



THE JACOB RADER MARCUS CENTER OF THE AMERICAN JEWISH ARCHIVES

Preserving American Jewish History

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

Series C: Interreligious Activities. 1952-1992

Box 44, Folder 4, Religious education, 1960-1969.

FAITH AND PREJUDICE: INTERGROUP PROBLEMS IN PROTESTANT CURRICULA,
by BERNHARD E. OLSON Yale University Press, Jan. 1963. 400 pp.

"If the Protestant legacy of freedom and toleration is impressive, it is also tragically stained. This mixed legacy is not entirely a matter of past historyWhy were some Christians staunchly able to resist the anti-Semitism that culminated in the horrors of Buchenwald and Auschwitz? Yet, why did the vast majority succumb? These ambiguities deeply disturb conscientious Christians who raise questions about the relevance and import of Christian ideology and commitment, which leads us to inquire whether there are both strengths and liabilities in Protestant teachings that permit these radically disparate responses to the fate of minorities. In sum, do the Protestant faiths contain both sources of and antidotes to prejudice, and, if so, can these contradictory factors be isolated and named?"

FAITH AND PREJUDICE reports the findings and insights derived from a massive Protestant self-study, carried out by the author over a seven-year period at the Yale University Divinity School, to determine whether Protestant religious education is a possible breeding ground for prejudice. In the course of this study, the most systematic and thorough of its kind ever undertaken, Dr. Olson examined more than one hundred and twenty thousand lesson units taken from religious school curricula. While all major Protestant denominations were initially surveyed, the author chose for intensive analysis four curricula representing basic variations of Protestant thought, tradition and theology. These four include: fundamentalism (represented by the materials of the Scripture Press); classical conservatism (represented by the curriculum of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod); liberalism (represented by the Unitarian-Universalist Beacon Press series); and neo-orthodoxy, (represented by the Faith and Life curriculum of the Presbyterian

Church in the USA).

Dr. Olson analyses the way "outside" racial, religious and ethnic groups are portrayed in the curricula of each of these groups, compares their approaches to prejudice and intergroup relations, pinpoints "problem" themes around which negative images of outside groups tend to concentrate, and offers to each group, within the context of its own faith perspective, suggestions for dealing more effectively with the problems of prejudice.*

Many religious educators have claimed that intergroup relations, while a commendable subject for study elsewhere, have little to do with Christian education. Others view prejudice solely in terms of race relations. Dr. Olson's findings challenge both these assumptions. He points out that, "Protestant religious textbooks incorporate an astonishingly high percentage of lessons in which other groups are spoken of, incidentally or in detail." Reference

*

This Protestant self-study in no way implies that prejudice is a uniquely Protestant problem. Indeed, the Yale project is but one of three independent self-studies of religious education materials. A survey of Catholic textbooks has been undertaken at St. Louis University and a Jewish self-study at The Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning, to investigate how outside racial, religious and ethnic groups are portrayed in Catholic and Jewish textbooks. All three studies were encouraged by the American Jewish Committee, a human relations organization with a history of interest in such research.

to outside groups ranged from 67 per cent, in one curriculum to 88 per cent in another. Moreover, Protestants are considerably more preoccupied with outside religious groups (mentioned in 10 to 66 per cent of all lessons) than with Negro-White relations (3 to 9 per cent) or with other ethnic groups (3 to 7 per cent), and have more difficulty in depicting other religious groups positively.

Protestant-Catholic Relations

While all Protestant groups in this study condemn anti-Catholicism and affirm basic Catholic rights, Roman Catholicism emerges with the least positive image of all religions discussed in Protestant lessons. Historic conflicts (the Reformation, past persecution of Protestants by Catholics) and doctrinal disagreements (Catholic teachings, particularly about the nature and authority of the Church) provide the occasion for many negative references; others reflect Protestant misgivings about the present-day attitudes of Roman Catholics toward them and towards traditional American freedoms.

In disagreeing with Catholic views, conservatives and fundamentalists depict a monolithic Roman Catholicism, sometimes characterizing the Church as "a network of evil." The neo-orthodox curriculum, however, achieves a positive image of Catholicism, balancing its critical judgments by stressing areas of kinship, correcting distortions, and encouraging cooperation.

Although an authentic Protestant position invariably involves some negative judgments about Catholic beliefs and policies, the author demonstrates that it is possible to deal forthrightly with the issues between the Roman Catholic and Protestant faiths, and still present a positive image of Catholics and Catholicism.

Christian-Jewish Relations

Protestant lessons refer more frequently to Jews and Judaism than to any other group. Jewish references ranged from 44 per cent of all lessons in one curriculum to 66 per cent in another. The conspicuousness of Jews in Protestant education is neither unexpected nor invidious, since the Protestant faiths, Biblically rooted, cannot be set forth without reference to Judaism. Nevertheless, it does create hazards. "As a minority which inescapably figures in the foreground of Christian thought--and remains an accessible minority in a society which contains deep strains of anti-Semitism--the Jewish community easily becomes a vulnerable target," Dr. Olson states.

Protestant concerns about Jews and Judaism are radically different from those regarding Roman Catholics. For example, Protestants have no anxiety about Jewish views on freedom and religious pluralism. Negative images of Jews, rather, reflect mutual conflict between the two groups at crucial points in Christian history, and fundamental theological questions which bear upon the nature of anti-Semitism. The themes which pose the knottiest problems for Protestant educators are the Crucifixion, the conflict between Jesus and the Pharisees, the early conflict between Church and

Synagogue, the question of Gentile inclusion, and the issues of rejection and unbelief.

Jews have frequently wondered, both publicly and privately, whether anti-Semitism is, in fact, rooted in Christian Scripture and thus an inevitable component of Christian teaching. The findings of this study bear relevantly on such a concern. Dr. Olson points out that while Scripture can and does affect references to Jews, it does not alone determine the over-all Jewish portrait in Protestant lessons. Cultural, social and political viewpoints, unrelated to Scripture, also find expression in these lessons. Moreover, states the author, "a point of view is brought to Scripture as well as derived from it." He illustrates how the same Biblical passage is interpreted negatively for Jews by one denomination and positively by another.

There are significant differences in the ways Protestants invoke Scripture to support their interreligious teachings. One group quotes Scripture at a ratio of 9 to 1 against various forms of interreligious action (cooperation, interfaith activities, etc.); another finds authority in Scripture for exactly the opposite viewpoint by a ratio of 6 to 1.

Conclusions

Whatever one's faith, it is possible to view other groups positively, Dr. Olson states. But paradoxically, it is precisely in the attempts to set forth the faith that the negative or ambiguous images of other groups appear. Lessons dealing specifically with intergroup relations are invariably positive. It is in the lessons which ^{expound} Scripture or doctrine that prejudice emerges.

What are the reasons for this?

In some respects a prejudiced portrait is simply a matter of "bad theology"--a fragmentary statement of faith, which does not draw upon doctrines and convictions existing within the theology of the particular group. (For example, some of the Conservative lessons attribute the persecution and suffering of Jews to divine judgment. Dr. Olson points out that other convictions, equally basic to conservative theology, are omitted: the doctrine that all men stand under divine judgment, that anti-Semitism is a sin, and cannot be equated with divine judgment.)

Sometimes, lesson writers use another religious group as a contrast or example, and in doing so reflect their own unconscious bias or cultural stereotypes.

For instance, in one discussion of Pharasaic legalism there is the comment that the Roman Catholic Church "teems" with such legalism. Another discussion, of God's covenant with the Jews, is punctuated with the remark that Jews are invariably successful in business.

Sometimes, too, lesson writers are simply not aware that their statements about other groups made in the context of past disputes may affect contemporary attitudes. Thus, Dr. Olson stresses the need to develop an explicit policy regarding intergroup relations, which will be intrinsically linked to religious faith and permeate the entire curriculum. The absence of such a clear-cut social concern leaves lesson writers at the mercy both of general American cultural prejudices and of an unreflective tradition inherited from days when prejudice was more characteristic of Protestant literature than it is today.

