

THE JEWISH SECULAR SCHOOL¹

By LEIBUSH LEHRER

Yiddish Lehrer Seminar, New York, N. Y.

A few years after the conclusion of the World War, a rather unusual Jewish book was published in Lithuania entitled "The Unitary Folk School." The author, Mr. Yoodl Mark, is a well-known journalist and a prominent figure in Jewish educational and scientific endeavor. In this book he had undertaken a task for which there was no opportunity in former periods of Jewish history.

This was in the heyday of the Jewish National Autonomy in Lithuania. The Treaty of Versailles, by incorporating cultural self-determination of national minorities in the newly established European states, had awakened bright hopes within the hearts and minds of the leaders of European Jews. However, no sooner had the barely-emerged Autonomy undertaken the first steps to carry out its prerogatives in educational practice, than it was seriously threatened by internal strife.

At any rate, Lithuanian Jewish Autonomy soon found itself confronted with three Jewish school systems, representing three fundamentally different conceptions of Jewish education. I say three, though actually there were four: the old Orthodox Heder, known as the Jabne schools; the modern Hebraist schools of Tarbut; the Socialist schools of the Kultur Luegue; and, finally, the Folk Shuln with Yiddish as the medium of in-

1. Because of its general interest for all who are concerned with Jewish communal activity, this article, written by a pioneer in the American Yiddish Secular Education Movement, is printed simultaneously in the Quarterly and in the current issue of *Jewish Education* so that it may reach a wider audience.

2. איינהייטלעכע פאלק־שול, פארלאנג, "ליכט", קאוונע, 1922.

struction. These different school systems, as Mr. Mark makes it clear², each carried on an absolutely independent existence without any contact whatsoever with the central bodies of the Autonomy. So much so that "in the last analysis the Autonomy has nothing to do with the schools. They arise, live and die without the consent of the organs of the Autonomy. A convention of the Kehiloth was broken up because a plan had been submitted for the creation of a central committee to regulate only minor matters, without in any way interfering with the independence of the different groups . . . It was impossible to introduce even the smallest measure of uniformity in general courses. The groups won't even permit an official of the Autonomy to enter their schools to see whether the floors are clean." It is needless to point out how tragic as well as ridiculous such a situation is, especially when we bear in mind that education is, after all, the most critical salient in every program of cultural self-determination.

Hence Mr. Mark made a desperate attempt to devise a Unitary Folk School, a sort of compromise or "crazy-quilt," which would contain all colors and satisfy all parties. Those acquainted with the Jewish situation the world over will need no further information as to what has become of Mr. Mark's Jewish educational millennium. No one short of a Messiah can ever hope to succeed in such a Herculean task.

I have dwelt at length on this point be-

3. דאס נייע לעבן, ניו יארק, אפריל, 1923.

4. *Ibid.*

cause I think the internal rift, as regards educational policy, methods, and curriculum, is something entirely new in Jewish educational history and may prove fatal if we doggedly persist in ignoring it. Some may insist that changing conceptions of Jewish education have always emerged in the course of our history and that the establishment of schools which have markedly departed from the prevalent type, is at least as old as the Haskalah movement. The historical facts surely justify such a point of view. But even Dr. Gamoran, who wrote a book to this effect, finds it necessary to remark: "The chief influence of the Haskalah on the educational institutions was therefore not in the numbers of children affected, for the great majority of Jewish children attended the *Hedarim*, but in the tendencies that it introduced into Jewish life. Although not affecting the schools very much, it did affect the individual."⁵

Just as Jewish education was universal, embracing practically the whole male population of our people, so was it uniform in curriculum, in methods, in administration, in requirements demanded of teachers, etc. And just as our universal education was effected without legal compulsion, so the prevalent uniformity needed no special organization for its preservation. In both cases we find a remarkable growth out of the soil of our traditional folkways and *mores*, a social creation which has hardly its equal among the nations of the world.

The social influence of the Haskalah movement was limited enough, but after all, this was merely a first step of a much more significant and widespread process. For, toward the end of the nineteenth century we witness the emergence of a

5. *Changing Conceptions in Jewish Education*, 1934, p. 195.

period which was truly called the Jewish Renaissance. The period is characterized by the rise of Zionism, of political parties including the labor movement; by the secularization of the Hebrew language, *i. e.*, the Holy Tongue turning into a medium for general communication; by the extraordinary development of Yiddish and its literature; by the rise of numerous social and cultural institutions of a worldly nature. In a word, a period which constituted a genuine departure in political as well as Jewish history.

Needless to say that events of such magnitude were bound to affect deeply the very warp and woof of every phase of our educational effort. Hence, whereas during the time of the Haskalah the changes, insofar as they did occur, had touched only the bare surface of national phenomena, this unprecedented metamorphosis was not merely a theoretical affair affecting only individuals, but every Jewish community in every country, East or West, was profoundly influenced by the new aims, methods and ideas of those modern educational trends.

II.

What in substance are the fundamental principles constituting the bone of contention among the different types of Jewish education today? I will mention only two which I believe to be the most important and the most revolutionary as compared with our old traditional educational situation. First, it is the conscious attention given to language (Hebrew or Yiddish), and second, what, for the lack of a better term, may be called secularity.

The more one contemplates the history of the Jewish curriculum down to the twentieth century, the more one marvels at the complete indifference with which our forefathers have looked upon this matter of language. All the books used

at the *Heder* were written in a language which was dear and sacred to the whole people. Besides, the vast majority had a vernacular of their own; and yet, language as such had no place in the course of study. Whatever the causes of this curious phenomenon, the fact remains that just as our God, according to tradition, maintains a sort of nonchalant attitude with respect to the language in which prayer is offered to Him, or His people with all their unexemplified emphasis upon learning left no place in their school curricula for a subject which occupied the most prominent position in the educational institutions of the nations of the world.

Small wonder, then, that the modernization of Jewish education brought about a significant change in this situation. It is only surprising that to some of us it was an unexpected shock to learn that the change came with a vengeance. For, instead of having Orthodox schools on the one hand and modern Hebrew schools on the other, we actually witnessed the rise of a third type, the Yiddish schools, in which Yiddish, both language and literature, have been for the first time in Jewish educational practice elevated to the rank of our creatively evolving national culture. However great the difference between the so-called Hebraists and Yiddishists, they have at least one basic principle in common, an ardent opposition to the traditional indifference to the, or to a, national language as a full-fledged subject of the course of study.

As to secularity, I wish to grant at the outset the infelicity of the term in our case. It is a concept born of a long struggle between church and state and aims to emphasize values over which state jurisdiction is more in the interest of the peo-

ple than ecclesiastical control. On the other hand, it has a reference to scientific method, to the necessity of inductive verification of proposed hypotheses, to new discoveries in natural science, to the development of centralized governments, to the rise of political democracy, etc.

Now all this is either wholly inapplicable to events in Jewish life, or is only very remotely related to it. In our internal differences of opinion or even actual struggles, we have never been divided into "church" and "state"; nor have scientific hypotheses torn us asunder. The conditions surrounding us were always of such a nature that only issues dealing with our very survival as a national unit could divide us into opposing camps. Hence the term *secular* must be redefined so as to make it applicable to the problems of Jewish life.

There is, perhaps, none who would dare minimize the significance of the cultural, social, and religious changes which East-European Jewry had to go through at the beginning of the century. The powerful and deeply embedded folkways have been shaken to their very foundation. Older and younger generations ceased to understand one another. And worst of all, the colossal power of good old Jewish public opinion began to dwindle and disappear.

A process quite similar to this had taken place earlier in post-Mendelssohnian times among German Jews. But the outcome in the two cases was radically different. In Germany, the effort to bring about rapprochement between Jewishness and the ideas of the Enlightenment of the eighteenth century, led to a constant sapping of the vitality of our national life. So much so, that one of its subsequent outstanding innovations, the Reform movement, was, from a national

point of view, actually an idea without any creative, positive end in view. It was literally a "deform" movement. This may perhaps be better appreciated by a present German-Jewish refugee in Palestine who was brought up on the prayer book in which all mention of Zion or Jerusalem had been carefully blotted out.

Now Eastern Jewry, after living through equally disconcerting experiences, gave rise to phenomena of a more positive nature. Instead of a purely religious schism between Orthodoxy and Reform, the line of demarcation has been today drawn between nationalism on the one hand and assimilation, or fusionism, on the other.

This point will perhaps bear some further elucidatory remarks. The long struggle between temporal and ecclesiastical power which began in Christian countries at the close of the Middle Ages, did not only bring up the question of jurisdiction, or state organizations, or the relations between government and church, but it also called for something which led to no less important consequences. It focused attention upon the differential characteristics among social as well as psychological phenomena, which in the past had been so closely knit together as to render invisible any dividing line between them. So that science, for example, not only fought for the truth of certain hypotheses, but also for its freedom as an independent force and factor in social evolution and individual conduct.

