

MS-603: Rabbi Marc H. Tanenbaum Collection, 1945-1992.

Series C: Interreligious Activities. 1952-1992

Box 29, Folder 3, Interreligious curriculum, 1963.

INTERRELIGIOUS INSTITUTE

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY  
Los Angeles, California

September 9, 1963

\*\*\*\*

"Intergroup Content in Religious Teaching Materials"

\*\*\*\*

Sponsored by  
LOYOLA UNIVERSITY  
in cooperation with  
THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE  
and  
THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS, INC.

\*\*\*\*

Institute Speakers

Father Eugene Schallert, S.J.  
Associate Professor of Sociology  
University of San Francisco

Dr. Samuel Dinin  
Dean, The Teachers' Institute  
University of Judaism of Los Angeles

Dr. John A. Hutchison  
Professor of Philosophy of Religion  
Claremont Graduate School

Institute Chairman

FATHER WILLIS J. EGAN, S.J.  
Chairman, Department of Theology  
Loyola University of Los Angeles

Institute Consultants

DR. JACOB H. CUNNINGHAM  
Executive Director  
Southern California Region  
The National Conference of Christians & Jews, Inc.

MR. NEIL C. SANDBERG  
Regional Director  
The American Jewish Committee

Planning Committee

RABBI LEONARD I. BEERMAN  
Temple Leo Baeck

DR. WILLIAM SANFORD LA SOR  
Professor of Old Testament  
Fuller Theological Seminary

RABBI MARVIN BORNSTEIN  
President, Southern California  
Board of Rabbis

DR. MARJORIE LIKINS  
Director, Christian Education  
United Church of Christ

DR. RICHARD W. CAIN  
Superintendent of Los Angeles  
District of the Methodist Church  
Southern California-Arizona Conference

REV. HARRY MC KNIGHT  
Executive Director  
Church Federation of Los Angeles

REV. E. DEAN CANADY  
Director, Christian Education  
Christian Churches of Southern  
California (Disciples of Christ)

REV. WILLIAM H. MERWIN  
Executive Secretary  
Board of Education of the Methodist  
Church of So. Calif.-Arizona Conference

REV. JOHN N. DOGGETT, Jr.  
Hamilton Methodist Church

DR. CLIFTON MOORE  
Radio and Television Director  
Presbyterian Church Headquarters  
Southern California and Southern  
Nevada Council of Churches

MRS. VELMA FRASHER  
Christian Education Director  
Church Federation of Los Angeles

RABBI WILLIAM SPIGELMAN  
Shaarei Tefila Congregation

DR. CHARLES S. KENDALL  
Hollywood First Methodist Church

DR. FORREST WEIR  
General Secretary  
Southern California-Southern  
Nevada Council of Churches

REV. KARL E. KNISELEY  
First Lutheran Church of Glendale

RABBI ALFRED WOLF  
Wilshire Boulevard Temple

The Institute was convened to provide an opportunity for spiritual leaders, religious educators, seminarians and others working in related fields of the major faiths to hear and discuss presentations on three studies made to determine the Intergroup Content in Religious Teaching Materials. These scientific self-studies

of Protestant, Catholic and Jewish curricula were initiated and supported by the American Jewish Committee.

The Institute was co-sponsored with Loyola University by the American Jewish Committee and the National Conference of Christians and Jews. It brought together many of the religious leaders and educators in Southern California who examined the findings of the studies and applied them to the religious education materials, teaching techniques and religious curricula of each of the three major faith groups.

The Jewish study, under the direction of Dr. Bernard D. Weinryb, was made at the Dropsie College of Hebrew and Cognate Learning. The Protestant study was completed at Yale University Divinity School by Dr. Bernhard E. Olson and has recently been published by Yale University Press under the title Faith and Prejudice. The Catholic study, a three-part project, was undertaken at St. Louis University, under the supervision and direction of Father Trafford P. Maher, S.J. The Institute examined the work of Sister M. Rose Albert Thering, O.P., which was published as a Ph.D. thesis under the title Potential in Religious Textbooks for Developing a Realistic Self-Content.

Each study represents a systematic examination of the portrayal of outside religious, racial and ethnic groups in religious textbooks, and, on the whole, they are surprisingly free of prejudice. The research procedures of the three studies are different, and, while they are parallel in intent, the various research designs are not interchangeable.

One of the most troubling paradoxes confronting religiously committed people is the existence of prejudice among their co-religionists. Every major religious tradition in the West teaches respect for one's fellow men as children of one God. Yet, all too often, men have tended to despise or hate their neighbors because of racial, ethnic or even religious bias.

Religious text-writers have often carried teaching beyond the statement of essential doctrines into the terrain of slurs that offend other faiths. These expressions, whether in Protestant, Catholic, or Jewish materials, can subtly evoke unfavorable attitudes to other faiths in the minds of pupils. Dr. Olson blames textbook writers and educators who rely on outdated history, interpret their church's theology too narrowly, and who seem to lack an awareness of their responsibility as teachers to present a fair picture of what other people believe.

The charge that Catholics were "papists" and "enemies of the gospel" still finds expression in Protestant materials. Dr. C. Ellis Nelson, of the Union Theological Seminary, says, "The findings of Faith and Prejudice showed the clear need for a thorough-going Protestant re-examination of its teachings on other religious groups".

One of the most profound and subtle roots of anti-Semitism is a tradition of Christian teaching that holds the Jews collectively responsible for the crucifixion and death of Jesus. Such teachings still are found in prayers and liturgy, in Sunday school lessons and weekly sermons, and all combine to stigmatize the Jews and to rationalize their continued persecution. The World Council of Churches in November, 1961, resolved that "Christian teaching should not be presented so as to fasten upon the Jewish people of today responsibilities which belong to our corporate humanity." The Ecumenical Council is also dealing with this important problem.

Sister Rose Albert points to negative and hostile references in Catholic materials concerning Protestants and Jews and suggests the need for inclusion of more positive commentary on the other faith groups. America, the national Jesuit weekly, editorialized as follows: "The scholars involved in these studies, as well as the

American Jewish Committee which actively encouraged them from the start, are performing a genuine service in our religiously pluralistic society."

It is recognized that the school is second only to the home as a place where social forces influencing the student's attitudes toward himself and others are centered. This is true of the religious school as well, and it is obvious that religious education is an important source of social attitudes.

While the religious curricula is designed to nurture students in a particular faith, it inevitably includes reference to, and comparison with, other faiths and ethnic groups. If the portrait of such "outside" groups is distorted, negative or prejudiced in comparison with the self-portrait, classrooms may be an inadvertent source of religious, ethnic or racial prejudice. Moreover, if prejudice exists in religious education materials, it is all the more dangerous because of the "halo" effect of religious teaching; the student is allowed to believe that a negative attitude toward a specific racial or religious group is sanctioned by his religion.

In the words of Sister Rose Albert, "The textbook is the most accurate index of both the subject matter presented to students and the temper and tone of instruction for the teacher. Print gives force and authority to the spoken word and even though the teacher may view the text as a springboard to creative instruction, the textbook is basic and a most important tool in the hands of the teacher, as well as in the hands of the student."

LECTURE DELIVERED BY  
DR. JOHN A. HUTCHISON  
PROFESSOR OF PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION  
CLAREMONT GRADUATE SCHOOL

My part of this panel will consist of exposition and evaluation of the main findings of Dr. Bernard E. Olson's recent study entitled Faith and Prejudice. Olson's book is a notable study of the extent, the nature and significance of prejudice in current American Protestant Sunday School materials. Olson's study began in 1953 and extended over a decade. It is clearly the most extensive and rigorous study of its kind currently available to us. As a study of current literature in this field it makes no effort to examine prejudice in the oral use or application of these materials where, it is my personal experience, prejudice sometimes enters the situation at precisely this point. However, within the limits which this volume sets for itself, it is clearly definitive work.

The study consists of an analysis of four samples of Protestant Sunday School material labeled respectively: Fundamentalist, Conservative, Neo-Orthodox, and Liberal. I never know where labels become libel, but I suspect they do at some point here. The sample of Fundamentalist material is from the Scripture Press whose materials are widely used by churches on the right end of the broad spectrum of American Protestantism. They are used inter-denominationally. The sample of conservative materials is from Missouri Synod Lutheran Sunday School pamphlets and books. The so-called neo-orthodox or neo-Protestant sample is the Faith and Life Curriculum of the United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. This I know best, for the reason that I happen to be a Presbyterian. My own children have used these materials and I have myself used it on the teaching end of the teacher-student relationship. The liberal sample is from the Unitarian Universalist Sunday School material published by the Beacon Press. In general, all these materials come off remarkably well. In a previous panel discussion of this subject I expressed my own enormous relief at how little actual prejudice turned up in them. I had expected to see much more, particularly in the Fundamentalist and Conservative materials. Another panelist, Rabbi

Marc Tanenbaum replied with some amusement that my anxiety constituted an altogether typical liberal Protestant attitude.

The two samples that show greatest freedom from prejudice are 3 and 4, the Presbyterian and Unitarian Universalists. This, I think, becomes extremely interesting because it shows among other things, that freedom from prejudice, at least in the Protestant community, is by no means the property of the liberal. The Faith and Life Curriculum of the Presbyterian Church has deliberately sought to recapture the viewpoint of the Reformation and the Bible. Perhaps the most illuminating thing I can briefly say about this curriculum is that in the early 1940's the leaders of the Christian Education Department of the Presbyterian Church sought a curriculum which would make available to the students in church schools the results of the new theology which was then and is now prominent in Protestantism. In this connection I mention such names as Karl Barth, Emil Brunner, the Niebuhr brothers, and Paul Tillich as well as many others who could be mentioned. There was an effort, in other words, to write a curriculum that would be in some way theologically responsible to the tradition in which the Presbyterian Church stands. I think it has succeeded remarkably well in doing this; however, the thing that is interesting in present context is that this curriculum and its materials, scored very well in their freedom from prejudice.

A word on the research design. The basic concept is taken from The Authoritarian Personality by Adorno and others and the idea of ethnocentrism is in a way the key concept. Olson follows Adorno in presenting the ethnocentric person as one who hugs his own group to himself, is fearful and hostile to the outgroup. Despite the gross over-simplification perhaps you can see the key concept of freedom and authority which is used. This, I think, is in great need of careful critical appraisal. In the Adorno Book, the concept of authority and freedom seems to me particularly uncritical; it identifies authority with authoritarianism. By and large, Olson has avoided the excesses of the book he takes as his model. He does not make the equation between authority and authoritarianism, an equation, incidentally, which is all too frequent among social psychologists. Hence this study avoids many of the secular prejudices of the social scientist.

A series of 14 points of possible prejudice are noted. These are called 14 analytic categories. With these assumptions, Dr. Olson examined representative samples of Sunday School materials, scoring each paragraph for a positive or negative imbalance with respect to prejudice. A positive imbalance means in effect affirmative feelings, or affirmative responses toward other groups, and a negative imbalance by contrast constitutes therefore the measure of prejudice. Seven out-groups were noted, ranging from other Protestant denominations to Jews to Catholics to Negroes, and to the other religions of mankind.

One result which emerges over all from this study is the existence of a real concern on the part of all four of these curriculum materials for out-groups. This goes flatly counter to the image that the writers of these materials have of their task. Almost to the man they told Dr. Olson, "we're just concerned with our own groups and we are only quite peripherally and incidentally concerned with other groups". But between 67 and 88% of the materials sampled show a significant concern with other groups.

Another general result is that there is no overt racism in these materials.

From this point onward the results become more detailed and subtle so that what I want to do is spend the balance of my time summarizing for you a few of the conclusions of this study.

First of all, Protestant attitude toward the Jews. As you might guess, the Conservative, the Fundamentalists and neo-Protestant or neo-Orthodox and the Liberals vary widely in their responses to Jews and to Judaism. This material is contained in Chapter IV of the book. A Conservative in the main tends to regard Jews as any other non-Christian group as objects for missionary activity. By and large, the Conservative and the Fundamentalist groups have taken more external attitudes, have attempted less to identify with Jews and Judaism. They tend to assume what the author terms some of the "scriptural stereotypes" of the New Testament. The Jew is the man who has rejected Christ, whose part in God's economy of salvation has now been superseded. Yet I must add immediately that there is less of this than I expected to find in these Sunday School materials.

If we move from Conservative and Fundamentalist to Neo-Protestant or Neo-Orthodox, immediately the point of view changes, and the initial concern is with the relation of Christianity to Judaism at the present time. The author quotes questions from one of the Presbyterian Sunday School pamphlets: "Do the members of the class know of any clubs, hotels, resorts that are for gentiles only? Are they aware that the term "restricted clientele" generally means that Jews are excluded. Has it occurred to them that Our Lord Himself would be excluded from such places? Is it likely that all of us have accepted services and privileges that would be denied to Jesus?"

The Unitarian Universalist material labeled here "Naturalistic Liberalism", moves very quickly to what can be perhaps called a socio-political concern with the relation of the nation Israel to the Arab nations today with Anti-Semitism in America. It is interesting to see these Presbyterians and the Unitarians frequently arriving at the same practical conclusion, but doing so from opposite theological and religious reasons.

In Catholic-Protestant relations the tendency of much of the Sunday School material is to take a point of view of the 16th and 17th centuries, and thus to identify the Roman Catholic Church as the oppressor and the Protestant Church as the champion of liberty. Another interesting difference among these materials is that the historical scholarship of the Fundamentalist and Conservative groups left what Dr. Olson felt was much to be desired. Olson is a student of Professor Roland Bainton of the Yale Divinity School for whom the concept of religious liberty has been the object of special and significant study. He is a very great scholar and thus Olson points out, for example, that many of the Protestant materials had much to say about Queen Mary of England as "Bloody Mary", but say almost nothing about the Protestant persecution of Roman Catholics both preceding and following Mary's reign. Still a further feature of this material is that there is almost no reference to the American experience of Roman Catholicism in our traditionally predominantly Protestant culture. For example there is no reference to the APA, no reference to the Ku Klux Klan and to organizations of this kind, which certainly are not only anti-Jewish, but anti-Catholic as well. These hostilities traditionally either endemic or epidemic in American Protestantism are consistently ignored in Protestant Sunday School materials, and also in Olson's evaluation of these materials.

In summary, then, Protestant Sunday School materials seem with remarkably few exceptions to emerge from this examination as innocent of prejudice. Yet two comments must immediately be added. The first is that absence of prejudice is a minimal and indeed a pale and negative achievement. Beyond lies the more challenging objective of exploring and cultivating more affirmative attitudes among America's three main religious traditions. One may only plead that such a course is in complete accord with the ethical ideal of love or brotherhood which Protestantism share with Catholicism and Judaism.

A second comment follows from this. It is that so much of the work together of Protestants, Catholics and Jews in the past has been directed to urgent practical objectives -- putting out the fires of prejudice -- that little time or energy has been left for the more attractive and affirmative tasks of getting acquainted with each others' faith and theology. For many of us at the present time this last objective appears as clearly the most attractive prospect on the horizon of inter-religions relations.

LECTURE DELIVERED BY  
DR. SAMUEL DININ  
DEAN, THE TEACHERS' INSTITUTE  
UNIVERSITY OF JUDAISM OF LOS ANGELES

I feel that at a conference of this kind something should first be said about the importance of the conference and about the nature of prejudice in general.

Gunnar Myrdal in his American Dilemma tells us that "there is a gulf between the American ideals of democracy and brotherhood on the one hand and the existence of racial prejudices, discrimination and segregation on the other." And Kenneth B. Clark, in his study of Prejudice and Your Child, tell us: "Our children will not be able to play an effective role in this modern world if they are blocked by our past prejudices and if through these attitudes they stimulate resentment and hostility rather than cooperation and understanding among other peoples of the world."

Now a word about what the social scientists tell us about the churches and synagogues and what they have done with reference to prejudice. They tell us there is no evidence that racial prejudices are inborn; that it is false to assume that a child remains unaffected by racial considerations until the teens or pre-teens. Racial attitudes appear early and develop gradually. The problem of the development of an awareness of religious ideas and identification in our children involves more subtle and complex distinctions which undertandingly require a longer period of time before they are clearly understood.

For Jewish children there is an earlier awareness of religious identification and minority status, and it comes at an earlier age than with Protestant and Catholic children. This awareness comes at about the age of 5, whereas with the Catholic and Protestant children, at the age of 7 or 8. When Jewish children reach the age of 10, this awareness decreases. When they reach 13 or 14 years of age, it declines still further. As they get older, they become aware of the fact that they have no preferred status in the larger community and, therefore, there is a drop in this awareness.

The racial ideas of children are less rigid and more easily changed than the racial ideas of adults. Churches and Sunday schools do not play an effective part in developing positive racial and religious attitudes in children. These racial attitudes reflect the efforts of other forces in society which are not counteracted, even if not reinforced by the church and the Sunday school. The influence of religious training reveals a paradox. Those who profess the strongest religious affiliation or those who attend church frequently are more likely to be prejudiced than those who attend infrequently. In other words, the conclusion is forced upon us that religion in America is another passive force which helps keep prejudice alive. The children get prejudices from a number of interrelated social influences; among these the family, the playmates, neighbors, associates, schools, the socio-economic status of the family in the community, the influence of the church, mass media of communication, and other influences.

It is the feeling of the author, Lillian Smith, that the major forces

responsible for prejudice are the anxieties and pressures that parents impose on their children in order to foster values of respectability and conformity.

These conclusions of the social scientists should at least shock us into an awareness of what exists and lead us to call more conferences of this kind so that the churches and the synagogues through their religious schools will become a positive rather than a passive force in combating prejudice in our country.

We now turn to the specific subject of discussion.

There actually were two studies made of intergroup content in religious teaching materials by Jewish groups. In 1935, the Synagogue Council of America, which is a council of the synagogues of the major denominational groups of American Jewish life, set up a Committee on Textbooks which examined from 400 to 500 textbooks. Of these they rejected only 43 and recommended revisions in 23 others. The study itself is described in an article by Dr. Bernard D. Weinryb in Religious Education (March-April 1960). The study examined two basic questions: the attitudes of Jews in Jewish - non-Jewish relations, and in intra-Jewish relations.

By means of quantitative analysis, using a sentence or a picture as the unit of enumeration, the study attempted to determine the range of preoccupation with intergroup matters in the textbooks of Jewish schools (the coefficient of preoccupation being the ratio of units dealing with intergroup themes to the total number of units); and the extent to which they reflect prejudice against other groups. Findings were expressed in terms of imbalance: negative imbalance indicating that the units containing prejudice outnumber those containing anti-prejudice, and positive imbalance indicating that units containing anti-prejudice are more numerous than those containing prejudice.

Since curriculum materials in the Jewish school deal for the most part with customs, ceremonies, holidays, prayer, etc., the preoccupation with majority groups is quite small: 10% in terms of majority ethnic groups, 4% in terms of non-Jewish religious groups, 1% for non-Jewish socio-economic groups and .2% with minority ethnic or racial groups.

One-third of all of the materials analyzed show an imbalance in the relation of Jews to other religious groups. But nine-tenths of that is a positive imbalance, meaning that they go overboard to show the other groups in a favorable light, and only 10% negative imbalance. When it comes to Jews and the majority groups there is even a smaller imbalance; and when it comes to the relations of Jews to other ethnic or racial groups the positive imbalance overwhelmingly outweighs the negative.

This analysis is based on a study of textbooks of some 50 publishing houses, representing every type of school in the American Jewish community. Though the bulk of them are identified with the Orthodox, Reform and Conservative groups, the study also includes other groups: the American Council for Judaism, and the ultra-Orthodox groups of the extreme right. These constitute a very small percentage of all of the schools and all of the textbooks studied. The negative imbalances were, as a whole, to be found in these extreme groups and not in the three major denominational groups within Judaism. Only two publisher types, the Hassidic-Orthodox which is one of the ultra-Orthodox groups and the Zionist groups who do not conduct schools in America but have textbooks published by Zionist publishing houses which are used in some of the schools, are the only ones which show a small negative imbalance, mainly in materials dealing with the non-American background. The Jewish schools in America have to teach a history of a people 4,000 years old, and the history of American Jewry is a comparatively recent one in the history of our people. Most of the material

deals, therefore with non-American background, and whatever there is of negative imbalance is to be found in this material dealing with the non-American background.

When it comes to intra-Jewish relations, there is even less preoccupation with other Jewish groups than with non-Jewish groups. When Jewish groups refer to one another in terms of religion, the number of texts showing imbalance is small (6%), but over half of that is negative (When Jews refer to non-Jewish groups the imbalance is almost 90% positive). Whatever negative imbalance there is is in two extreme groups, in this case, the Orthodox and the Reform (including the American Council for Judaism), and the prejudiced statements mostly concern each other. They both treat the Conservative group gently.

When the category of reference is political-cultural relations or sub-ethnic relations, the imbalance is overwhelmingly positive and only the American Council for Judaism shows a negative imbalance here (with a diatribe against Zionism). With the exception therefore of the Orthodox groups, particularly the ultra-Orthodox, and the American Council for Judaism, Jewish groups offer fairly objective images of each other. Each group, however, sees itself as the preserver of the essential faith of Judaism. Christianity is portrayed as a religion of high ideals and an important advance over polytheism. Christianity is sometimes taken to task in the historical books because it fails to heed the admonitions of justice and because it has a profoundly pessimistic view of man's nature. These are the only two points where something negative is said about Christianity in the textbooks studied.

I would like to indicate what the conclusions of the study were and then make some general remarks about the whole problem touched upon in the study. The curriculum of the Jewish schools as a whole is centered on subject matter and language. It is concerned with the study of the Hebrew language and literature, of Bible, of Jewish history, of customs and ceremonies, and there is very little of doctrinal material particularly in the elementary school years. The textbooks show a higher rate of preoccupation with majority groups and a smaller preoccupation with other minority groups and with intra-Jewish groups. There is very little prejudice shown against non-Jewish groups. What there is is exceeded many times by expressions of positive imbalance, or friendliness and anti-prejudice. The higher negative imbalance is in intra-Jewish relations in the two extreme groups listed above. The Jewish textbook writer is sensitive about his group minority status and care is taken to show fairness and to avoid prejudice. As Dr. Hutchison indicated there is no way of estimating how many times one could have dealt with brotherhood and other values and didn't. Nor does it reveal how the textbook is used by the teacher and what its impact is upon the student. This was a sentence by sentence count instead of consideration of paragraphs and units of study.

As Rabbi Arthur Hertzberg points out, the curriculum of the Jewish school deals with Jewish culture and religion, with emphasis on learning the Hebrew language. With so little time available, it is no wonder that there is little concern with other groups in our textbooks.

The sources of prejudice revealed are the novels and stories of classic Yiddish fiction and the attacks of traditional Jews upon non-traditional Jews and of the American Council for Judaism upon Orthodox and Zionist groups.

There is very little attention to Christianity in the curriculum of the Jewish schools. The Jewish school is a supplementary school with little time for other studies. Jewish children absorb awareness of Christianity from the public school and the environment. Neither the Bible nor the Talmud has any reference to Christianity. Judaism and Christianity do not encounter each other on the same level.

For Christianity, its relation to Judaism is of fundamental doctrinal concern. Left to itself Judaism is under no compulsion to define its attitude towards Christianity.

Judaism emphasizes obedience to law rather than assent to specific doctrines. The Jewish school is concerned with teaching customs, ceremonies, history, language and Bible rather than theological foundations. Judaism claims no monopoly to salvation. It teaches the common parentage and unity of the human race. The righteous of all nations have a share in the world to come.

There is no negative portrayal of Christianity in our textbooks because there is so little about it. The Jewish school does have a responsibility to teach our young people about the Faiths of others within our society. The study of other faiths has been introduced in a number of our schools, particularly in the Reform Sunday Schools. There is increasing awareness of the need for teaching our children something about the faiths of our neighbors, and there is no doubt that more and more schools will introduce this subject into the curriculum of the Jewish school, particularly on the junior and senior high school level. The studies under review give us assurance that whatever textbooks and curricular materials will be introduced will describe the beliefs and practices of other religions and ethnic groups with fairness, with sympathy, and without prejudice.

LECTURE DELIVERED BY  
REV. E. J. SCHALLERT, S. J.  
DEPT. OF SOCIOLOGY  
UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Sister Mary Rose Albert Thering of the Dominican Order has done a remarkable job in her study of "The treatment of Intergroup Relations in Social Studies Curriculum Materials Used in Catholic Schools: A Content Analysis." Following the general lines of an earlier study by Bernhard E. Olson, Faith and Prejudice, she has adapted the research design and the specific instruments of Dr. Olson to her own research problem. Her study was completed in 1961 and now is in preparation for publication.

Sister analyzed sixty-five different textbooks involving some 3000 items. She was involved primarily with the "self-image" of Catholic students in so far as this might be a function of the content of Catholic high school textbooks. She hypothesized a relationship between the content of these books, the gradual emergence of an adequate self-image and the concomitant elimination of prejudicial attitudes in the students.

In the analysis of her material, Sister Mary Rose utilized two concepts both of which are rather common in Sociological literature, the concept of ethnocentrism and the concept of altruism. An ethnocentric person is negative in his relationships to others. Ethnocentrism is an emotional or cognitive pattern, usually one of superiority, according to which the ethnocentric person tends to make judgements of members of the "out-group" in terms of the meanings and values and norms to which he has himself been socialized. He thus tends to be exclusive in his relationship with "aliens" or "foreigners". Insensitive to the communal transcendence of human existence, he tends to maximize differences, however superficial, and to be intolerant of both the ideologies and the members of other religions or other ethnic groups or other color groups, or other class groups and so forth. This maximization of differences is not a static kind of thing. As a human social process, it tends to grow and proliferate in terms of its own inner dynamic unless checked and held in balance by other equally dynamic processes. Customs, mores, emotional or intellectual habits, perspectives, ideologies, world-views, entire philosophies and theologies are

considered odd at first by the ethnocentric individual. And, of course, to the person who has centered his own values and interests upon those of the limited group to which he belongs, they most assuredly are odd. If, however, an individual's own personal sense of inadequacy is the reason why he has identified with the group in the first place, and if the group is such that he cannot find within its framework any meaningful, valid authentication of his personal existence, then he may well turn to belittlement of the "oddities" of the out-group, to negative stereotyping, to rigid and inflexible judgements about them, to hostility, aggression, hate and isolation.

Ethnocentrism is, thus, a cutting off sort of attitude, ghettoish. The almost fruitless search for the self, for an affirmation of one's own worthwhileness, for acceptance, for esteem and reverence, for simple human love evokes a submissive and uncritical attitude in the ethnocentric towards the group with which he is attempting to identify. Thus, the very self which is the object of the quest is so immersed in the group as to despair of self discovery. The presentation of the self to the group is not made out of a sense of adequacy but of emptiness. The group thus will seem to "fail" the individual, and the alienation, born of despair will tend, paradoxically enough, to evoke increasingly hostile attitudes towards the different and consequently separated members of the out-group. The radical right in the United States, for example, are most profoundly alienated from American society with which they have unsuccessfully attempted to identify, and have found, in Communism, the scapegoat they need to make their alienation tolerable. The same thing can be said about Catholics who are hostile to Jews, or white who are hostile to the colored. Prejudice is this kind of thing.

Sister's hypothesis is that textbook material which either treats others in a hostile way, or fails to adequately and sympathetically deal with them in terms of their own socio-cultural universe, will tend to give rise to negative images or stereotypes, will tend to feed into existing ethnocentric attitudes and will, negatively at least, tend to be creative of prejudice.

Altruism, on the other hand, is conceptualized by Sister as occupying the opposite pole of the continuum. The altruistic person enters the group out of a sense of his own worth. He is seeking human fulfillment, to be sure, but is conscious of his own powers of fulfilling others in the group and of making a meaningful contribution to the primary entelechy of the group. Secure in his awareness of the worthwhileness of his own human existence, he can identify with both groups. He can be quite critical of his own primary group because he is concerned with getting on with the task at hand. He faces others, of either group, with human understanding and empathy, respectful of the human person. Permissiveness or passivity vis a vis others is gradually supplanted by a sense of relatedness which is more profoundly human. He is concerned with the human enrichment of both groups through contact and interaction, and this demands of him a sense of the value of differences. He will thus desire, for example, that the Negro be just that and as such make his own contribution to the enrichment of his fellow men. The altruist will think of each sub-group in society as having a crucial role to play in the satisfaction of general societal exigencies, each in his own way and in terms of his own sub-culture. He will be aware of the fact that entire societies suffer when one or another of the social sub-groups is not properly functioning and will be as concerned with the crises of the sub-groups as he is with the crises of the entire social system. The altruistic Catholic, for example, will thus tend to be concerned with the inner strength and vitality of Jewish or Protestant religious groups, and will expect that these and other groups within American society will be concerned with the strength and vitality of the Catholic Church.

Sister's second general hypothesis is that textbook material which contributes to the emergence of altruistic attitudes in high school students will tend to enhance the self-image of the sub-group and will thus tend to give birth to positive images of others and to be destructive of ethnocentric and prejudicial attitudes.

There were a number of other more specific hypotheses in Sister's research all of which tended to follow the lines of the earlier Olson study. The primary thrust of both works was to test the potential in textbook material for the creation of ethnocentric or altruistic attitudes towards others. This word "potential" is extremely important to an understanding of the kind of problem with which the author was grappling. She studied no de facto students nor any de facto teachers. Nor can she be criticized for this since each scientist has the right to "zero-in" on any aspect of the general problem. What she and Dr. Olson have left undone only remains to be done.

Much like the Olson study, Sister discovered that there is very little in the content of Catholic high school textbooks that might give rise to ethnocentric or prejudicial attitudes towards other groups. Only half of the items scrutinized contained any mention whatever of other groups, and of this half, somewhat over 74% scored positively, that is, they contributed more to the amelioration of group relationships than not. She suggested that further inquiries would have to be made to determine whether or not the failure to mention intergroup problems might well contribute more towards the emergence of prejudice in students than an honest attempt to grapple with the problems of intergroup tensions.

Were the intent of this paper to merely report on Sister Mary Rose's study, I would conclude at this point with an apology to Sister for having been somewhat imaginative in the discussion of her conceptual tools. Scientific analysis, since it is so highly focused, tends to be limited in its perspective. Scientists research segments of facts, not entire socio-cultural phenomena. For this reason, there are some other things which might contribute to a better understanding of the relationship between faith and prejudice in our society. We cannot fail to note that there is prejudice among religious people in the United States in spite of the fact that there is little potential in the high school textbook material for the creation of prejudicial attitudes. In fact, there are a number of observable phenomena in American society and in American religious groups which, under analysis, might throw some light on the question of faith and prejudice.

We observe, for example, that intergroup tensions are not restricted to irreligious or areligious groups in the United States. Jew-hate, Negro-hate, Catholic-hate seems to be as much at home among 'religious' people as among other groups. The attitudes of the American people can be ranged on a continuum from ethnocentrism to altruism irrespective of their religiosity, and many individuals tend to use their religion as a divine sanction upon attitudes and activities which seem scarcely God-like.

Furthermore, we observe an apparent lack of serious, religiously inspired engagement with the general problem of group tensions and group antagonisms. As we have suggested before, it is rare that one discovers a religiously committed Jew or a religiously committed Protestant who is seriously concerned with the present crisis in American Catholicism. It is similarly rare that one discovers an individual who is deeply committed to the Catholic religion and, at the same time, seriously concerned with the ineffectiveness of either the Jewish religion or the other Christian religions. While this kind of altruism may seem a bit far-fetched in our society, a minimal interest in the amelioration of intergroup hostility would not seem outside the scope of the religious life of the sons of the prophets of either the Old or the

New Testaments. There are some few dialogues taking place, there is an awakening of a spirit of ecumenism among some religious leaders, there are some extremely active human relations groups. But even these indicators of religious vitality do not seem to have captured the imagination of religious people at large who seem as unconcerned with the elimination of intergroup negation as they are with a simple affirmation or authentication of the transcendent goodness of each other precisely in this otherness.

We observe a dearth of effective leadership in the management of this crucial social problem. Religious leaders there are, but their charism tends to be limited to the organizational aspects of religious life, to the perfection of religious bureaucracies. Strong encyclical letters have been written by recent Popes of the Catholic Church concerning the relations of Negroes and whites which could, by extension, be applied to the relations of Jews to Christians, or of Catholics to other Christians. Abstract principles, however, stated in a pre-ideological way and with little or no observable dynamic thrust towards the solution of a specific problem have had little effect upon the behavior of men in our society. The pastoral letters of the American Catholic hierarchy have been strongly oriented towards religious freedom. But the concern of these letters has been by and large with the "freedom to be" of other religious groups rather than with the freedom to be confronted with respect and reverence, with esteem and love by other religious groups. Religious toleration, even if inspired by a spirit of religious love, is ersatz religion, a negation of the very thing that supposedly inspires it. We humans do not tolerate those whom we love -- we embrace them in the fullness of their existential being with warmth and affection and a profound kind of need for all that they are or can become. If somewhere around 90% of American Catholic men have not seriously read nor accepted papal encyclical letters, the same is likely true of the pastoral letters of the American hierarchy. And, if this is true of Catholic men, it is undoubtedly true of the men of other religions. One American Catholic cardinal is reported to have said that there is no serious Negro problem in his diocese because the Church has already made its stand clear on this issue. This is like saying that there are no traffic violations in the city of Los Angeles because the city fathers have made themselves clear on this point.

We observe some slight change in the general directionality or dynamics of religion in the United States most of which is European in its origin in the Catholic church, and probably in others as well. Certainly Martin Buber and Abraham Joshua Heschel will emerge in history as two of the greatest religious prophets of our times as will Pope John XXIII and Pope Paul VI, and all for the same reasons. When charismatic religious leaders appear in our society, the movements they inspire seem to be away from the structural, the organizational, the legal, the rational and towards the "pastoral", the communal, the spiritual, the intuitive. If the movement of religious life is from secondary to primary relationships, from "I-IT" to "I-Thou" it is because God is an irreducible Thou, and because man is made in His image. But, in spite of this kind of leadership, we see little evidence in our society of men or groups of men facing each other as irreducible Thous, who can freely tolerate the manipulation or utilization of the self for greater and more common goals. We see more evidence of men seriously seeking status as though this thing could somehow or other enhance the value of a man already worthy of a Divine covenant.

The social critics of our society have said many of these things before and at much greater length. We religious men and women might well think their thoughts when reflecting on the problems of faith and prejudice. We might gain some insight into the data we are considering if we approach it from the perspective of the social scientist, the only assumption being that we, as religious people, do not live in a socio-cultural vacuum, that we are profoundly influenced by the secular world in which we live. Thus, in approaching the problems of our society, we may well tend

to think about them in terms which are at best religiously ambiguous and which may very well be quite secularistic. If religious people, on the other hand, are to make a specifically religious contribution to the solution of our social problems, they must work within the framework of religion itself. This approach would not tend to invalidate the serious efforts of secular society to grapple with its own problems in its own framework, nor would it, in any way deprecate these efforts. It would insist that there is a religious dimension to socio-cultural problems.

As religious people, then, we might want to ask ourselves what kind of a contribution we have de facto made either to the development of intergroup hostility or the amelioration of these strains in our society. In this kind of analysis, we will have to keep in mind specifically religious factors, and a specifically religious perspective. We shall have to keep in mind also that religious people in the United States have been seriously influenced by what Max Weber calls the process of rationalization or the process of secularization.

In a rational or a secular world, men tend to be more concerned with means than with ends. Disengaged from the problem of meaning or ultimacy, the secularized person is oriented towards the rational manipulation and elaboration of the instrumentally important, and will tend to think of both inanimate things and human persons in this way. Having rationally abstracted from or pretended away the sacred dimension of the real world, he will tend to lose his awareness of the sacred. His relational world will be to a certain extent depersonalized, even dehumanized. He will live in a world of "objects" rather than "subjects." He will think of things objectively, in terms of that which is "essential" to them, rather than in terms of the fullness of their being. A mind that is committed to the rational differentiation and classification of logical constructs and taken up with a clear and precise definition of logical categories, may well be insensitive to human existence, to the joys and sorrows of men, to human emptiness and human fulfillment. The categories men create may be either a source of insight into the richness and fullness of the real or they may be an object in themselves. For the rationalist, the categories are the object of human thought, and for the secularist in religion, the categorical analysis of God and human-Divine relationships are the object of religion rather than God. In both instances, the existential phenomena are reduced to something considerably less than they really are, and, in the last analysis, to a caricature or a stereotype of the real. The Jew is no longer an intensely religious human being confronted with all of the human dilemmas of every seriously religious person. He is simply a "Jew".

There is true value in rational or secular pursuits. All of us are quite conscious of the wonderful contributions towards human progress which have been made by secular society. But, there are also limitations to rational or secular knowledge, as there are to religious knowledge. But, a society which is suffering from these limitations is confronted more with a religious crisis than with a secular one.

In a sacred society, men are consciously sensitive to the presentiality of God in their world. The God, whose presence religious men experience in the world around them, is not a conceptualized, objectified God. Nor is His presence seen only in the spectacular, the "magnalia Dei." Once an individual has sensitized himself to the reality of God in the world, he sees Him in the smile of a child, in the beauty of a rose, in the car he is driving, the movement of his hand, in his world. Whatever he sees, he perceives as a Temple of God. Having identified himself by reason of the discovery made in the Temple, he similarly identifies others and is, thus, always "among his own."

From one point of view, the religious experience is an experience of the Divine affirmation or authentication of the self. My own worthwhileness, precisely in so far as this transcends both space and time, is not something which is immediately

observable to men in a secular world. A sensitive man may discover this in a mirror. Most of us discover it in the mirror of another's love for us, and ultimately, in the mirror of our God's love of us. As we observe God responding to us with warmth and affection and with love, as we observe the God of the Covenant exquisitely concerned with HIS people, we discover the worth of His people and the worth of the self.

Of course, this experience, if it is real, is not limited to an exclusive or individualistic involvement with the Divine "Thou." The epiphany of the transcendent value of the self is, at one and the same time, an epiphany of the value of human existence. The religious experience, thus impels one outwardly, towards others. As Joachim Wach has observed, the intentionality of the religious experience is towards its communal expression, towards, that is, a profound involvement with others precisely because of the great goodness that is perceived. The religious experience thus thrusts one upon the world of human beings. It places no conditions upon the commitment. The religious man cannot say to his fellow man, "I will reverence or esteem or love you IF you can rid yourself of your color or your religious creed or your political ideology or your ethnic roots or your sin." He is antecedently predisposed to see beneath these socio-cultural differentiations to the undergirding reality of the richness of human existence.

If, then, we as religious people are to make a religious contribution to the solution of social problems, we must do this precisely in so far as we are religious. There are large numbers of groups in the United States who are attacking these problems as social or psychological scientists or as social welfare workers on a number of different levels. The social problems of our day cannot be solved without the admirable efforts of these people, and they cannot be solved without our own religious efforts. Because of the secularization of our religious life, we may well have lost the creative imagination needed to respond to this challenge. If this is so, and I think it is, it is even more important now that we make serious efforts to regain our religious insightfulness precisely while we are working towards the solution of these social problems. This will be particularly difficult in the face of the continuing scandal of a divided and bickering Christendom and a Christendom divided against Judaism. In working together we may well discover some of the beauty and richness of each others' religion and may consequently learn to face each other with the kind of respect and love needed to manage the problems of prejudice in our society.

As we have noted above, religious faith deepens a man's insight into his fellow man. It helps him to see things he might not see otherwise. It is important to our society that this kind of vision be institutionalized once again and that it become functional in the day to day relations of our people. It is frequently difficult for men in a secular society to perceive the kinds of things in themselves that God sees and that evoke the kind of response from Him that we observe in the history of Judeo-Christian religious life. The love of the God of the Covenant or the God of the Cross is an unintelligible, frequently an intolerable kind of love. The phenomenon of religious people working together towards the solution of the societal problem of prejudice between religious and ethnic groups may well provide our secular society with the depth of insight it needs to ultimately resolve these conflicts. We have learned from the studies of Dr. Olson and Sister Mary Rose Albert that the elimination of material carrying a potential for the creation or elaboration of prejudice from high school text books by no means eliminates prejudicial attitudes. The teaching and the living of religion in the tradition of Martin Buber and Pope John XXIII may well accomplish this task.

### WORKSHOP CONCLUSIONS

Following is a summary of the workshop sessions held during the Interreligious Institute at Loyola University. The similarity of many of the reports given at the closing general session suggests that honest men of good will do have a chance of coming to agreement, even on matters of faith.

1. Religious materials and instruction which encourage positive attitudes toward other groups are primary factors in dispelling prejudice.
2. Groups of intellectually honest theologians working together to authenticate their views could do much to overcome prejudice and would give us a truer picture of our points of agreement and disagreement. The exchange of ideas by clergymen of various faiths should also be encouraged in the spirit of overcoming prejudice.
3. Much prejudice finds its genesis in the "selective teaching of history." Teachers have an obligation to present to their classes accurate, objective accounts of the political, religious and cultural factors which influenced historical events and movements.
4. In our relations with one another, there is need for greater emphasis on love rather than on tolerance.
5. The aim of various religious groups working together is to be able to express, sympathetically, and in a way acceptable to those concerned, the views of members of another faith. Our aim should be unity in diversity rather than unity in faith.
6. We must be well acquainted with our own viewpoints and secure in our convictions as a basis for developing positive attitudes toward others. It is important to emphasize the points we have in common acknowledging especially our common bond of faith in God and mutual respect for freedom of conscience. This carries with it the acceptance of the legitimate existence of many viewpoints, and requires a knowledge of our own shortcomings and a spirit of charity.
7. We can be receptive to the views of others without destroying our own faith values and religious integrity.
8. The teacher must have a firm foundation in his own faith so that his religious allegiance is based upon more than emotionalism and ethnocentrism.
9. The rules of "dialogue" involve respect for the faith of others, the seeking of understanding rather than of adherence, and the absence of any efforts to recruit.
10. Inherent in each faith group are important resources, including such concepts as the dignity of man and the brotherhood of man.
11. It is possible to disagree very strongly in spiritual or doctrinal matters without being prejudiced and without necessarily having a prejudicial attitude toward those with whom we disagree.
12. These Institutes should be held frequently and should be expanded to include other groups in the religious community. Human relations workshops, like that held at Loyola each summer, are most important.

13. The proceedings of this Institute should be made available to all religious educational institutions in the area.
14. Participants agreed on the nature of the problems they faced although there was disagreement on some of the answers.
15. Students of different faiths should be encouraged to meet with one another and engage in conversations, especially in the realm of community service projects geared toward achievement of a common task. A youth exchange, which would bring into contact children from parochial schools, Jewish day schools and Protestant church schools, would be desirable.
16. The education of parents is crucial and children can be considered a resource toward this end.
17. As a second phase of the evaluation of textbooks, a study might be undertaken by scholars of a faith other than the one using the material.
18. Progress toward interfaith harmony is indicated by the relatively low incidence of prejudice in curriculum materials.
19. The mass media have a special responsibility to represent the facts accurately and to contribute to a wholesome intergroup climate.
20. Full use should be made of literature, films and educational materials made available by organizations such as The National Conference of Christians and Jews, The American Jewish Committee, and The National Catholic Welfare Conference. There should be opportunities for the comparison of religious literature and other educational materials.
21. One of the first steps in overcoming prejudice is the avoidance of cliches and the careless application of "labels" to groups or individuals.
22. Intelligent and dispassionate men must be selected to write religious materials and textbooks.
23. Proper training of religious teachers and dialogues among teachers of various faiths is of primary importance in overcoming prejudice. Negative attitudes toward other groups may be instilled in the minds of children through the prejudice of teachers.

INTERGROUP RELATIONS  
in CATHOLIC TEXTBOOKS

A Summary and Interpretation  
of the St. Louis University Study  
of Catholic Religion Textbooks

---

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY:

The school is second only to the home as a place where social forces influencing the student's attitudes toward himself and others are centered. This is true of the religious school as well, and it is obvious that religious education is an important source of social attitudes.

While the religious curriculum is designed to nurture students in a particular faith, it inevitably includes reference to and comparison with other faiths and ethnic groups. If the portrait of such "outside" groups is distorted, negative or prejudiced in comparison with the self-portrait, our religious classrooms may be an inadvertent source of religious, ethnic or racial prejudice. Moreover, if prejudice exists in religious education materials, it is all the more dangerous because of the "halo" affect of religious teaching: the student is allowed to believe that a negative attitude toward a specific racial or religious group is sanctioned by his religion.

To bring the light of objective, scientific study to bear on this problem, the American Jewish Committee, a pioneer human relations agency, initiated and encouraged self-studies by Protestants, Catholics and Jews of their own curriculum materials and helped to stimulate foundation support for these independent research projects.

The Jewish study, under the direction of Dr. Bernard D. Weinryb, is nearing completion at the Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning; the Protestant study was completed at Yale University Divinity School by Dr. Bernhard E. Olson and has recently been published by Yale University Press under the title Faith and Prejudice. The Catholic study was undertaken at St. Louis University under the supervision and direction of Father Trafford P. Maher, S.J. It consists of three separate investigations, covering literature textbooks,<sup>1</sup> social studies textbooks<sup>2</sup> and religion textbooks<sup>3</sup> used in Catholic parochial schools.

Each study represents a systematic examination of the portrayal of outside religious, racial and ethnic groups in the textbook materials. The research procedures are different for the three studies, however, so, while they are parallel in intent, the various research designs are not interchangeable.

The studies are centered around textbook materials. While not the primary source of social attitudes, "for the great majority of schools in the United States, the textbook is, and is likely to remain for some time, the most accurate index of both the subject matter presented to students, and the temper and tone of instruction for the teacher," writes Sister Rose Albert Thering, O.P. Print gives force and authority to the spoken word, she states, and "even though the teacher may view the text as a springboard to creative instruction, the textbook is basic and a most

1 "Intergroup Relations as Revealed by Content Analysis of Literature Textbooks Used in Catholic Secondary Schools" by Sister Mary L. Gleason, C.S.F., A.M.

2 "Intergroup Relations in Social Studies Curriculum," by Sister Rita Mudd, Ph.D.

3 "Potential in Religious Textbooks for Developing a Realistic Self Concept" by Sister Rose Albert Thering, O.P.

important tool in the hands of the teacher as well as in the hands of the student." The textbook is also more accessible to measurable content analysis and thus may provide an objective indication of what is taught in the religious school classroom.

This is a digest and interpretation of one of the St. Louis self study projects, carried on by Sister Rose Albert Thering, O.P., and published as a Ph.D. thesis under the title Potential in Religious Textbooks for Developing a Realistic Self Concept.

This summary and interpretation has been prepared in order to condense and highlight the findings and recommendations of the study. All statistics, percentages, quotations and excerpts from Catholic textbooks are drawn from the study, but the organization, presentation and interpretation of the material are the responsibility of Judith Hershcopf, Assistant Director of the American Jewish Committee's Interreligious Affairs Department, who prepared this summary.

#### DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY:

Sister Rose Albert Thering's study is an investigation of the religion textbooks, with their related and supplementary teaching materials, that are currently most widely used in Catholic secondary schools throughout the United States. The sixty-five volumes (books and/or manuals), chosen on the basis of the number of dioceses that have approved their use in Catholic schools, comprise: seven basic series (four books to a series); two Church histories; one guidance series; four supplementary volumes; and, when available, the manuals or teacher's guidebooks accompanying each of the above-mentioned books.

Only basic secondary textual materials used in Catholic schools were analyzed. Thus, Confraternity of Christian Doctrine materials were not included, nor were missals, prayer books, hymnals, audio-visual religious teaching aids or Catholic periodicals dealing with religious subjects and used in schools as supplementary teaching aids.

It is to be noted that in no instance did central doctrine enter into the analysis and evaluation. Thus, if a lesson stated that another group is in error, such a statement was not scored in the analysis. If, however, the group in question was placed in a prejudicial and negative light, this was evaluated.

While the researcher has provided a list of the textbooks analyzed, and also a list of the eight publishing companies whose materials were included, both textbooks and publishers remain unidentified throughout her inquiry. The reader must follow the entire presentation of materials analyzed via code. Thus, while all excerpts in this summary are drawn from the St. Louis Study, they cannot be identified as to textbook or publisher.

In order to classify the references made to outside groups in Catholic textbooks, the researcher developed nine analytical categories, intended to cover, as fully as possible, the entire range of statements which may be made about other groups. Then, by scoring these references as positive, negative, both, or neutral, she sought to determine statistically, the "coefficient of preoccupation" (i.e. the extent to which other groups or any given outside group is mentioned in the materials), and the "coefficient of imbalance" (i.e. whether the references were predominantly positive or negative). A fuller description of the

research procedure may be found in APPENDIX A.

GENERAL FINDINGS OF THE STUDY:

Catholic religious educational materials do reveal a substantial degree of intergroup content. Over half (51.4%) of the 2,970 units analyzed dealt with "outside" religious, racial or ethnic groups. (While the Roman Catholic Church is, of course, universal in racial, ethnic and national constituency, the identification of the textbook writer was considered to be white when other racial groups were mentioned, and American when other national and ethnic groups were mentioned.)

Which groups are most "visible" in the textbooks? As might be expected, the religion textbooks are much more preoccupied with non-Catholic religious groups than with outside racial or ethnic groups. Of the intergroup references, 69% were directed to other religious groups; 16% fell into the "general" intergroup category, (i.e. discussion of the brotherhood of man, broad references to "all men" etc.); and 15% referred to specific racial, ethnic and international groups.

Of all groups mentioned, Jews are by far the most conspicuous in the materials. Preoccupation with Jews and Judaism ranged from 25% to 58% of the basic textbook series, and from 4.3% to 84.1% of the supplementary materials. The high visibility of Jews and Judaism in Catholic religious curriculum materials is understandable in view of the Jewish origins of Christianity. Obviously, Catholicism cannot be theologically set forth without reference to Abraham, the Prophets, the history of Israel, the Jewishness of Jesus and the disciples, nor can Church history be

presented without describing the conflict between the early Church and the Synagogue. Nevertheless, the prominence in the textual materials of a group which, on the one hand, plays so central a role in the Christian drama, and on the other hand, continues to exist as a distinctive religio-ethnic community in the contemporary world, can create special problems. Textbook writers may not always be aware that comments made about "the Jews" in a First Century setting may influence feelings and attitudes toward Twentieth Century neighbors. Protestants were the second most visible group in the material, mentioned consistently more than the Catholic non-Roman or other non-Christian categories.

How are the various outside groups portrayed in Catholic textbooks? The following table illustrates how the eight publishers whose materials were analyzed for the St. Louis Study were scored in the various group categories. The figures represent the imbalance scores for the combined textbooks and supplementary materials of each publisher. While group categories such as "Jewish," "Protestant" and "Negro" are self-explanatory, others may require some explanation: General - included in this category were references to "all men;" unspecified references to other groups; explanations of the Fatherhood of God, Brotherhood of Man, doctrine of the Mystical Body, etc. Racial-Ethnic - included in this category were references to Negroes, other ethnic, racial and national groups; references to international organizations such as UNESCO, etc. Religious Groups - a broad category covering references to specific groups such as Protestants and Jews; Catholic non-Roman groups such as Greek Orthodox; other non-Christians,

such as Buddhists, pagans, etc.; and inclusive references to "non-Catholics."

<u>Publ.</u>	<u>General Score</u>	<u>Racial-Ethnic Score</u>	<u>Negro Score</u>	<u>Relg.Groups Score (non-Cath.gen'ly</u>	<u>Prot. Score</u>	<u>Jewish Score</u>
A	.918	.746	1.000	.440	.290	.495
B	.956	.869	.900	.272	-.160	.412
C	.958	.849	.955	.232	.043	.290
D	.984	.921	.920	.661	.650	.640
E	.854	.718	.917	.285	.136	.305
F	.941	.795	.857	.105	.024	.062
G	.989	.685	.952	.531	.257	.579
H	1.000	1.000	1.000	.545	1.000	.700



What observations may be drawn from an examination of these figures?

First, it is clear that when Catholic textbooks deal with such broad concepts as the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man, or refer to outside groups in general terms, the comments are overwhelmingly positive. All but one publisher scored over .900 in the "general" intergroup category, where such references are tallied, and the remaining publisher scored over .850. While general intergroup references are high, however, they count for a relatively small percentage of the total intergroup content - sixteen percent (16%).

Similarly, it is apparent that the educational materials are positively disposed toward racial and ethnic groups, particularly the Negro. Scores for the racial-ethnic category are, in every case but one, above .700, and for Negroes, in every case well over .800. Comments regarding racial and ethnic groups, however, make up a similarly small percentage of the total references to other groups - fifteen percent (15%).

In references to other religions, where the great bulk (sixty-nine percent (69%) of intergroup content is to be found, the scores drop sharply. Perhaps the most striking examples are publisher B, whose high "general" score of .958 drops to .412 in the Jewish category, and to minus .160 when dealing with Protestants, and publisher F, whose "general" score of .941 descends to .062 when the references to Jews and Judaism are tallied, and to .024 for the Protestant category.

These sharp divergencies of scores indicate that there is a vast difference in the way racial and ethnic groups are portrayed in the materials, and the way religious groups are portrayed. Apparently, the problems of identifying in a positive manner with other religions are more difficult and more complex than those of identifying with other racial and ethnic groups. Thus, although racial prejudice and the challenge of racial justice may be America's most pressing social concern, it is interesting to note, insofar as Catholic religious textbooks are concerned, the area of interreligious affairs poses more delicate problems of writing.

This contention may be further supported by an examination of the examples provided in the body of the study. The researcher has selected a total of 173 representative quotations from the religion textbooks which make up the seven series, plus the two volumes of Church history which were incorporated because of their wide use in parochial schools throughout the country; these selections have been used to illustrate the different kinds of statements found in Catholic textbooks about outside groups, and how they are scored. Each example has some direct or implied intergroup content, and while they do not cover the total intergroup content of the textbooks, they provide a random sampling. Of the 173 examples provided, 61 may be classified as "general" references—statements such as "all men are created equal" or "Christ makes charity the special sign of His followers: 'By this shall all men know you are my disciple, if you have love for one another.'" These 61 references accumulated a total of 138 positive scores, 5 neutral and no negative.\*

\* A statement may be scored positive or negative in more than one category. For example, consider the following excerpt from a textbook: (continued on page 10)

It is evident that the religion textbooks include general statements of a positive nature, statements which stress the obligations of the Catholic student to accept and extend friendship to people of all races and backgrounds. But again, the statistical picture changes when the specific non-Catholic religious groups are mentioned. Of the 173 representative examples given in the study, 62 refer to Jews and Judaism. These incorporate 50 negative, 27 neutral and 38 positive scores. Thirty of the examples refer to Protestants; these 30 excerpts accumulate 41 negative scores; 8 are classified as neutral, and only 5 are positive.

(\* continued from pg. 9)

Every person on the world is your neighbor whether he is black, brown, yellow or white; whether he lives in the Western or Eastern half of the world; whether he can talk English or not; whether he is a Christian, Jew, Protestant or Pagan; whether he is young or old, a gentlemen or a fool, a Republican or a Democrat; whether he knows the latest song hits, the latest baseball score and the latest slang. That gives you about 1,900,000,000 neighbors.

You must love your neighbor because all men have souls which were given them by God, their Father, and because Christ died for all men -- not just the ones you know and like.

This reference earns positive scores in four different analytical categories: descriptive characteristics of outside groups; creeds, codes and prestige figures (because an appeal to moral behavior is made on the basis of religious injunction); the category of rejection/acceptance (because it is acceptance of outsiders) and the category of: deploras differences/accepts similarities (because the kinship with outside groups is stressed).

Similarly, consider the following excerpt from a textbook:

Since Pilate could not find anything wrong with Christ, he decided to disfigure His pure and beautiful body, so that even the bloodthirsty Jews would back down and say that Christ had enough.

This reference is scored negatively in two categories: descriptive characteristics (because of the gratuitous reference to "blood-thirsty Jews") and the category of distortion/correction (because the researcher considers this statement a distortion.) Thus, it is apparent that a single statement may earn more than one positive or negative score, depending on the number of categories into which the references fall.

Thus, it would appear that the broad generalities reflecting and exhorting goodwill and altruism are not always effectively applied when the lessons concentrate on specific religious outgroups.

Around what specific themes do the positive and negative images of outside groups intensify? By examining the illustrations provided as representative examples from the basic series and church histories, and by breaking down the positive and negative references into various thematic categories, it is possible to see which particular themes occasion the most positive and negative intergroup references.

For Protestants, negative references cluster around: (1) doctrinal differences with the Roman Catholic Church; (2) the Reformation; (3) areas of modern Catholic-Protestant conflict, such as Protestant evangelical efforts in South America.

The researcher quotes with approval a selection from the Reverend Karl Adams, suggesting what should be the normative Catholic approach to Protestantism:

In the light of Christ, the Catholic will no longer wish to regard Luther simply as an apostate who broke faith with the Church. He will recognize the many lights in his character, his unfathomable reverence for the Mystery of God; his tremendous consciousness of sin; the holy defiance with which, as God's warrior, he faced abuse and simony; the heroism with which he risked his life for Christ's cause...

...It is not as if it were only the Protestants who are needy, and the Catholics who are rich, overflowing with abundance and therefore able to wait contentedly until their starving brethren knock on their door. When these large portions of the Catholic Church were lost to her, she lost with them all those precious constructive powers, all those souls of deep religious aspiration who since have worked so fruitfully and creatively within the separated communities, and who might have been called to cultivate the most perfect flowers of religious life upon Catholic soil. We lost much when we lost them.

"Very infrequently," comments the researcher, "did communicators tend to present the related material of other religious intergroup areas as suggested by Karl Adams." Indeed, the more characteristic treatment of Protestantism, at least as reflected in the given excerpts from Catholic text books, is aptly summarized in a quotation from author William Clancy in which he recalls his own experience as a student:

AMERICAN JEWISH ARCHIVES

In the primary and secondary schools, I learned the standard things, all negative: Protestants reject the authority of the Pope; they do not honor the Virgin; they deny the efficacy of good works; they acknowledge only two sacraments, etc....Through 18 years of Catholic education I heard nothing positive about Protestantism: no teacher ever suggested that beyond the Reformation's negations, Protestantism has a prophetic vision of its own...

The negative approach recalled by Mr. Clancy is exemplified in several of the representative excerpts from the study:

Protestantism granted concessions in an attempt to attract all who lacked courage to live up to the high standard proposed by Christ and the Church. Protestantism today is rapidly deteriorating, while the unchanging spiritual Church has grown ever stronger with the years.

What conclusion can be drawn from the fact that the only point of unity among Protestants is opposition to the Catholic Church?

In the 16th and 17th centuries, the Protestant Revolt divided the defenders of the supernatural into two hostile camps, with the result that most of the sects which then broke away from the Church have since lost all sense of the supernatural, and have frankly worked to spread secularism even into the field of religion.

On the inside the Church has always had a certain number of proud people called "heretics" who seem to think they know more about God's business than God Himself. The latest of these, those who called themselves Protestant Reformers, are realizing more and more, as time goes on, that the Church was right. Every census in the United States shows a gain for the Catholics and the decrease for almost all the other.

After 400 years of starvation without most of the sacraments, non-Catholics today have grown to view men in an opposite way; now they hardly think of him as anything more than an animal.

Luther's unrestrained passions led him to sin; and in his pride he refused to have his life be considered sin. He worked out, therefore, a different teaching, in which the ideas of sin and of goodness were changed to correspond to what it pleased him at the time to consider sin or virtue. His pleasure, rather than truth, was to be the standard for measuring right and wrong.

Obviously, Catholic views of the Reformation conflict differ from Protestant interpretations, and an authentic Catholic position will involve some criticism and negative judgments regarding Protestants. The kind of distortion which marks the above excerpts can be avoided, however, as can the use of pejorative terminology - such as the following from a Church history describing leaders of the Reformation:

Obstinate heretic  
Self-satisfied monarch  
Positively immoral  
Drunken brewer  
Adulterous tyrant

Occasionally, statements about Protestants which are dogmatically true, nevertheless contain unfair implications:

A Christian is a baptized person who believes the teachings of Jesus Christ and lives according to them....Many call themselves Christians although they believe only part of the teachings of Christ. Such Christians are Lutherans, Methodists, Episcopalians, and other Protestants, as well as members of the Orthodox Church. Strictly speaking, Catholics are the only real Christians, as they believe all the teachings of Christ and try to live according to them.

While the dogmatic distinction may be clear and valid here, the unfair implication is that the Protestant groups do not try to live according to the teachings of Christ. This implication converts a neutral statement into a distortion. The same thing occasionally happens in discussions of areas of contemporary conflict between Catholics and Protestants: a neutral factual statement, -for example, that both Communist agitation and Protestant evangelism constitute problems for the Catholic Church in South America -- becomes a distortion by the textbook writers' gratuitously linking Protestants and Communists together, and failing to make any distinction between them. While similar in tone, the following comments come from 2 different textbook series.

Protestantism and Communism have hindered the Catholic Church in South America. Although Protestants, mostly from the United States, have not won many converts from Catholicism, they have succeeded in making some Catholics indifferent to their faith. Their vast financial resources also threaten to weaken the respect for the Church in areas where they can supply much needed help for the poor.

Besides local problems, Catholics of Latin American countries face two sources of trouble from the outside: Communists and American Protestants. The former are outlawed as a political party in most countries. But Communist agitation occurs at various times. The Protestants, supported by plentiful funds from the United States, are still attempting to "convert" Latin American Catholics, a procedure that has frequently caused the latter to look upon all North American help as treachery in disguise...

It should be clearly stated that charitable and positively-oriented attitudes toward outside groups are reflected in the textbooks and supported by appeals to authoritative doctrinal principles, as illustrated by a few of the many examples:

Now not only Catholics but non-Catholics as well can attain to the state of grace. For instance, a non-Catholic who, by an act of perfect love or perfect contrition, has received baptism of desire, is united to Christ by an invisible bond as long as he persists in the state of grace.

Non-Catholics who, through no fault of their own, do not know that the Catholic Church is the true Church, may be pleasing to God. The Catholic teaching that "outside the Church there is no salvation" does not mean that everyone who is not a Catholic will be damned. It means that salvation comes to men in and through the Catholic Church. Therefore, non-Catholics who are in the state of grace, are in the Catholic Church, though invisibly, and if they persevere in grace, they will be saved...

It is quite possible, however, for a Protestant to be "in good Faith" in holding to some truths and rejecting others, for he may not know that these others are revealed. If he knew, he would accept them.

Even on dogmatic points, such as the above, different Catholic textbooks reveal what seem to be different viewpoints, because of the emphasis in tone and the choice of language.

Example 1

...Equality in the Mystical Body calls for greater Charity among all the members. Christ makes Charity the special sign of His followers: "By this shall all men know that you are my disciple, if you have love for one another." Christ really wants all to be members of His Mystical Body, and everyone is thus potentially, if not actually, a member. For this reason we have charity for all persons. Race, nationality, position, personality--all these things must be brushed aside by the love that Christ wants to bind all people together in Him.

Example 2

Many Protestants are baptized but as they do not accept the Catholic faith, they do not belong to the Mystical Body. The Orthodox Church members are baptized and they profess most of the truth of the faith taught by the Catholic Church; their refusal to give obedience to the Pope, however, excludes them from the Mystical Body.

While the two textbook writers might not disagree on a factual definition of the Mystical Body, the difference in emphasis makes one passage seem more inclusive and accepting than the other.

AUTHOR'S RECOMMENDATIONS:

Writes the researcher:

Often religious groups, other than the Catholics, were treated in the textbooks only when the respective groups appeared chronologically on the scene of the Church's history as a schismatic or heretical group. ...Generalizations, oversimplifications, or negations in the textual content matter regarding another religious group may result, at least to some extent, in distorted knowledge for the students. Information secured through an author's limited negative presentations of these areas may well be the source of resultant knowledges which one may term "mere caricatures" which the adolescent readily applies to his schoolmate, his neighbor, or his friend of another Christian denomination....In certain series analyzed, the emotionalism of the author comes in to color certain presentations of religious intergroup materials to the extent that sometimes main issues are obscured by the intrusion of the author of his own feelings.

The researcher then goes on to recommend:

Great care must be taken to avoid statements that would lead young students to question the basic motivations, sincerity, and integrity of their neighbors who are of other religious denominations. Students must recognize and appreciate that if by the mercy of God, Catholics possess ultimate truth, they must nevertheless bow their heads in admission that many are without it who have searched harder, and shown a deeper devotion to the search than they have.

The researcher joins Father Kilian McDonnell in his appeal for Catholics to:

...discard that type of Catholic apologetics which was intent on demolishing their (Protestants') religious arguments, and in a manner of speaking, stripping them naked and defenseless.

She adds:

A climate of suspicion and resentment is not the proper environment for virtue, hence to authors, editors, and instructors of secondary religion materials, the writer recommends that the student receive the information needed whereby he may understand his non-Catholic neighbor and learn better to trust him.

After pointing out that secondary religion materials written from an apologetic approach tended to be more negatively oriented than those which stressed the psychological or kerygmatic approaches to religion, Sister Rose Albert recommends:

Teaching materials which formerly were planned mainly from the apologetical point of view with an appeal, for the most part, to the intellect, need revision so as to develop better the positive virtue of love of God and neighbor.

#### THE JEWISH PORTRAIT:

What are the sources of positive and negative imagery of Jews in Catholic textbooks? An examination of the representative excerpts bearing on the Jewish portrait indicates the positive and neutral references to Jews are found, for the most part, in comments associated with the Old Testament heritage of Judaism which has also become the heritage of the Catholic Church, or implying Jewish acceptance of Christianity: For example:

The Jews of Old held the name Yehweh in such reverence and awe that it was not used in speech. The High Priest alone was allowed to pronounce it and that but once a year on the Day of Atonement.

Abraham, Father of the People of God, Yesterday and Today.

Jews and Gentiles, representing the whole human race, have paid their homage to the Child Jesus.

Catholics of the world, regardless of their nationality, are all, spiritually Semites. We are all

children of Israel. God's revelation of Himself to the Patriarchs and His promise of good things handed on to the children of Israel reach down through time to us who believe, trust in and love the one true God and who enjoy good and wonderful things beyond compare as His adopted children in the Mystical Body of His Divine Son Jesus Christ.

The overwhelming majority of negative references are concentrated around the themes of: (1) the Jewish rejection of Christianity; (2) the Jewish role in the Crucifixion; and (3) comments regarding the Pharisees.

The researcher quotes with approval the comment of Father George Tavard regarding various aspects of Christian doctrine relevant to the Jewish people:

The idea that Jews are cursed because their ancestors crucified the Lord stands in contradiction to the Gospel. Christ excused His tormentors, Jews as well as pagans: "Father forgive them: they know not what they do" (Luke 23:34). It is furthermore opposed to the Catholic doctrine on mankind's collective responsibility in sin. Those who put Christ to death were only the instruments of mankind as a whole. Since Christ died on account of our sins, we all are to blame for the crucifixion. Nevertheless, the idea is still often met with among people who are accounted good Catholics. To the mind of anti-Semitic bigots, it even explains a great deal of history. God would periodically "visit" the murderers of Christ and incite them to penance through persecution. All the anti-Semitic excesses of times past and present can thus be cheaply excused. They are freely granted the blessing of Providence. And we, who have done so little or nothing to stop them, can rest satisfied in our religious arrogance.

In similar vein, she draws upon a comment from Father Ralph Gorman:

The true Christian identifies himself with those who schemed against Christ, clamored for his death and crucified Him on Calvary. Looking for the guilty party, the true Christian strikes his

own breast and acknowledges that it was because of his sins that Christ died on the Calvary. What better model can a Christian adopt for his attitude toward the Jews than Jesus Christ's, who loved them, wept over the city of Jerusalem at the thought of its destruction, and prayed a prayer of forgiveness for them (and ALL men) from the cross....The religion of Jesus Christ is a religion of love. No man can harbor hatred of the Jews in his heart and be a Christian.

The representative excerpts provided from Catholic lessons dealing with the Crucifixion, however, seldom incorporate this approach. The accusation of unique and collective Jewish culpability for the suffering and death of Christ, so effectively rejected by Fathers Tavad, Gorman, and additional authorities quoted in the study, finds frequent expression. Such accusations are abetted when the term, "the Jews" is used to denote the enemies of Jesus, without the corrective information that a limited number of individuals, and not the entire Jewish populace of Palestine, is in question:

Why did the Jews commit the great sin of putting God Himself to death? It was because our Lord told them the Truth, because He preached a divine doctrine that displeased them, and because He told them to give up their wicked ways.

However, when the mob saw this, the chief priests took up a cry that put a curse on themselves and on the Jews for all time: "His Blood be upon us and our children."

There can be no doubt that the Jews did everything they could to discredit the story. But the best story they could invent was that the disciples had stolen the body of Jesus from the tomb.

In spite of the countless graces given to the Chosen People, they voluntarily blinded themselves to Christ's teaching.

The worst deed of the Jewish people, the Murder of the Messiah...

The Jews wanted to disgrace Christ by having Him die on the Cross.

Christ replied to the question in the mind of his listeners as to what the owner of the vineyard will do to these wicked wine dressers. He will destroy them. He will turn over the vineyard to others who will render Him fruits. His prophecy was partially fulfilled in the destruction of Jerusalem and more fully in the rejection by God of the Chosen people...

Christ then returned to His teaching on humility by telling them the parable of the Great Supper and of the guests who refused to come. This is one of those parables which refers to the obstinacy of the Jews in spurning the Gospel.

Christ, by His miracles and preaching, tried to conquer the obstinacy of the Jews and to bring them to repentance. The Jews, on the contrary, by the bad influence of their hypocrisy and pride, hindered the spread of the knowledge of God among other nations.

The Jews as a Nation refused to accept Christ, and since His time they have been wanderers on the earth without a temple, or a sacrifice, and without the Messiah.

God turned even the murder of our Saviour by the Jews to the Salvation of the world.

Since Pilate could not find anything wrong with Christ, he decided to disfigure His pure and beautiful body, so that even the bloodthirsty Jews would back down and say that Christ had enough.

Why did the Jews decide to kill Christ?

The same culpable blindness which closed the eyes of the Jewish leaders to the Scriptures, which portrayed the Messiah as a suffering Redeemer and not as a military conqueror, also closed their eyes to Christ's resurrection and its significance.

Sister Rose Albert comments:

Many of the distorted statements resulted from generalizations, unjust, and at times, inaccurate interpretations. Some misunderstandings about the Jewish people may have their sources in such deficient textual materials.

It should not be presumed that comments stressing the universal responsibility for the death of Christ are lacking in the lesson materials. On the contrary, statements such as the following are found with frequency:

Why did Christ suffer death? ...As Christ's merits were infinite, He could have redeemed the sins of a thousand worlds by shedding one drop of His Blood; but He chose of His own free will to suffer such excruciating torments in order to show His love for us and to make us realize the enormity of sin.

Did Christ suffer for all men or only for those who will be saved. Christ died for each and every person who ever lived or shall live.

Why Christ suffered. That all men might be united in love and peace with one another, and that all men might be united in love with God; it was for this that Christ prayed and it was for this that Christ suffered and died.

This universal viewpoint, however, is seldom brought to bear in discussions of the specific events leading up to the Crucifixion. Thus, although the Catholic secondary student may be informed that the "sins of all men" are responsible for Christ's suffering, this theological principle will remain abstract if it is not meaningfully applied to the depiction of particular historic events.

This is particularly true of the portrayal of the Pharisees in much of the lesson material. Passages referring to the Pharisees are among the most negative encountered in the given excerpts; in one basic textbook series, they are depicted in such a distorted fashion as to make it almost impossible for the Catholic secondary student to sense any human identification with them, or to believe that they acted out of human motivations:

No man is less pitied than one who has deliberately gouged out his own eyes. Hence, no one has sympathy for the Pharisees because they deliberately made themselves blind to the inspiring miracles and teachings of Christ. They were not ignorant men; if anything, they were experts in the law. If anyone should have recognized the Messiah, they should have. The fact that they, of all the people, didn't know Christ for what He was, is due to their jealousy and prejudice.

...The Pharisees weren't much interested in seeing that God was honored on the Sabbath; they wanted their own laws observed.

...They willfully refused to accept Christ as the Messiah, and they neglected the duty of brotherly love.

...they were shocked to see racketeers selling sheep and doves in the building....This was His first meeting with the "Temple Gang," that is, the Scribes and Pharisees and priests who used religion to build up their own power among the people.

Some revealing insights about the way different Catholic textbooks treat the same theme may be achieved by contrasting some of the negative excerpts with more corrective and objective selections. In the following series of examples, all of the comments in the right-hand column are taken from the particular textbook series which revealed the highest positive score for the Jewish group. Selections in the left-hand column are drawn from various other series. While each set of comments deals with a similar theme, it may be observed that the quotations on the right tend to be corrective rather than distorted, and when a critical comment is made regarding Jews, it is also applied to Catholics:

The question of the Jews when Christ told them the secret, "How can this man give us His Flesh to eat?" was a thoughtless one. Just because they could not understand, they would not believe.

We can, of course, hardly blame the crowds for not understanding our Lord's words, but He knew that they could not grasp His meaning. He even told them so. He said they were taking His words in too material, too "fleshly" a sense...

The Jews rejected Christ mainly because they expected Him to found a never-ending kingdom, as was foretold in the prophecies. This, He really did, but the Kingdom He founded -- the Church -- was a spiritual one, not a temporal one such as the carnal Jews were hoping for.

So it was that many Jews in our Lord's time were looking forward to the coming of a prophet who would introduce an age of true religion and of great closeness to Yahweh and who would bring even the Gentiles to worship the God of Israel. They seem to have called this awaited one simply the "Prophet". Whether or not they thought he would be the same person as the Davidic Messias we cannot be sure. Some of them may have done so. Most of them, however, seem to have forgotten that the ideal prophet in Isaias (40-55) was a suffering prophet; they did not expect the awaited prophet to suffer.

Why did the Jews commit the great sin of putting God, Himself to death? It was because our Lord told them the Truth, because He preached a divine doctrine that displeased them, and because He told them to give up their wicked ways.

To love one's enemy and to forgive injuries which one has received were lessons hard for the Jews to learn, as they are hard for all of us.

In her recommendations to authors, editors, publishers and instructors of religion for the improvement of teachings which affect the Jewish portrait in Catholic-religious education, the researcher's suggestions are as follows:

1. Set forth the continuity of the Old and the New Testament, the unity of the divine work of Salvation. In discussions of the Old Testament, stress the existing law of love, also.
2. Show Jesus, the Word made Flesh, as He lived in His own country and among His Jewish people, with His Mother Mary, the Jewish Maiden, His Apostles and disciples -- Jewish friends. Picture Jesus as the true "Israelite" (John 1:47) who came "not to destroy the law but to fulfill it." (Matt. 5:17).
3. Give a true picture of Judaism in the days of Jesus with its tense atmosphere of expectancy, pointing out the fact that

there were SOME digressions (not universal) and note also the rich participation in religious worship without over-emphasizing the extremes in the law. It is necessary to avoid this same warping of the truth in speaking of present-day Judaism. To try to inculcate love for Christianity by denigrating (so it seems at times) would be as shameful as it is incorrect.

4. State clearly the conflict between Jesus and SOME of the Jewish leaders of the people -- the people at the time of our Lord; present the treatment of the Passion itself in a way that is historically and theologically correct.
5. Avoid expressions which may be termed generalizations. Often these are used to identify all the Jewish people and/or Jews of all time with SOME of the leaders of the Jews who, at the time of our Lord, plotted against Jesus.
6. Refrain from making negative value judgments in the treatment of the Jewish people, those of the time of our Saviour as well as of those regarding present day Jews. God alone knows the secret yearnings of the individual (Catholic, Jew, Other Christian or Gentile).
7. Explain the true significance of the Crucifixion: Jesus suffered and died for the sins of ALL and for the salvation of ALL. The only disposition proper at the foot of the Cross is sorrow for one's own sins; there is then no need to accuse others.

#### RACIAL - ETHNIC GROUPS:

The St. Louis Study revealed that Catholic textbooks portrayed outside racial and ethnic groups in an extremely positive way, and when the lessons dealt with the general subject of inter-group relations, or provided an analysis of prejudice, the outcome was invariably positive. The researcher points out, however, that there was much less preoccupation with these groups as compared to other religious groups. This is understandable in religion textbooks, she states, and may stem from the very teaching of the Catholic doctrine on the Mystical Body of Christ. Thus, "to emphasize physical racial differences...may only give rise to problems where none or very few exist."

However, she adds, the omission of treatment of the various racial and ethnic groups which students have a right to meet constructively in their vicarious experiences via religious textbooks, may be a failure. She suggests that opportunities for teaching positively about race and ethnic relations present themselves on every level of the high school student's religious education program and that questions of racial justice might be incorporated into subjects such as the following:

1. Study of the Ten Commandments, especially the injunctions of the Fifth Commandment.
2. Treatment of the Life of Christ, particularly a study of His parables and their application.
3. Explanation of the liturgy.
4. Treatment of the virtues of justice and charity.

She comments:

Adolescents have a need for a presentation of these all-important matters of racial/ethnic relationships in specific rather than in general terms, to their question, "Who is my neighbor?" The answer, given in the specific terminology in the environment of his pluralistic community, will bring into open discussion the Negro, the Mexican, Puerto Rican, the Italian, Irishman, etc., his true brothers and sisters in Christ. Such treatment in the text will clarify for him the true significance of the teachings of the Old Testament, the Gospels and/or Epistles. Clarifications, instead of broad general clichés, will enable the student to fit himself into this picture of reality and offer him the opportunities to comprehend more fully what is really meant when he reads that he must love all men as he loves himself.

An important general finding of the researcher was that recently published materials tended to present intergroup themes in a more constructive manner than older materials, with special attention given to the psychological approach.

November 1963

APPENDIX "A"

Description of the Research Procedure:

Rather than "prejudice" or "bias," the researcher chose the basic concepts of ethnocentrism, and its opposite, altruism, as the criteria of analysis. These concepts were selected because it was felt they had a more easily measurable content than the other terms. The distinguishing elements of these opposing attitudes are:

Ethnocentrism

Based on a pervasive and rigid ingroup-outgroup distinction; it involves negative imagery and hostile attitudes toward and regarding outgroups; stereotyped positive imagery and submissive attitudes regarding ingroups; and an hierarchical, authoritarian view of group interaction in which ingroups are rightly dominant, outgroups, subordinate.