Dr. Olson also points out that lessons calling for "love" and "justice" in a vague, general way are not as effective as those which apply these demands to concrete situations and to the plight of specific groups in the world today.

Each faith has its own problems in intergroup relations, but each faith offers resources for understanding the nature of prejudice and for viewing the positive terms the life and existence of outside groups. In this lies a great hope for the future of freedom in America, where faiths may be communicated without prejudice, yet where each group is genuinely free to be itself and to declare its faith with candor and zeal.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Dr. Bernhard E. Olson is an ordained minister of the Methodist Church. He served as pastor of several churches in New York and Connecticut before joining the Yale University Divinity School faculty to direct the seven year study of Protestant texts which culminated in this book.

From 1960-1963 Dr. Olson was an instructor and research associate in religious education at Union Theological Seminary, and Director of the Project in Research and Consultation in the Intergroup Aspects of Protestant Curricula.

He is presently Director of Intergroup Relations in Religious Education for the National Council of Churches in the U. S. A.

Dr. Olson has a Bachelor of Divinity degree from Drew University and a Ph.D. from Yale.



Erasing Textbook Bias: A Project for Catholics

By Jo-ann Price
Of The Herald Tribune Staff

A three-year study urging revision of Roman Catholic textbook material to erase negative images and distortions relating to Jews and Protestants was released here yesterday by the American Jewish Committee in co-operation with St. Louis University, a Jesuit institution.

The analysis, initiated by the AJC and hailed as long overdue by the St. Louis Jesuits who supervised it, will be distributed as a corrective measure among publishers of Catholic school books. The report's authors hope it will serve as a guide for future manuscripts.

The study consists of dissertations submitted for doctor of philosophy degrees by three teaching nuns supervised by the Rev. Trafford P. Mahar, S. J., director of the university's department of education. Findings were released at the close of the AJC 57th annual meeting at the New York Hilton Hotel.

The study found that Catholic religious textbooks are "overwhelmingly positive" in references to racial and ethnic groups. They also scored high on the plus side in "general" intergroup teachings alluding to "all men."

But when it came to religious references centered on the Jewish rejection of Christianity, the Crucifixion and the Pharisees, many of the authors abounded in bias, inaccuracy and distortion, the report said. They displayed negative attitudes, as well, when they attempted to describe or interpret historical conflicts with Protestants over doctrinal differences with Catholicism, the Reformation and areas of contemporary Catholic-Protestant competition.

"Some of our Catholic materials," Father Mahar said in reference to a series of Catholic Bible history textbooks published 35 to 40 years ago, "were incredibly awful, perfectly horrible, and the art was terrible. They were used in grammar schools and taught to little

kids at an impressionable age."

Not infrequently, Catholic children, taught that "the Jews crucified Christ," would become prejudiced toward Jews, he said. "There was never any differentiation that some Jews, in one little moment of history, were at

the Crucifixion," Father Mahar said.

Likewise, Catholic textbook references to "hard-hearted" Protestants revolting against Catholicism "never left room for good will, sound motivation and objectively moral principles of conscience."

The nuns participating in the study were Sister Rose Albert Thering, Dominican sister of Madison, Wis.; Sister Rita Mudd of Helena, Mont., and Sister Mary Linus Gleason of Dodge City, Kans.

The analysis is the second of three reports about prejudice in religious teaching. The studies are being made under the sponsorship of the A. J. C., a human relations agency.

One of the other reports is "Faith and Prejudice," a seven-year self-study of Protestant materials completed at Yale University Divinity School and published last year by Yale University Press. A Jewish self-study has been completed at Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning, with findings soon to be released.

Rabbi Marc Tanenbaum, AJC Interreligious Affairs director, noted that the wish of religious groups to discover prejudicial teachings in their own ranks "grew out of their common experience in Europe during the Nazi holocaust."

"Christian leaders have tried to find out what it was in their education that caused millions of Christians to reject Jews," he said. Church leaders, notably Jesuits, in Europe and Latin America have spearheaded this research.

The Rev. Paul C. Reinert, president of St. Louis University, commented that while racial prejudice may be America's "most pressing concern" at present, "inter-religious relationships pose more complex problems" in the preparation of religious textbooks.

From The Textbooks

Catholic school textbooks studied by researchers in a 3-year project at St. Louis University, a Jesuit institution, have been found to contain negative teachings and distortions about Jews and Protestants. Here are some examples cited in the study, which urged that Catholic authors and publishers correct such statements:

ON PROTESTANTISM: "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."

ON NON-CATHOLICS: "Catholics should avoid all non-Catholics."

ON MARTIN LUTHER: "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."

ON REFORMATION LEADERS: "Obstinate heretic" . . . "Self-satisfied monarch" . . . "Positively immoral" . . . "Drunken brewer" . . . "Adulterous tyrant."

ON LATIN-AMERICAN CHURCH: Protestantism and Communism have hindered the Catholic Church in South America. . . .

ON JEWS AND CHRIST: "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."

ON BLAME FOR CHRIST'S DEATH: "The worst deed of the Jewish people, the Murder of the Messiah . . ."

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

JEWISH REJECTION OF CHRISTIANITY: "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."

Religion and Race

♦ ONE HUNDRED years after the Emancipation Proclamation the religious organizations in the United States finally came together in one body to discuss the moral problem of racial discrimination and segregation in specific and concrete terms. Six hundred fifty delegates from 70 religious groups met in the first National Conference on Religion and Race at the Edgewater Beach hotel, Chicago, January 14-17. This interreligious conference, the first of its kind in the nation's history, was convened by the department of racial and cultural relations of the National Council of Churches, the social action department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference and the social action commission of the Synagogue Council of America. The conference thus had the approval and support of the highest representative officers of the participating bodies. In addition to the delegates, several hundred observers and visitors attended the open sessions.

In the depth of the planning for the conference, the efficiency of its machinery, the comfort and conveniences of the housing provided for it, the mood of congeniality and cooperativeness which pervaded it, the earnestness of the delegates in grasping the problems which called them together, the auspices under which it met—in all of this the National Conference on Religion and Race was extraordinarily successful. But the tests of the true success of this gathering run deeper.

Whatever the values of the conference in the solution of the racial problem, it made a deep and far-reaching contribution to the solution of the interfaith problem. This was the most cosmopolitan gathering of religious leaders under religious auspices in American history. What Will D. Campbell said and William Stringfellow and others implied was in some measure accomplished: it is more realistic to seek a true inner life for church and synagogue through the race problem than to seek a solution to the race problem through the inner life of church and synagogue. The nation's number one domestic problem called together and introduced to each other people who on religious grounds have long been estranged. What else could have put in one room representatives of the American Ethical

Union, the Christian life commission of the Southern Baptist Convention, the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America, the Polish National Catholic Church, the Rabbinical Council of America, the Unitarian Universalist Association, the National Council of Catholic Men?

If a family so big is to gather in peace in one room, it has to be a room big enough to hold all its members. Particularities had to be submerged; generalities had to be avoided and the greatest common denominators sought. The harmony and the mutual dedications which were achieved were paid for in patience, restraint, understanding, courtesy, and a willingness not to say everything that could be said. It was an open conference, but the delegates operated on the healthful Pauline principle that though all things are lawful, not all are expedient. Brought together by a great cause, the delegates stayed together and arrived at mutual dedications despite the theological chasms dividing them.

But was it a successful conference on race? No, if it is supposed that such gatherings solve problems. Yes, if it is assumed that the meeting of minds and hearts on a vast and grave human problem is a beginning rather than an ending. Such conferences do not solve problems; they discover problems. They lift up the unresolved issues, identify the unused talent and resources, dramatize the unfinished business, renew the faltering commitments. In these respects the National Conference on Religion and Race was successful not only in the interfaith but also in the interracial quest. Two, three, five years from now will be soon enough to ask what good came of it.

From the brilliant, scholarly opening address by Rabbi Abraham J. Heschel to the moving plea of Martin Luther King, Jr., at the close the accent was on action. In the plenary addresses by Archbishop Cardinal Meyer, J. Irwin Miller, Rabbi Julius Mark, Franklin H. Littell, Robert Sargent Shriver, Jr., in the forums and work groups the accent was on action. Who, indeed, can say anything more than has been said? Who can resolve anything more than has been resolved? The conference declared explicitly

and implicitly that what is lacking in human relations is not ideas, instructions, resolutions, but deeds—deeds such as picket lines, sit-ins, freedom rides; the less dramatic but equally creative deeds of love and justice in our homes, our neighborhoods, our churches and synagogues, our public and private facilities; the personal deeds of prayer, faithful obedience, courageous individual witness to the will of the God who set the solitary in families and made all men one.

Provision was made for a follow-up committee and, temporarily, for a continuing secretariat to put the resources of the conference at the disposal of local groups which want to transform words, ideas and plans into action. The life of the secretariat, without which the accumulated values and resources of the conference will be inadequately used, will depend on the availability of funds for its support. But this is not the action the delegates had in mind: it is merely a means to such action. Already ten follow-up local committees have been or are being formed—in Chicago, Atlanta, Detroit, New Orleans, Pittsburgh, St. Louis, San Antonio, San Francisco and Oakland.

What were the complaints about the conference? It was said, largely unjustly, that Negroes were not adequately represented on the program and in the number of delegates. There is a measure of truth in the first part of this criticism. President Benjamin E. Mays of Morehouse College, Atlanta, was chairman of the conference. With the exception of him and Martin Luther King, Jr., the talent and insight of the Negro were neglected. But it is incorrect to say that Negroes were not proportionately represented. All the religious groups in the Negro community were invited to send delegates. Although some of the groups did not accept the invitation, roughly one-fourth of the delegates were Negroes. Since delegates were selected on a religious rather than a racial basis, the Negro contingency was disproportionately large.

There were more serious omissions. A conference on religion and race should not—as this one did—ignore the Indian and other minority racial groupings. It would have been fitting to have paid some attention to the plight of Spanish Americans in the United States. Although most Spanish Americans are identified as Caucasians, their speech and physical traits subject them to the same kind of oppressions suffered by Negroes in American society. But even more serious was the failure to give recognition, credit and responsibility to women. With the exception of Mahalia Jackson, who sang, and the Rev. May Yoho Ward, who gave an invocation, no woman appeared anywhere on the program. Yet the fact, which some of the delegates and participating groups seemed not to realize, is that the women of the United States have been far in advance of men in the field of interracial activity. This was a regrettable oversight, but fortunately it will not halt the courageous, far-sighted services of women and women's organizations.

The conference, tied to the nationwide celebration of the centennial of the Emancipation Proclamation, was the brain child of a young Roman Catholic layman, Mathew Ahmann of the National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice, who deserves immense credit for the quiet, efficient work which brought this meeting to fruition. With the cooperation of Rabbi Marc H. Tanenbaum of the American Jewish Committee and J. Oscar Lee, executive director of the department of racial and cultural relations of the National Council of Churches, he initiated, planned and directed the development of this historic gathering. He placed himself—and often the religious group to which he belongs—in the background and brought off without bitterness, rancor or envy on the part of anyone an interreligious gathering which may prove to be epochal.

KYLE HASELDEN.

Reprinted with permission from

The Christian Century

Copyright © 1963 by the Christian Century Foundation. All rights reserved

JANUARY 30, 1963

The American Jewish Committee, Institute of Human Relations, 165 East 56 Street, New York 22, N. Y.

INTERRELIGIOUS INSTITUTE

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY
Los Angeles, California

September 9, 1963

"Intergroup Content in Religious Teaching Materials"

AMERICAN JEWISH
ARCHIVES

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 SAIFORD LA SOR
Professor of Old Testament
Fuller Theological Seminary

RABBI MARVIN BORNSTEIN
President, Southern California
Board of Rabbis

DR. MARJORIE LIXINS
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 understandably 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 subgroup 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.