In Jewish life no such differentiation took place, and it was indeed nationally disastrous where it did. The continuity of the Jewish web of life has kept up for about five more centuries, unaffected by this dichotomy, and showed no break into religious and secular elements. It has

maintained itself as a unified system of folkways which was our strength and our fortress in our vale of tears.

Presently this structure began to crumble. Whether we like or not, whether we consider it beneficial or detrimental, we are confronted with facts which we cannot avert, nor can we shut our eyes to them with impunity. To reorganize the scattered debris of our former life-giving system of folkways would have been a task of tremendous national value, but though no organized effort has been put forth in this direction, the process is going on just the same. In fact, millions of our brethren have been affected by it and it practically changed the face of Jewish life everywhere.

It is not to be denied that, as Dr. Dushkin points out: "It must be emphasized that the demarcation between the religious and the national attitudes is no more distinct and no more real than the geographic line of the equator or the zone lines."⁶ But it is equally true that this purely conceptual demarcation within the matrix of Jewish life is now constantly being filled with the blood of perceptual reality. Only those who are hopelessly blinded by dogma, or who by their unreasoned adherence to tradition "pure and undefiled" have lost all contact with what actually occurs in Jewish life, can afford to pooh-pooh this obvious fact.

This attempt at some sort of differentiation of our folkways, stressing those which bear directly upon our historical development and survival as a cultural creative entity, and which do not depend for their existence upon purely religious sanction, is the Jewish secular point of view. It represents a characteristic species of secularity born and bred in the atmosphere of recent Jewish history. A

⁶ *Jewish Education in New York City*, 1918, p. 6.

Jewish educational institution based upon some such outlook as this on the evolutionary processes of modern Jewishness is a Jewish Secular School. It is one which does not dare close its eyes to the new ways of present-day Jews whose children are being educated. It is one which sees great national and educational possibilities in language, literature, history, holidays, etc., with all the emotional halo surrounding such experiences, though without the admixture of purely religious ritual.

If we understand secularity in this sense then the above-mentioned schools, with Yiddish as the language of instruction, may be called Jewish Secular Schools. Although some educators from the Hebraist camp attempted time and again to found Hebrew schools, or introduce some modifications into existing Talmud Torahs, along such secular lines, they were in the end decidedly unsuccessful. The Yiddish schools, on the other hand, cater to groups that insist upon the secular nature of the curriculum and the secular spirit in which all school activities are to be conducted.

At the time when the choice was between Orthodoxy and assimilation, the only thing left to such groups, organizations, and individuals as now uphold the Jewish Secular School, would be national suicide, either by active conversion or by passive stagnation. At present, fortunately, the vitality of our people has opened another way to constructive Jewish effort, to creative survival. The Jewish Secular School is one of the most important milestones of this newer way.

III.

The history of this type of Jewish schooling leads us back to Czarist Russia.⁷

7. נח מישאקאווסקי, זכרונות פון א שולמוער, יארבוך, 1928, פון שלום עליכם פאלק אינסטיטוט.

But those were mere beginnings, and for the most part shortlived. At that time, several elementary schools, in one case a kindergarten,⁸ grew up sporadically and under private initiative, but they could not hold out for any length of time, either because of their unpopularity among Jews, or because of governmental opposition, or both.

It is the World War which gave greater impetus to the movement and on a much wider scale. During the war every unit of organized Eastern European Jewry could not survive if it did not assume some responsibility for the starving children, the orphans, and those who, after the Jewish expulsion from the war zone, roamed about like stray dogs without parental or any other supervision. Hence, all parties and organized groups opened homes to give food, clothing and shelter to the innocent victims. Some of these institutions, which were under the care of the different Socialist, Poale-Zion and Folkist parties, turned later into Jewish Secular Schools.

In America, the movement started a little earlier and under more normal conditions. But since developments in New York City are characteristic of the early groping of the movement, as well as of its subsequent subdivision into several types, each with its particular emphasis upon certain points, I shall henceforth confine myself chiefly, though not exclusively, to this City.

The first Jewish Secular School on the American continent of which we have any record was opened in Brooklyn in 1908.⁹ The whole enterprise was the result of the private efforts of three Jewish

8. זיידל כאנאצקי, די ערשטע קינדער-היים אויף אידיש, יארבוך 1929, פון שלום עליכם פאלק אינסטיטוט.

9. ה. נאלדבוים, אין אמאליקע יארן, יארבוך 1929, פון שלום עליכם פאלק אינסטיטוט.

teachers who were inspired by the hope that this school would be the harbinger and forerunner of "a new epoch and a new modern Jewry."

The curriculum which had been introduced, perhaps for the first time in this country, consisted of Yiddish, Hebrew, Jewish history and singing, with Yiddish, of course, as the medium of instruction. Of Yiddish textbooks there had been only one, published in Poland, which was unacceptable to the leaders of the school. So they decided to get along with all sorts of devices and makeshifts. The program for singing was also worked out in a similar manner. One of the three teachers supplied his own poems, and another composed the music.

In the meantime rumors had been spread among the parents of the children that the school was really a Mission House, that the teachers were impostors, and that the whole aim was the seduction of the children. The enterprise lasted for a very short time only; it was driven out of existence by highly efficient means involving scolding, bullying, shattering of window panes, and finally by arresting the teachers on the charge of seducing and corrupting the morals of little children.

The real beginning of the Jewish Secular School as a movement in America dates back to 1910, for in that year the first National Radical School¹⁰ was opened in New York City. This time the initiator was not a private individual, but the party Poale-Zion. The Jewish National Workers' Alliance, an organization conducted along the ideas of the Poale-Zion, immediately became a partner to the undertaking. Soon several schools were opened in other cities, and also in

10. This was the name given to it at the beginning. Later the word *Radical* was eliminated, and the name was changed to Jewish Folk School.

Canada. By this time the Socialist-Territorialist organization, a party which became extinct during the World War, also undertook to open secular elementary schools, though the latter introduced a fundamental curricular difference by omitting the Hebrew language altogether. The schools of the Poale-Zion, however, insisted pertinaciously upon the teaching of both Yiddish as well as Hebrew.

The unity which was so much needed at the beginning of the movement found an insurmountable obstacle in this difference of opinion. The quarrel was still more aggravated by the fact that the parties in question had been political opponents for many years. Hence they were psychologically ill-prepared for the mutual concessions and the conciliatory tone demanded by their new Jewish educational objectives.

Of these objectives I shall consider only two, which I believe to be of paramount importance for the cause of Jewish education and its development.

It is a characteristic fact that these schools, although secular in content and radical in spirit, have, at the beginning, found support only among the socialists of a distinctly Zionist or frankly nationalist leaning. The other Jewish Socialist organizations—the majority of the Jewish radical circle—were strictly opposed to any form of Jewish education. Such education, of whatever kind, they contended, would necessarily imbue the Jewish child with the spirit of chauvinism, which in turn might retard the coming of the international social millennium.

This theory had been furiously attacked for a number of years, prior to the time of which I am writing, by a great scholar, ardent Jew and Socialist at the same time, Dr. Chaim Zhitlowsky. Fortunately this man, who had been inde-

fatigable in his repeated onslaughts on the Jewish Socialists' position with regard to Jewish national problems, was also instrumental in penetrating a mighty stronghold of Jewish Socialism, the Workmen's Circle. This organization, which had for some time supported only Sunday Schools for the teaching of Socialism to the children of its members, passed a resolution at its convention in 1916 to establish a Jewish school with the usual secular curriculum, but again omitting the Hebrew language. At the present time the Workmen's Circle schools, in New York City as well as all over the country, are largest in number as compared with those of any other organization maintaining Jewish Secular Schools.

In 1926 the welfare of these schools was seriously threatened by the embittered conflicts between the communist and socialist members of the organization. But the result was rather fortunate for the cause of Jewish education. The final separation of the two factions led to the establishment of a new type of Jewish schools, those supported by the International Workers' Order (communist); at the same time the Workmen's Circle Schools kept on increasing their number.

A few words about these communist schools will suffice to complete the picture. It should be understood that there are only minor distinctions between the curricula of the different Jewish Secular Schools. Those types which do not include the Hebrew language in their elementary schools do so in their high school curricula. Some may attempt to inculcate a favorable attitude toward Zionism, Socialism, or some other issue; others may prefer the non-partisan attitude. But as to Yiddish, Yiddish literature, Jewish history, Jewish folk-lore, these have always been and still are the backbone of

the Jewish Secular School. The communist schools were the first to remove most of these subjects from their course of study. The only thing left was the Yiddish language, and some Yiddish literature which might be used for the purpose of propaganda, or to evoke an antagonism to everything Jewish of which communists do not approve. In other words, barring the Yiddish language, there is nothing Jewish to be seen in such schools.

Recently, however, significant changes did take place in these schools, so that now some smatterings of Jewish history are admitted, and perhaps also a broader view on literature.

How far these changes will go, or whether these schools will not soon relapse into their old exclusively propagandist *raison d'etre* no one can tell; not even the communists themselves. For this reason only the future may decide whether or not such institutions as these should be included in an essay dealing with phenomena of a definitely Jewish educational character.

There is also an organization in New York City maintaining two or three so-called Jewish Workers' Schools, at the head of which is Mr. Jacob Levin, once a leader of the Workmen's Circle Schools. This organization, founded by a few left-wing Socialists (in opposition to the Workmen's Circle Schools, which are under the influence of the right-wing Socialists), did not meet with much success. Their curriculum is practically the same as that of the Workmen's Circle Schools, and generally, as I pointed out before, closely similar to those of the other Secular Schools.

These considerations aim to show that the first objective of the movement, to win over the Jewish radical to the idea

of the necessity of Jewish education, was more or less successfully achieved. At present the old socialist point of view, which amounted to an extreme assimilationist or fusionist philosophy, is practically extinct as an active, dynamic doctrine. Thousands of Jewish radicals now send their children to the Jewish Secular Schools, an institution which heretofore had been considered by them to be either decidedly reactionary in content or, at best, futile.

It goes without saying that no other cultural or educational power in Jewry could have accomplished this except the organizations which are closely allied to the socialist or radical ideology, and such men as Dr. Chaim Zhitlowsky, Mr. Joel Enteen—the principal of the first National Radical School and well-known Yiddish writer—and their kind. That this is a significant gain for the cause of Jewish education no one will deny.

IV.

The second objective aimed at by the Secular School movement is a more complicated affair. It is an obvious fact that the Jewish people, as we find it today, may be divided into several more or less well-defined sections, each with its own cultural interests and characteristics. How large the numbers of those who are living in the sphere of Yiddish culture and conceive Jewishness in terms of the secular aspects of our old tradition, on one can tell. But there is such a section, having its own centre and periphery, just as the other sections.

If we contemplate the fact that in New York City only about 30-35 per cent¹¹ of our people send their children to Jewish schools, we may safely assume that all our educational efforts have thus far succeeded in penetrating the centre and only

11. At a given time.—Ed.

very imperfectly the periphery of each of the different sections. Those belonging to the periphery are larger in number, less interested in cultural and Jewish-educational problems, more self-centered, and more easily influenced by the ways of the immediate non-Jewish environment. What has the section called "secular" done to intensify the educational appeal to its own periphery? This great task was unconsciously assumed by the schools of the Sholem Aleichem Folk Institute, and other schools of a similar character.

The schools of the Sholem Aleichem Folk Institute originally have sprung from the first National Radical system, which was established and conducted by the Poale-Zion and the Jewish National Workmen's Alliance. One school which they had opened in the Bronx in 1913 was under the immediate care of men the majority of whom did not agree with the mother organization on two major points. First, it was the old problem of the Hebrew language. These men contended that on purely psychological grounds it was highly inadvisable to have children of early school age learn two languages within the limited time at the disposal of the Jewish school. Furthermore, if a choice must be made, the preference should be given to Yiddish as the language of these children's Jewish environment. Besides, they argued, Yiddish was a more potent nationalizing factor on the ground of its being the vernacular of the majority of living Jews. Hebrew, according to them, should be postponed to the higher classes of the elementary school, or to the secondary school or *mitelshule*.

However difficult it was to find a compromise with regard to the teaching of Hebrew, the second point was a much greater obstacle. It was really a *cul de*

sac from which no peaceful escape was possible. For the leaders of the Bronx School maintained that educational institutions should not be governed by political parties, or organizations whose chief aim was not educational. In other words, they revolted against every form of control or supervision exercised by the mother organization.

These quarrels led, in 1916, to the final breaking away from the original founders, so that the school became independent, a fact which was still further emphasized by a later decision to assume a different name, the name of Sholem Aleichem Folk School. Subsequently, more schools of the same type were established all over New York City, all united into what is called the Sholem Aleichem Folk Institute.

In addition to elementary schools, each of the afore-mentioned organizations has its own secondary school and also a summer camp, so that there are five summer camps for children connected with the Jewish Secular Schools of New York City. Each of these camps, unlike the schools, is properly equipped with modern improvements and facilities.

There are several other institutions of great educational value connected with these organizations. The Jewish Teachers' Seminary, which has for many years supplied teachers to all types of Secular Schools, belongs to the Yiddish Folk Schools of the Poale-Zion and the Jewish National Workers' Alliance. At the beginning of this academic year a similar institution was opened by the Workmen's Circle. There are also two educational monthlies, published respectively by the Workmen's Circle and the International Workers' Order. The Publication Department of the Sholem Aleichem Folk Institute ("Matonoth") is concerned

chiefly with the publication of Yiddish books for children and the "*Kinder Journal*," a children's magazine. Finally we have the Higher Courses, opened by the Sholem Aleichemites three years ago, designed to give courses in higher Jewish education to the graduates of their high school, without any practical end in view.

Since purely curricular differences among the various Secular Schools touch only upon unessential points, the distinguishing characteristics may be found only in the spirit or background which color both subject-matter as well as all other activities. Hence among the differentia of the Sholem Aleichem Folk Schools I find two which are most important. First, the emphasis upon the value of the folkways, what is called in Yiddish *Lebns-shteyger*, a word which cannot be adequately rendered in English. Second, the preference of a general nationalistic and progressive spirit to narrower forms of propaganda in favor or against particular views with regard to current problems, Jewish or otherwise. Anyone with an understanding of educational procedure will at once appreciate the possible effect of such approach on the study of literature, history and practically every item of the curriculum.

The Sholem Aleichem Folk Institute is the only Jewish Secular School organization consisting of members of the most diverse shades of opinion with regard to political or Jewish problems. Most of them are either passively interested in or indifferent to both. Jewish education is the only social cause which succeeded in arousing them to active participation. Thus, according to the definition given above, they belong to the part of Jewry which I call Secular.

Let me not fail to mention that all schools of the Sholem Aleichem Folk In-

stitute are situated in New York City or in the immediate vicinity. There are similar schools in other parts of the country, sometimes even bearing the same name; there are however no administrative connections between them.

I deem it unnecessary to give here statistical figures of the number of schools, pupils, teachers, of each school organization in New York City. For all this, I may be permitted to refer the reader to a recent publication where figures may be found relative to most Jewish Secular Schools the world over, as well as a general statistical summary by the sociologist, Dr. H. Frank.¹² The number of these schools and the average number of pupils per school, although constantly increasing, is small enough as compared with the Jewish population, whether in New York City or in any other locality. This may be accounted for in different ways, at least one of which consists in the fact that Secular Jewishness represents a radically new and complete departure in Jewish historical consciousness. So that its growth is necessarily slow, and even this imperfect rate of progress has been constantly impaired by the incessant bickerings of the different factions.

However, if we consider those Secular Schools which are conducted or sponsored directly or indirectly by political parties, and whose inner spirit is implicitly or explicitly that of a given party, and compare them with those whose chief concern

is the secular expression of Jewish folkways, we find that the former have advanced more successfully than the latter. It may, of course, be argued that the former had a non-educational agency to give it constant financial aid, while the latter was at the mercy of its own recourse. But this is really a fact rather than a clarifying explanation.

It seems that we are nearer the truth if we try to conceive of such facts in terms of periphery and center. To all types of Jewish education the 35 per cent are more readily accessible than the 65 per cent. This only shows that, whether secular or religious, or what not, the very atmosphere surrounding Jewish education permits it to stimulate the inner strata, and only to a very limited degree the outer fringes.

All this goes to show that education is not a thing dependent only upon subject matter or improvement of technique. It depends, by far, more upon the workings of non-educational agencies which help prepare the general conditions for its proper functioning. In our case, what we are most in need of is an aroused public opinion, accompanied by powerful social pressure favoring Jewish education, regardless of personal sympathies with particular types. But this means nothing less than some form of a general organization of the Jewish people. That American Jewry is not at present prepared for this great national task I know only too well. For this reason we should the more appreciate the furthering of the cause of Jewish education which has been accomplished in many direct and indirect ways by the Jewish Secular Schools.

12. שול אקאדעמיע, ארויסגעגעבן פון די פילאדעלפיע ארבעטער רינג שול, 1935.

Those interested in the remarkable development of the Yiddish text book will find a wealth of material in the excellent bibliography by J. Anilowitz and M. Joffe, published in the first volume of *Studies in Psychology and Education of the Yiddish Scientific Institute*, Wilno, 1933.