Altruism

Devotion and respect for interests of others; identifying with others; accepting differences; critical of one's own group in an objective manner when necessary.

In order to classify the various kinds of references which are made to other groups, the researcher developed nine analytical categories, which are intended to cover, as fully as possible, the entire range of statements which may be made about the outside groups. The nine categories are divided into three broad areas: portrait, relationships and general. Each category has a plus (positive) and a minus (negative) side. Thus, in scoring references to Protestants, Jews, Negroes, Orientals, etc. which appear in Catholic textbook materials, the researcher must ask herself two questions: (1) In what analytical category does it belong? (2) Is the statement positive, negative; does it contain elements of both, or is it neutral? Analytical categories

are described as follows:

A. Portrait:

Under the first area, Portrait, or description of other peoples, are two analytical categories:

1. Descriptive Characteristics:

In this category, unit references which describe other groups are scored.

Negative: Statements with: negative emotionalized descriptive terms of individuals and/or groups; the assignment of traits of inferiority; the imputation of non-acceptable roles; negative value judgments or negative stereotypy.

Example: "Blood-thirsty Jews," "Temple Gang."

Positive: Statements with: wholesome, kindly descriptions of individuals and/or groups, assertions that defend acceptable roles of other groups; positive objective references with a refutation of negative stereotypy; emphasis placed on an individual as an individual, or recognition of merit irrespective of group images.

Example: "The new converts, the Jews, devoted to their traditions and customs, continued to attend the temple and synagogue prayer services daily."

2. Factual Materials:

This category allows for the scoring of intergroup content as positive, negative, or neutral, when such references are purely factual.

B. Relationships:

Under the second broad area of analytical categories, Relationships toward other groups, there are the following four categories:

3. Creeds-Codes-Prestige Figures:

This category deals with creeds, codes and Catholic authorities as they bear upon the field of intergroup relations. The bearing of the Christian and American creeds as reflected in the faith of the communicator, in the persons of authority, and in official pronouncements or teachings are scored in this category.

Negative: Statements, teachings, creeds, which appeal to the communicator's own group against the concern for the problems of tension, prejudice and hatred of other groups, or the attitudes of inequality toward others exhibited by a creed, code, or person in authority.

Example: "Catholics should avoid all non-Catholics."

Positive: Statements, teachings, figures of authority, which or who illustrate interest in the breaking down of barriers against communication and dialogue; statements of equality as stressed in the Declaration of Independence, or as discussed in the encyclical on the Mystical Body of Christ.

Examples: Encyclicals on Unity; action of the Holy Father, Pope John XXIII, in the removal of the derogatory terms from the official prayers of the Church.

4. Rejection/Acceptance:

This category deals with the communicator's relationship with other groups.

Negative: References that show or indicate: punitive statements of expressions of hostility toward other groups; rejection of other groups by forbidding interaction (unless justified by principle or held as a value with one's own group.)

Example: "The first glorious mystery teaches us to meditate on the mysteries of faith, to pray for faith... and to avoid the dangers to faith coming from bad reading, or associating too much with non-Catholics, who have no faith themselves."

Positive: References which show friendliness and encourage love and helpfulness to one's neighbor; statements which encourage interaction.

Examples: Description or mention of the Christian social principle; "The Sermon on the Mount teaches us to be kind to everyone"; "Charity demands that we be kind to every man -- Jew, Protestant, or Negro."

5. Blames others/Criticizes self:

The category measures the degree to which the communicator is disposed to involve or separate his own group from the responsibility for the misfortune of the other groups or for existing tensions relative to intergroup relations. This is measured by the presence or absence of self-criticism in the intergroup area as well as by direct statements of responsibility. Self-criticism not related to intergroup content is non-scorable.

Negative: References blaming others for existing tensions and problems.

Example: "Regarding the curse on the Jews: 'They brought it upon themselves.'"

Positive: References acknowledging failure and guilt of one's own group toward other groups.

Examples: "Abuses prior to the period of the Reformation needed correction"; mention of guilt and involvement of the Catholic group at the time of the Inquisition.

6. Deplores differences/Accepts similarities:

This category seeks to determine whether the intergroup content shows other groups mentioned as related and similar to the Catholic's or the ingroup's as unrelated and different.

Negative: Statements which deplore differences; which reject contributions of others; which deny historical rootage; which fail to recognize the advantages coming from various contributing groups.

Example: Negative reports concerning differences.

Positive: References which appreciate differences; which are receptive of contributions of other peoples; which acknowledge historical rootage; which recognize the advantages coming from the various contributing groups.

C. General:

The last main division of the nine analytical categories is the General area. In this section are the last three categories defined as follows:

7. Distortion/Correction:

This category seeks to measure the amount of distortion or correction of statements, references, in the treatment of other groups: religious, racial and ethnic.

Negative: References relevant to intergroup content which conflict with true historical fact; generalizations and unwarranted conjectures.

Example: Generalizations regarding the entire group stemming from the wrongdoing of one member, or quoting from unauthoritative sources: "All references to Jesus in the Talmud are filled with hate and resentment."

Positive: Statements correcting former distorted interpretations and faulty teachings, or suggesting that these corrections be made.

Examples: "We must remember that not all of the Jews..."; "Some of the leaders of the Jews condemned Jesus to Death." Correction now in the texts regarding the interpretation of the former faulty discussions on the so-called "curse on the Jews."

8. Failure to analyze/Analysis of prejudice:

This category attempts to understand prejudice in its fundamental manifestations. Focus is upon prejudice itself, upon understanding it and analyzing its mechanism, its function and etiology. Statements which are scored in this category constitute an indirect report of self-criticism in the intergroup area.

Negative: The characteristic response is silence, that is, disregard of this area, not measured except by lack of scores on the positive side.

Positive: In this category are scored definitions of prejudice; discussions of the psychological principles of good intergroup relations; discussions of the harm done to the development of a realistic self concept by the harboring of prejudices.

9. Activities:

This category is scored whenever activities, questions, and discussions which are relevant to intergroup matters are such that either positive or negative group attitudes are elicited.

Negative example: "How did the Jews blackmail Pilate?"

Positive example: "Name the Jewish holidays. What do Catholics owe the Jewish people?"

Through statistical procedures, the researcher calculated the extent of preoccupation and the extent of imbalance regarding a variety of other religious, racial and ethnic groups.

The preoccupation figure expresses the ratio of units which contain intergroup content to the total number of units analyzed. Mathematically expressed:

$$C_{pr} = \frac{r}{t}$$

Where r is the relevant content and t is the total content.

The imbalance figure expressed numerically, is a complex relation between positive, negative and neutral units; it reflects the degree of preponderance of positive or negative imbalance.

The formula used by the researcher to determine the imbalance figure for the separate analytical categories was:

For positive imbalance, where p is greater than n,

$$C_{pi} = \frac{p^2 - pn}{rt}$$

For negative imbalance, where n is greater than p

$$C_{ni} = \frac{pn - n^2}{rt}$$

where r = relevant content and t = total content.

All the units scored in a single category regardless of direction are relevant content. Total content indicates the total number of units (lessons) containing references to the particular group category being measured.

In addition, the researcher calculated two kinds of general imbalance scores: one, to indicate the general orientation of an individual textbook, or series of textbooks, or publisher for a particular outside group; the second, to determine the direction for combined intergroup areas; for example, all non-Catholic religious groups, racial and ethnic groups, etc.

The basic textbook series analyzed were:

Essentials of Religion Series (Loyola)  
Living With Christ Series (La Salle)  
Our Quest for Happiness Series (Mentzer, Bush)  
Religion: Doctrine and Practice (Loyola)  
The Catholic High School Religion Series (Sadlier)  
The Christian Life Series (Fides)  
The Laux Religion Series (Benziger)

The supplementary series were:

Answer Wisely (Loyola)  
Christ the Leader (Bruce)  
Christ in His Church (Bruce)  
Church History (Benziger)  
Group Guidance Series (Bruce)  
Moral and Social Questions (St. Anthony Press)

The eight publishers whose materials were analyzed are:

Benziger Brothers, Chicago, Illinois  
Bruce Publishing Company, Milwaukee, Wisconsin  
Fides Publishers Association, Chicago, Illinois  
Loyola University Press, Chicago, Illinois  
Mentzer, Bush and Company, Chicago, Illinois  
Saint Anthony Guild Press, Paterson, New Jersey  
Saint Mary College Press, Winona, Minnesota  
W. H. Sadlier, Inc., New York, N. Y.

For more detailed information regarding statistical procedures, the reader is invited to consult the Ph.D. thesis at the Library of St. Louis University.

D R A F T

STUDY PROPOSAL

ON MUTUAL PERCEPTIONS OF CATHOLIC AND JEWISH YOUTH

I. BACKGROUND

In spite of the vast changes which have occurred in American life during past decades the problem of inter-group relations remains one of our most baffling national concerns. Whether analyzed from the vantage point of the implications of the problem for America's global role, or viewed from the more limited perspective of domestic concerns, inter-group relations stands high on the list of the great unsolved problems of our society.

In spite of some terminological ambiguity inter-group relations may be conveniently subdivided into inter-religious, inter-ethnic and inter-racial relations. Of the three it is inter-racial relations which has constituted the major focus of research effort. Such concentration is understandable, for manifest inter-group conflict in our society has largely centered on the issue of Negro-White relations. Thus, research on inter-racial relations has succeeded in attracting some attention on the part of certain of the major foundations whose objectives are broad in scope. While such foundations have moved with great caution in this area examples of their interest readily come to mind. One such example is the research project supported some decades ago by the Carnegie Corporation -- the project which culminated in the publication of Myrdal's An American Dilemma and associated volumes. A more recent example

is the research conducted by the Commission on Race and Housing under a grant from the Fund for the Republic; the Commission's efforts have also been published in a multi-volume series.

While research on inter-ethnic problems is less abundant such research did receive support during an earlier period. The ethnic factor in contemporary social relations is considered to be ambiguous by some and this factor -- in concert with others -- has drawn attention away from this area. For example, Will Herberg's Protestant-Catholic-Jew -- an influential volume in spite of the fact that it lacked much of the empirical data necessary for testing its hypothesis -- seems to have influenced some scholars to downgrade the importance of ethnicity as a factor in American life.

In any case, however, it is inter-religious research which has been the most neglected of the three areas: when compared with inter-ethnic research, and especially with inter-racial research, inter-religious research constitutes a veritable terra incognita. Avoided by official bodies and lacking the support of major foundations such research has largely been conducted by private scholars who happen to have an interest in the problem or by private agencies charged with the improvement of inter-faith relations.

The largest block of research has been sponsored by the Jewish inter-group relations agencies. A very specific problem gave rise to such research: the world-wide spread of Nazism and the consequent threat which anti-Semitism posed to American democracy generally and to American Jewry in particular. This

research has been strongest in leading to an understanding of the dynamics of anti-Semitism during a period of profound social unrest, and, secondarily, in contributing perspectives for a general understanding of personality. Its contribution to an understanding of contemporary inter-group relations problems, especially as seen in the perspective of inter-faith relationships, is limited.

Of what significance is the present situation between Americans who hold membership in our diverse faith-communities? It is our belief that the conflict aspect of the present situation should not be underestimated. True, the gang fights of the immigrant ghettos are no longer of overriding importance. Nevertheless, we believe that inter-faith conflict -- albeit conflict on a more subtle level -- is of considerable significance and will be present for many decades to come. There are even those who feel that relationships between our faith-communities will constitute no less a chronic issue than the problem of inter-racial relations. Like the latter, some believe that relationships between our faith-communities may give rise to very acute tensions -- tensions which may assume nation-wide significance.

## II. NEW DEVELOPMENTS AND NEEDS IN THE INTER-RELIGIOUS AREA

While little research has been done in the inter-religious area certain fundamental changes have occurred in the last decade which are of great importance for our proposed research project. What we have in mind are noticeable shifts in the level of discourse about inter-faith problems. In contrast to the earlier "brotherhood" approach which frequently involved the demonstration

of what the three major faiths hold in common, in recent years inter-religious discourse has been moving in quite a different direction. The popular term for this new development is "Dialogue", by which is meant -- among other things -- frank confrontation on the part of those who speak from different faith-perspectives and who represent diverse faith-communities. "Dialogue" involves exploration of differences as well as of similarities, of areas of tension as well as of agreement.

Many agencies have been involved in "Dialogue". Perhaps the single most influential enterprise has been the "Religion and the Free Society" project sponsored by the Fund for the Republic. As an example of the new atmosphere we may note the issuance by a Catholic publishing house of a volume whose title is self-explanatory: American Catholics: A Protestant-Jewish View. (This is the book edited by Philip Scharper.) Another example is the volume by Robert McAfee Brown and Gustave Weigel, S. J., An American Dialogue. This book constitutes a type of tri-faith enterprise inasmuch as it contains a foreword by Will Herberg.

