THE PEOPLE AND EDUCATIONAL VALUES

Religion, morality and knowledge, being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged.

These memorable words from the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 rise from our past to instruct and guide a people whose values are at issue and at stake. Being the statutory embodiment of the same idea expressed by such Founding Fathers as Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and John Adams, these significant and meaningful words belong to our central tradition. We treasure them, for we Americans evidently value that which is traditional. For example, today we so often speak of the American tradition, the American way of life. And, although we seldom quote the Founding Fathers truly and in full, we mention their names to support our arguments. In quoting from our tradition, I am on safe and fruitful ground. The result, I hope, will be the discovery of values and ideals upon which both extreme conservative and extreme liberal citizens can agree, which they can hold in common, and which they can utilize for the betterment of education. This objective of finding what we have in common is also in keeping with our central tradition. For the method of democracy is that of discussion, of open-minded critical inquiry, and of reasonable compromise—all undertaken in a spirit of mutual respect and toleration.

In a short sentence the Northwest Ordinance states the necessity for education, the task of education, the right to an education, and our hope and faith in education. It states what we value. Here are concepts and ideals upon which we can agree and which we can have in common as a basis for educational progress.
Can we not agree that education is a necessity? Our forefathers believed it to be so, and a present-day writer seems to agree by saying:

Without education there would be no such thing as civilization, but merely raw naturalism. . . . Education is the one indispensable element of human civilized existence; and without teachers there would be little if any education. Schools are therefore the world's best insurance policy and society's most profitable investment. Without their contributions free government, the safety of life and property, and in short the very means necessary to the pursuit of happiness would be wanting. Without education all the great professions, such as law, medicine, engineering, journalism, and the like would be impossible; all modern art and science would be nonexistent; all cultural advances of the civilized world would disappear.¹

Especially in a democracy is education a necessity. Wise indeed were the Founding Fathers in perceiving that the success of a democracy depends upon citizens who are enlightened by means of education. Washington recognized this when, in his Farewell Address of 1796, he said:

Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it is essential that public opinion should be enlightened.

Jefferson also:

If a nation expects to be ignorant and free in a state of civilization it expects what never was and never will be. . . . There is no safe deposit [for the functions of government] but with the people themselves; nor can they be safe with them without information.²

And Madison:

A popular government without popular information or the means of acquiring it is but a prologue to a farce or a tragedy, or, perhaps, both. Knowledge will forever govern ignorance; and a people who mean to be their own governors must arm themselves with the power which knowledge gives.³

Education, then, is a necessity and the foundation of a re-
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public—a fact recognized by Mirabeau B. Lamar and perpetuated in this statement appearing on the frontispiece of every official publication of the University of Texas:

Cultivated mind is the guardian genius of Democracy, and while guided and controlled by virtue, the noblest attribute of man. It is the only dictator that freemen acknowledge, and the only security which freemen desire.

But also a part of our tradition is the idea that education is a right. We have come to believe that every child has a right to an education. This educational ideal stems from Pufendorf, was elaborated upon by Blackstone and John Locke in England, and was applied in the United States by Horace Mann and James G. Carter. It came to fruition in the Common School Movement and the establishment of a system of public schools.

Also dear in our hearts and minds as a part of our tradition are the words chiseled in the base of the Statue of Liberty:

Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me;
I lift my lamp beside the golden door.

Here are implied ideas central in our tradition: education is the right of each individual, no matter who he is or where he comes from; education is a necessity to a nation struggling to create unity out of diversity; and education in a democracy must perform tremendous and vital tasks.

These quotations from our heritage make evident the fact that we do value education. For we assign to education such a vital role in our democracy: in providing the foundation of our government, in creating unity out of diversity, in developing among diverse peoples a common language, a common heritage—all so necessary for bringing to reality the
American dream of the good society. As the noted historian Henry Steele Commager puts it, "No other people ever demanded so much of education as have the Americans."  
Not only did the Founding Fathers in their wisdom see the values of education; they also recognized, perhaps better than we, that what is valuable usually costs, in money as well as in effort. To them what is to be gained by education is well worth the cost. So John Adams wrote:

Laws for the liberal education of youth, especially of the lower classes of people, are so extremely wise and useful that, to a humane and generous mind, no expense for this purpose would be thought extravagant.  

And Thomas Jefferson phrased it even more emphatically in words pertinent today:

The tax which will be paid for this purpose [to establish and improve the law for educating the common people in a crusade against ignorance] is not more than the thousandth part of what will be paid to kings, priests and nobles who will rise up among us if we leave the people in ignorance.  

Thus spoke the Founding Fathers on the values of education, in words which we cherish, profess to believe, and accept as our own ideals. But the question arises today, a few short years past mid-century and a time of stock-taking: How, in the course of time, have these ideas fared, and how do we stand today?

American educational achievement has been significant—significant enough to warrant our utmost faith in our public school system and in our teachers. Commager, whom we quoted earlier in noting the tremendous demand we Americans have made upon education, continues by saying: "None other was ever served so well by its schools and educators. . . . For a century and a half American schools have served and strengthened the commonwealth. They provided a citi-
zenry as enlightened as any on earth. They justified and vindicated democracy's promise.""

Yet the air is thick with expressions of discontent and dissatisfaction with our public school system. Recognizing its contributions to our welfare and retaining faith in the public school system as a vital instrument for good, some of us offer constructive criticisms. Our hope is that, without destroying the good, we may ever build better than we have. Others launch attacks upon the intellectual integrity of our institutions and teachers, support textbook and library censorship, and exert political group pressures on our schools—usually in the name of the very heritage we have been talking about. The methods used are authoritarian and the exact opposite of the democratic methods of our heritage: the course of action is not derived from considered, critical judgment based upon a serious attempt to get at the facts, and action is taken without respect for the rules of fair play and justice. If this method bears its natural fruit, the result may be the destruction of our public school system and thereby our way of life. But expressions of dissatisfaction, of whatever variety, indicate that educationally things are not so well as we would like.

If this be so, wherein lies the responsibility? I suggest that it does not lie primarily with our public school system but with the citizens. For education is a function of society; in our society, the function of the people, of you and me. Attendant upon our rights and privileges are duties and responsibilities. We assume these responsibilities in a number of ways: we vote for school board members, local and state; we vote bonds and pay taxes; we vote on candidates for our legislature, state and national, who when elected pass legislation affecting education and who appoint or approve the
appointment of regents and trustees of state colleges and universities; we take part in parent-teacher meetings and town-meetings; we converse and talk about the school program or system. In these many ways we determine our educational program, we express our values, and we contribute, for well or ill, to the future.

Have we met our responsibilities as adequately and as well as we might? Have our actions expressed our best valuation of life, or even those values held dear by our forefathers which we profess to cherish?

Evidently, we have not fulfilled our duties as well as we might. This we see when we notice how few of our citizens turn out to vote on school issues. Or we may witness, as I did recently, a citizen marking his ballot by covertly glancing at a printed card containing the names of the candidates of one faction in a school board election. Such observations lead one to conclude that too many of our citizens are inclined to be told how to vote and too few take the time to become informed and enlightened. To be informed and enlightened is the primary duty of the citizen. Failure in this duty results in action which is irresponsible and unworthy of citizens of a democracy.

Other evidence directs attention to our irresponsibility and the great disparity between what we say we value and what our actions show us to value. Figures for the year 1949 show that we give poor financial support to education. In that year only about 2% of our national income was devoted to public education. Less than 1% was devoted to private education. About 1% was devoted to religion and welfare. A challenging question arises when these figures are compared with others. About 5% of our national income was devoted to alcoholic beverages; about 10%, to automobiles and travel;
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about 6%, to recreation. When we spend $5 billion for public education but $8 billion on liquor and $19 billion on automobiles, do we not show what Americans really value? In 1953 a U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare report estimated that public schools would open with a shortage of 345,000 classrooms; that three out of five classrooms would be overcrowded; and that one out of five pupils would go to school in a classroom which would not meet minimum fire safety conditions. Moreover, the net shortage of qualified elementary school teachers that year would be about 72,000, the number graduating from colleges the previous year constituting less than half of the total needed. More recent studies indicate that the situation has not improved—the most recent one indicating that high school officials are faced “with disaster if the teacher supply trend is not sharply and decisively reversed.” Thus we stand before the Fourth Gospel standard: “By their fruits ye shall know them.”

Classroom and teacher shortages, the root of many of our educational ills, cannot be blamed on the remote government in Washington, on “creeping socialism,” on “intellectuals,” on “progressives.” The blame is ours, for ours is the responsibility. Moreover, let us realize what is at stake by recalling Jefferson’s statement of the danger we face if we do not pay the tax necessary to improve education and fight ignorance. Our freedom is at stake, a freedom which is gained and preserved through the exercise of critical judgment and the assumption of personal responsibility by each of us.

Almost in spite of the ennui of citizens, our schools have progressed; and so at mid-century education in America has reached a new and, let us hope, a higher stage of development. But here we find ourselves called upon to make value judgments and to indicate by intelligent action what the
tasks and duties of our schools ought to be. These decisions expressed in proper action will constitute the test of what education in America has been and will largely determine what our future shall be.

Our present educational situation is to our nation what a moral situation is to the individual. As individuals experiencing life in its manifold phases, active in organic, economic, social, intellectual, aesthetic, and religious pursuits, we come to the point where a moral judgment must be made. In terms of the larger aims and purposes of life and by critical judgment prevailing over “the lawless drive of unreflective impulse,” we commit ourselves to the better, the right, the good course of action. This thing and that come to mind as good and desirable, or bad and undesirable, courses of action. From among these contending values according to their relative worth and rank we make our deliberate choice and thereby express our declaration of the highest and most important value in the situation. We declare what, to us, most matters in life. Our defensible preference, our judgment, and our action will express ourselves, what we have become as persons. The moral act should express our better selves. For the morally free responsible act is so by virtue of its being representative of the agent, an act with which the person is identified and for which he can answer. “Let your light so shine . . . ,” say the Scriptures. For also this act contributes to the kind of person we become in the future, to our self-realization.

The analogy with education is clear, I think, and need not be spelled out. The people must decide the course education in this country is to take, what is good, what matters most. But let us keep in mind one thing about the educational progress which we desire. Educational achievement occurs when
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the younger generation, through the educational process, is enabled to face the higher tasks that yield the greater values. This perfection is never conclusively attained. Mastery of each stage of living leads not to routine living of life at that level but to ever more complex living in which more difficult problems must be faced and solved. At the higher stages the possibilities for attaining greater satisfactions are greater, and the greater also is our chance for attaining the sublime. But likewise the more involved and far-reaching are the risks and the more abysmal the fall if we fail. Hence as we stand at the educational cross-roads, our duty as citizens is inescapable. So much is at stake now when we exercise our responsibilities for education; so awesome is the prospect if we fail to make the right decisions.

Since such momentous decisions must be made, the pertinent question is: What suggestions for our guidance seem most fruitful? I venture to suggest three.

The first suggestion is that the right kind of educational progress can be initiated only when more of our citizens are aroused to the point of assuming intelligent responsibility for education. Each of us needs to adopt the attitude of educational duty and responsibility which R. A. Tsanoff has expressed in regard to the moral life:

The morally free life . . . is in our making. Save for us, things would not be as they shall be; and may yet be different, by our will. And in our life these are not merely facts to record, but challenges to meet. On some anvil the iron is glowing hot, and the hammer ours alone. . . . Only as we feel that it is 'up to us,' do we also come to feel that we ought or ought not. There is no possible recognition of duty, unless the matter-of-fact disclaimer 'What is that to me?' is ruled out. The river before us is any river, until we come to see it as our Rubicon. Then we realize what is freely and responsibly in our power and alone morally significant: not whether the river will be crossed, but whether we should and shall be
Profound insight is revealed in a sentence by Josiah Royce: "This is my duty, nobody in the universe—no, not God, so far as God is other than myself—can do this duty for me. My duty I must myself do."  

A second suggestion arises from the present confusion and controversy. Extreme conservatives are allied against extreme liberals, and the clang of battle reaches every ear. For all the noise, there seems to be precious little understanding. One side utilizes the American heritage in support of its position. The other side does the same. Yet the two views are at opposite poles. Having the American heritage in common, both groups should be able to communicate, agree, and promote education. Yet the one thing in common, the American heritage, means one thing to one group and just the opposite to the other. