



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 46, Folder 7, Textbooks, 1963-1964.

June 11, 1964

Neil Sandberg
Judith Hershcopf

Dear Neil:

This is in reply to your memo of June 9th to Marc Tenenbaum regarding specific program suggestions for your forthcoming conference (tri-faith) at Loyola.

First and foremost, let me advise you that Ned Goldberg in the Chicago office has been instrumental in setting up a tri-faith conference of religious educators based on the three self studies which will be taking place in Chicago in November. A good deal of thought and planning has gone into working out the program for that conference, and I am asking Ned to send a copy of it, along with whatever personal comments and observations he would want to make. (I shamefacedly confess that I am unable to find the copy which Ned sent to me.)

I believe the Chicago program will be very helpful to you. I don't know how the Loyola conference is being set-up, and exactly who will be involved, but I can add a couple of suggestions which I believe would make for interesting program if the level of interreligious communication is high enough and the psychological *defenses* are low enough.

1. I would like to see a discussion between a Catholic, Protestant and Jewish scholar on the Crusades, and how these events are described in the various religious traditions. What kinds of underlying premises and value judgements motivate the writer? Christians tend to look at the Crusades as a sincere, if somewhat romantic, effort for the glory of God; for Jews it was a blood bath. Is there some way of presenting a balanced picture of this period?
2. I would like to see a similar discussion between Protestants and Catholics on how the Reformation is presented.

3. I would like to see a serious and enlightened discussion regarding the Pharisees: who they were, what values they represented, their importance to contemporary normative Judaism.

I hope the above, plus Ned's memo, will give you food for thought for awhile.

Warmest best wishes.

JH:as

CC: Marc Tanenbaum
Ned Goldberg



711 HT

June 11, 1964

Ned Goldberg
Judith Hershkopf

Dear Ned:

The attached is self explanatory. Neil Sandberg's planning committee for a tri-faith conference at Loyola is meeting within the next couple of weeks. Please rush him a copy of your program (along with whatever helpful suggestions you might want to make.) Incidentally, send us another copy of your memo. Thanks for your cooperation and warmest good wishes.

JH:as
Enc.

P.S. I am sure you have it but just in case, here is Neil's address:

590 N. Vermont Avenue
Room 224
Los Angeles 4, Calif.

① M Ta
② Olsen community
conferences

June 16, 1964

Neil Sandberg
Ned Goldberg

Religious Textbook Conference

At Judith Herschcopf's suggestion; I am sending you, herewith, a copy of our Conference plan, as revised at a planning committee meeting on June 4th, and the minutes of that meeting.

The Religious Education Association of Metropolitan Chicago is co-sponsor, with our chapter. We have invited the University of Chicago Theological College to join in sponsorship, since we will meet at the University's Center for Continuing Education.

Judith and Marc Tannenbaum have been most helpful in developing our Conference plans. Both, we hope, will participate. We are also asking Judy to meet with Franklin Littel to help him prepare his statement.

We have tried to make an equitable distribution of assignments, by faith, including our planning committee, which is composed of two Catholics, two Protestants and two Jews.

Our maximum budget, including an estimate of \$2,600.00 for honoraria and expenses for speakers is \$3,600.00. We hope to reduce this sum through the waiving of honoraria by some speakers.

Participants will pay a \$5.00 registration fee, to help defray some conference costs, in addition to paying for their own lodging and meals.

If you wish any further details, please let me know.

Warm regards.

NG:js
enc.

cc: Judith Herschcopf
Murray Ortof

MAY 3, 1964

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 cooperation 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."

JEWS 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."

JOHN SLAWSON
DAVID DANZIG
MARC TANENBAUM
JUDITH HERSHCOPF
SELMA HIRSH
MORRIS FINE
EDWIN J. LUKAS
MAX BIRNBAUM
ANN WOLFE
MORTON YARMON
ELEANOR ASHMAN
S. ANDHIL FINEBERG
SAMUEL GABER
A. HAROLD MURRAY
MURRAY ORTOF
ISAIAH TERMAN

THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE

LOS ANGELES CHAPTER

590 NORTH VERMONT AVENUE • NOrmandy 3-2186 • LOS ANGELES 4, CALIFORNIA

Memo from: Neil C. Sandberg

Attached is a summary I have prepared of the proceedings of the Inter-religious Institute held at Loyola University last fall to hear and discuss presentations on three studies made to determine the "Inter-group Content in Religious Teaching Materials". These scientific self-studies were initiated and supported by the American Jewish Committee at Yale University School of Divinity (Protestant), St. Louis University (Catholic), and Dropsie College (Jewish).

More than one hundred religious educators of the three major faiths, priests, nuns, rabbis, ministers, religious textbook and film writers, and others dealing with the preparation of religious materials were in attendance. It is worth noting that almost half of those present were nuns who were principals and administrators of many of the parochial schools in Southern California. The proceedings of the Institute were tape recorded and broadcast under the auspices of the Southern California Council of Churches.

It should also be noted that there is very little tri-faith activity in Los Angeles, and this Institute represented a meaningful contribution to the development of a wholesome interreligious climate. Cardinal McIntyre appointed Monseigneur Dignin as his personal representative. We were also privileged to have with us a representative of Fuller Theological Seminary which trains many of the Fundamentalist ministers in this area.

Over the past eleven years, the American Jewish Committee has been developing close contact with Catholic scholars and educators through its support of the annual Human Relations Workshop at Loyola. This year, I will be privileged to serve as consultant to the Workshop.

As follow-up to the Institute, it was agreed that such conferences should be held on a regular basis. The next conference will be held in September at Loyola and will be concerned with "The New Spirit of Ecumenism" and its impact on interreligious activity in this area.

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 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 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.

NEWS

◀ This is the American Jewish Committee:

- ◀ Founded in 1906.
- ◀ Pioneer American organization combating bigotry, protecting the civil and religious rights of Jews here and abroad, and advancing the cause of human rights everywhere.
- ◀ Chapters and units in more than 80 principal cities; members in more than 600 American communities.

THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE INSTITUTE OF HUMAN RELATIONS

165 East 56 Street • New York 22, N. Y. • Plaza 1-4000

Washington Office: 1012 14th Street, N.W. • Wash. 5, D. C. • District 7-3204

European Headquarters: 30 Rue la Boetie • Paris 8, France

South American Headquarters: Libertad 773 • Buenos Aires, Argentina

Officers

A. M. SONNABEND, President

JACOB BLAUSTEIN
LOUIS CAPLAN
HERBERT B. EHRLMANN
IRVING M. ENGEL
JOSEPH M. PROSKAUER
Honorary Presidents

MORRIS B. ABRAM
Chairman, Executive Board

RALPH FRIEDMAN
Chairman, Administrative Board

JOHN SLAWSON
Executive Vice-President

HAROLD STEINBERG
Director of Publicity

Press Room 510
New York Hilton

FOR RELEASE SATURDAY, MAY 2, PMs & SUNDAY, MAY 3, AMs

New York, May 2...A scientific analysis of the contents of Catholic religion textbooks has been completed at St. Louis University, a Jesuit institution, to determine how outside racial, religious and ethnic groups are portrayed in these materials. The three-year study reveals these major conclusions:

1. Catholic religion textbooks are overwhelmingly positive in their references toward racial and ethnic groups.
2. General intergroup teachings, which refer to "all men," are also overwhelmingly positive.
3. But negative and distorted statements are found to be more prevalent in references to Protestants, Jews and other specific non-Catholic religious groups.

At the same time, the study offers concrete suggestions for avoiding distortions in Catholic teachings about Protestants and Jews, and concludes that recently published materials are more constructive in their approach to intergroup themes than the older textbooks.

The three-year study at St. Louis University analyzed the Catholic religion textbooks most widely used in parochial school systems throughout the United States. Carried out by Sister Rose Albert Thering, O.P., it is one of three research projects at St. Louis University. The other two analyzed the intergroup content in Catholic social studies and literature textbooks. All three projects were under the supervision of the Rev. Trafford P. Mahar, S.J., director of the university's Department of Education.

The findings were made public jointly here today by the Rev. Paul C. Reinert, S.J., President of St. Louis University, and Morris B. Abram,

President of the American Jewish Committee, at the closing session of the Committee's 57th Annual Meeting. The agency, pioneer human relations organization in this country, encouraged the independent research project as part of its program to further interreligious understanding through objective self-study of religious education materials.

Mr. Abram pointed out that the Committee also stimulated the seven-year self-study of Protestant materials, which was completed at Yale University Divinity School and published last year by Yale University Press under the title Faith and Prejudice. A Jewish self-study has been completed at Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning and its findings will soon be made public.

The St. Louis Study reveals that Catholic religious textbooks mention other groups to a substantial degree. Sixty-five volumes were analyzed, comprising seven basic religion series; two church histories; one guidance series; four supplementary volumes; and the manuals of teacher's guidebooks accompanying them. For purposes of analysis, these were broken down into 2,790 lesson units.

More than half of them made reference to some "outside" religious, racial or ethnic group. (While the Roman Catholic Church is 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.)