The "Dialogue" has been conducted largely by theologians, clergymen, religious journalists, professional and lay officials of our major religious bodies, and representatives of inter-faith and inter-group relations agencies. While social scientists have at times been involved and have contributed important insights, they have done so more on the basis of their general intellectual sensitivity and competence rather than as scholars drawing

implications from major sociological or psychological studies.\*

We believe that there is a crucial need for social-science research in this area. We maintain that such research will provide significant data on which to base the future discussions between theologians, clergymen, religious journalists, professional and lay officials of our major religious bodies, and the representatives of inter-faith and inter-group relations agencies. We believe that ultimately such material will play a significant role in spurring efforts to improve inter-faith relations. The "Dialogue" has in fact prepared the climate in which research on inter-religious relations can be initiated and -- when completed -- can lead to salutary changes. In sum, the decline in insularity of all our major religious groups involves receptivity to the initiation and implementation of research in inter-faith relations -- receptivity of a type previously unknown. To be effective, however, such research must be on a high technical level and must be informed by a perspective which recognizes the validity of man's supra-social as well as social aspirations.

### III. PAST RESEARCH ON INTER-RELIGIOUS RELATIONS

From our knowledge of the literature we are convinced that there are few precedents to guide us in the initiation of

---

\*  
Note, for example, Joseph P. Fitzpatrick, S. J., "Catholic and Jew: A Problem of Images", Catholic Mind, July-August, 1961, pp. 292-300.

research on inter-religious relations. In the past the Bogardus Social Distance Test has been popular; the social-distance perspective has been widely adopted. We believe that this perspective has proven valuable and may still be desirable as a supplementary tool. However inasmuch as the problem of inter-religious relations is not merely a problem of social distance this approach does not promise much in the way of advancing our knowledge. Furthermore the unstated assumption of many who use the social-distance concept is the desirability of assimilating our multitude of religious and ethnic groups. This is an assumption which we reject. Nevertheless the social-distance approach is of value inasmuch as it clues us to the importance of childhood learning -- the test has been extensively utilized in youth studies.

Another approach is that of the crucial incident -- the utilization of a crisis situation to study tensions which ordinarily do not rise to the surface. Kenneth W. Underwood's book Protestant and Catholic demonstrates this approach. While study of the crisis situation does have certain advantages we feel that for our purposes its shortcomings outweigh its advantages. We prefer to study inter-faith relations in a more benign setting, on the assumption that by so doing we increase the possibility of generalization.

There are, however, two studies -- both recently published -- which cast important light on our interests. One study constitutes the first major empirical investigation of the impact of religion on individual attitudes and behavior. We refer to

Gerhard Lenski's The Religious Factor. While Lenski devotes himself almost entirely to the analysis of how various faith-groups diverge in a number of important areas -- mainly politics, economic behavior, education, and family life -- he is well aware of the problem of inter-religious relationships. In one section of his book (pp. 55-67) he deals explicitly with the mutual perceptions held by individuals from our different faith-communities and in several other places, especially in his final chapter, he makes reference to the problems which result when faiths constitute communities as well as groups distinguished from one another by virtue of the fact that they share a unique faith-perspective.

The Religious Factor is also helpful in pointing up ambiguities in the use of the word "prejudice" -- a term employed with great frequency by scientists and practitioners alike. Lenski believes that: "In many cases the term 'prejudice' has been used by social psychologists and sociologists more as a weapon than as a scientific tool" (p. 68). He prefers to use the phrase "unfavorable group image" and the section of his book previously referred to is simply entitled "Intergroup Images". His point seems to us well taken; we plan to study images and to do so without immediately categorizing all images of out-groups -- especially all unfavorable images -- as "prejudice."

Bernhard Olson's recently-published study Faith and Prejudice also casts important light on our interest. This volume constitutes a highly-detailed survey of the inter-religious

images found in Sunday School texts of a number of Protestant denominations of contrasting theological perspectives. In spite of its suggestiveness the shortcomings of the approach -- at least from our vantage-point -- are numerous. However original in approach a content analysis tells us little about the impact of the material being analyzed. And if it be assumed that such material does have an impact we do not know the manner in which it is interpreted by the reader. Content analysis of Sunday School texts also has additional limitations: the printed word is only one source for the formation of inter-religious images; it may in fact not be the primary source for the formation of such images.

#### IV. RESEARCH PLAN: OBJECTIVES AND STUDY POPULATION

The objective of the present study is to determine the imagery -- whether positive, negative, or neutral -- held by youth from two of our faith-communities, the Catholic and Jewish. While the determination of such imagery will constitute a substantial problem, insofar as possible we will also seek to determine the sources of the imagery. Possible sources to be examined include parental influence, peer-group influence in peer groups composed of members of the in-group, peer-group influence in mixed peer groups, neighborhood contacts, the ethnic culture, the classroom, religious teaching, and inter-group contact. The study will seek to assess each source and, if more than one source is operative, assess to what degree the sources are mutually reinforcing. The study will seek to gather data on the

Mass  
Media

personality orientation of respondents and discover to what extent contrasting personality orientations are related to different inter-religious orientations. The study will also seek to clarify how different orientations to the individual's own religion are related to his orientation to other faith-communities. The extent to which class, status, and power conflicts, as well as ethnic hostilities, are expressed as inter-religious conflicts will also be an object of study.

Bearing in mind the present state of Jewish research in the field it seems wisest to refrain from advancing specific hypotheses about the origin, causes, development, maintenance, correlates, and consequences of inter-religious imagery. Such hypotheses will be formulated during the preliminary phase of the project and after exploratory interviews have been conducted.

We believe that at this stage in inter-religious research the employment of nation-wide samples and the attempt to study the inter-religious attitudes of all of our denominations and sects should be avoided. Rather we believe depth rather than of breath should be emphasized. Accordingly we plan to restrict ourselves to samples of special populations; we intend to concentrate on the attitudes of Catholic and Jewish young people between the ages of 11-14. This age-grade should provide us with a group old enough to have been exposed to such multiple influences as the home, school, peer group, neighborhood, and mass media. This age-grade will also be sufficiently mature to have had some experience with our area of interest. Also, some children in this age-grade will have been exposed for a number

of years to some type of program of religious instruction.

We also favor the 11-14 group because we believe that such youngsters are not mature enough to have constructed well-rationalized positions in respect to their inter-religious attitudes. Neither are they mature enough to have received extensive reinforcement of their attitudes, nor conflict experiences in respect to such attitudes. Since we do not wish to concentrate on the initial recognition by the child of his religious identity or his first reactions to religious differences, we have chosen to avoid a younger population. On the other hand we do not want to concentrate on the late high school years; this is a time when dating becomes a serious concern and can color the inter-religious situation. We believe that both boys and girls should be sampled. Our emphasis upon the study of attitudes of 11-14-year-olds is also connected with our desire to gain understanding about an age-grade where therapeutic efforts, if indicated, will have a good chance of success.

As noted earlier we plan to confine our sampling to two religious groups -- Catholics and Jews -- and to study each in such a manner that the mutual perception held by one group of the other will emerge. Material on Catholic-Jewish imagery of Protestants will be gathered but it will be utilized chiefly for the purpose of placing the imagery held by Catholic and Jewish young people of each other in perspective. Hopefully other investigators will want to replicate our study on a variety of Protestant populations.

Why the choice of the Catholic and Jewish groups? While this would seem to flow out of the sponsorship of the study such sponsorship is not a chance arrangement but constitutes an expression of certain characteristics of the contemporary inter-religious situation. Ecologically-speaking Catholics and Jews are in contact with each other. The fact is that both groups are spread very unevenly throughout the country -- they are concentrated in certain of our largest cities. The groups are therefore inevitably thrown together and their imagery is formed out of something more than bookish acquaintanceship or the encountering of folklore. The choice of these groups, then, means that we will be studying imagery in the context of propinquity, a context where the changes for varying kinds of contact (or for deliberate avoidance) are considerable.

While simple propinquity would be a sufficient justification for the choice of the two groups with whom we will be dealing, something even more significant is involved: our belief that a substantial problem of inter-religious amity exists as between Catholics and Jews. While we wish to avoid the study of inter-religious relations in cases where groups are at sword's points (thus -- unlike Underwood -- we do not plan on choosing a community such as "Paper City") it does seem strategic both from the scientific as well as from the therapeutic standpoint to examine a situation in which substantial problems of inter-religious amity exist. The significant point about our two groups is that in spite of many similarities -- time of immigration, the common struggle to improve living conditions and to

leave the area of first settlement, the mutual experience with discrimination and exclusion -- Catholics and Jews deviate sharply on a host of questions which have grave implications for public policy. Federal aid to parochial schools, Sunday closing laws, and legislation and administrative practice regarding birth control are examples of the many religiously-connected issues in which the groups deviate. In addition they differ on certain questions of public policy less directly connected with their faith perspectives.

Although young people are generally not directly involved with such matters we would expect their imagery to be affected by the resulting polarization of the two groups. However the choice of the Catholic and Jewish groups is also dictated by the fact that their conflict may proceed on a latent as well as a manifest level. And if we push this idea further we may well conclude that the Catholic-Jewish relationship represents a kind of ideal-type situation in the area of inter-religious relations. What we have in mind is that from the Jewish stance the Catholic represents the arch-Christian -- a reaction clearly documented by the Jewish essayists in the Scharper volume. On the Catholic side the Jew may also be viewed in a special light. The Jew is not a half-Christian or a non-Christian -- he may be seen as the arch-type of the anti-Christian. In sum our study will concentrate on the inter-religious imagery of two groups whose situation highlights the problem of contemporary American inter-religious relations and, in a broader sense, the difficulties which result when diverse faith-communities confront each other.

V. RESEARCH PLAN: TECHNIQUES AND LOCATION

The basic source of data will be questionnaires to be administered to several thousand Catholic and Jewish young people. The instrument will be a self-administered one. The advantage of a self-administered instrument is clear: it will enable us to gather sufficient respondents so that we may work with a wide range of variables. However, due to the nature of the problem to which the study is addressed extensive preliminary work will be necessary to determine the conditions under which a self-administered instrument can best be administered, the kinds of information which can best be elicited by such an instrument, and the extent to which a self-administered instrument will require supplementation with other techniques. It would seem advisable to conduct personal interviews with those respondents whom we discover hold either the most favorable or the most unfavorable inter-religious images. It is expected that the cooperation of public and parochial school officials will be forthcoming, thus enabling us to utilize school facilities.

While the basic data of the study will come from 11-14-year-olds, it is contemplated that personal interviews of a loosely-structured kind will be conducted among school officials, local religious leaders, community figures, social workers, and others. Structured interviews with parents of those children who are found to hold highly favorable or highly unfavorable inter-religious images is desirable in order to

gather more extensive data about the family environment of such children than will be available from the self-administered questionnaire.

The location of the study has not been finally determined. Our present thinking is that we will be able to discover a number of appropriate sites in the New York metropolitan region; should this not be the case a community within easy reach of New York will be selected. Whatever the city we believe that the study should work more intensively in the suburbs than in the central city, for we see suburbia as the new frontier in Catholic-Jewish relations. It is desirable that at least two suburbs of contrasting character should be studied. The most important factors which should be varied appear to be socio-economic status and the ratio between the two religious groups. It is also desirable that a central city area be added for purposes of comparison. While such an area will probably be one of second rather than first settlement, its character should be in strong contrast with the suburban communities. It would seem desirable that all areas selected should contain both Jewish as well as Catholic parochial schools, thus enabling us to study young people of both religious groups with equivalent educational histories.

The study is conceived of as a three-year effort. The first year will be devoted to further specification of the research problem, construction of instruments, and selection of communities. The second year will be devoted mainly to the gathering and processing of data. Analysis of data will begin

in the latter half of the second year and the study report will be completed by the end of the third year.

#### VI. SPONSORSHIP

The study will be jointly sponsored by Fordham University and The American Jewish Committee. An executive committee, consisting of representatives of both institutions, will be responsible for engaging the research staff, analyzing the research design and the research instruments developed by the staff, and reviewing the progress of the study at periodic intervals. The executive committee will also seek to protect the research team from any undue influence on the part of either of the faith-communities being studied.

It is expected that the study director will be given considerable freedom. He will have full responsibility for drawing up the research design, for executing the study, and for arranging for publication of the study report. The executive committee will not have the authority to veto publication of the results of the study.

It is suggested that two additional committees be established. The first -- an advisory committee of responsible citizens, leading educators, and religious officials -- should function so as to facilitate communication with the faith-communities involved in the study. The second -- a committee of research consultants -- should consist of social scientists of recognized competence and reputation, and should fulfill strictly a technical function.

The grant for the study will be administered by  
Fordham University under an agreement which will be made  
between the executive committee and the University.

MS:RGB  
1/18/63



APPENDIX

B U D G E T

A. Personnel	
1. Study Director 3 years @ \$15,000 .....	\$ 45,000
2. Research Associates (2) 2 years @ \$9,000 .....	36,000
3. Statistical Clerk 1 year @ \$5,500 .....	5,500
4. Secretarial Assistance .....	16,000
5. Social Security, Insurance, and Other Benefits .....	6,000
B. Consultant Fees and Committee Expenses.	2,000
C. Data Processing Costs .....	21,000
D. Stationery, Printing, Supplies and Equipment .....	2,000
E. Travel Expenses .....	1,500
	<hr/>
SUB-TOTAL .....	\$135,000
Indirect Cost Allowance (@ 15%) .....	20,250
	<hr/>
<u>TOTAL</u> .....	\$155,250
	<hr/> <hr/>