deficiency in, 97, 101, 103-110, 277-280, 283-284
- Tildsley, John L., *quoted*, on Dewey-ites, 33
educational revolution, 135-136
frontier thinkers, 124
- Transcription Supervisors Association, 103-105
- Tripod of liberty, 141-149
- Undermining our Republic*, 66 *fn*, 246
- UNESCO, precursors of, 60
- United States armed forces courses, 157-159
economics textbook, 158
- United States Armed Forces Institute, 158
- United States Army trainees, deficiencies in, 98-99
- United States Constitution, courses on, 93-94, 230-231
debunking of, 40, 69, 76-77, 80-82, 84, 130-131, 146-147, 226, 275
economic rights under, 148-149
framing of, 138-142
ideals underlying, 139-142, 165, 230
ignorance of, 94, 221, 223-224
political rights under, 145-148
religious freedom under, 141-145
- United States Navy, educational survey, 98
trainees, deficiency in, 98
- United States prisoners of war (*see* Korea)
- United States Supreme Court, 81
- Universities, revolt of, 282-284
- University of Illinois, 283
- University of Minnesota, 283
- University of Moscow summer schools, 55-58
- University of Peking, 219
- Utopian colonies, 211, 213
- Vincent, William S., 259-260
- Virginia Colony, educational system of, 12-13
- Von Mises, Ludwig, 275
- Wallace, Alfred, 201
- War of Independence, pedagogical attitude toward, 76
public education during, 13
- Warren, William C., 283-284
- Watson, Goodwin, and John Dewey
Yearbook, 26
member, policy committee, 48
quoted, on mass communications, 58-59
as teacher, 235
- Watts, V. Orval, 154-155, 161
- West, E. H., 245
- Woelfel, Norman, 26
- Woodlock, Thomas F., 233
- "What's Happened to Our Schools?", 190
- White House Conference on Education, 286-288
- Whitman, Howard, *quoted*, on educational philosophy, 8
conducts survey, 252-253, 271, 277
- Why Johnnie Can't Read*, 279
- Whyte, William H., Jr., 190
- Wittmer, Felix, 276
- Wyclif, John, 142