Of the intergroup references, 69 per cent concerned other religious groups, 16 per cent fell into the "general" intergroup category, covering broad, unspecified references to "all men," and 15 per cent referred to specific racial and ethnic groups. The percentage of positive sympathetic references in the general, racial and ethnic intergroup categories was invariably high. It fell sharply, however, in the category where the greatest bulk of intergroup content is to be found -- references to other religions. Thus, one publisher scored .958 (out of a possible 1.000, representing only positive comments) in the general intergroup category, and .955 for Negroes. However, the score drops to .290 for Jews and to .043 in discussing Protestants.

Similarly, the Protestant self-study at Yale also revealed that racial and ethnic groups are more positively portrayed in Protestant textbooks than other religious groups. Rev. Reinert commented on this aspect of the studies:

"Apparently, the problems of identifying in a positive manner with other religions are more difficult and complex than those of identifying with other

racial and ethnic groups. Although racial prejudice may be America's most pressing social concern, interreligious relationships pose more complex problems in the preparations of religious teaching texts.

"This is understandable," he observed, "since the religious textbook is where each group sets forth its own faith and recounts its own history. Critical judgments regarding other faiths may be unavoidable, but great care must be exercised to prevent bias and prejudice from distorting teaching materials. These self-studies are designed to help make textbook writers, religious educators and clergymen more sensitive to the problem of prejudice in religious teaching texts."

The St. Louis Study revealed that of all groups mentioned in the textbooks, Jews are by far the most conspicuous. References to Jews and Judaism ranged from one-quarter to more than one-half of the basic textbook series. Protestants were the second most visible group mentioned in the textbooks. The study indicates that negative comments regarding Protestants and Jews tend to concentrate around certain themes, particularly those dealing with historic conflicts. For Protestants, these themes are:

1. doctrinal differences with the Roman Catholic Church;
2. the Reformation conflict;
3. some areas of contemporary Catholic-Protestant competition. For Jews, negative references tended to concentrate around the following themes:

1. the Jewish rejection of Christianity;
2. the Crucifixion;
3. the Pharisees.

Positive references to Jews abound in comments associated with the Old Testament heritage of Judaism, which is also the heritage of the Roman Catholic Church. For example, one religious text states: "Catholics of the world, regardless of their nationality, are all spiritually Semites, we are all children of Israel."

The St. Louis study offers recommendations for avoiding distortions and bias in teachings about Protestants and Jews. It cautions against generalizations, oversimplifications and overall judgments of an entire group. In teaching about Protestants, the author suggests that Catholics discard the apologetic approach, which aims at demolishing the religious arguments of Protestants, and adopt the psychological or "kerygmatic" approach, which stresses the positive virtue of love of God and neighbor.

To avoid distortions in teachings about Jews, the study offers the following recommendations:

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 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.

"In general," summarized Rev. Mahar, Supervisor of the project, "the St. Louis University textbook research project indicates that the skills of

intergroup communication still need much more attention. If the many groups in our heterogeneous society are going to prepare our children to live more intelligently and constructively, much more time and attention must be given to human relations and intergroup education knowledges and skills. It is hoped that these research projects will serve as a stimulous to school people in the great work of preparing children to live harmoniously in the democracy that is the United States of America."

The AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE, founded in 1906, is the pioneer human relations agency in this country, combating bigotry, protecting the civil and religious rights of Jews, and advancing the cause of human rights for all.

No. 64
A-32 30
NP-20 3 p
NPE-17 3 q
AJ-31 2 n, 1g

5/1/64



From
VALLEY JEWISH NEWS
San Fernando, Calif.
JUN 25 1964

International
Press Clipping Bureau, Inc.

New York City

Our Visiting Editor *Study Of Religious Texts*

Now available for further study is a scientific analysis of the contents of Catholic religious textbooks made at St. Louis University, a Jesuit institution, to determine how outside racial, religious and ethnic groups are portrayed in these materials.

The major conclusions of the three-year study point out that Catholic religious texts are overwhelmingly positive in references toward racial and ethnic groups; general intergroup teachings, which refer to "all men," are also overwhelmingly positive; but negative and distorted statements are more prevalent in references to Protestants, Jews and other specific non-Catholic religious groups.

Carried out by a Nun at the University, the research project was encouraged by the American Jewish Committee in furtherance of interreligious understanding through objective self-study of religious education materials.

This report should not be regarded as merely an academic project that will be put aside to gather dust in some library – at least we hope not; and we think it is important that the study does offer concrete suggestions for avoiding distortions in Catholic teachings about Protestants and Jews. Also of great importance, is the finding that recently published materials are more constructive in their approach to intergroup themes than older textbooks.

THE JEWISH TIMES, Philadelphia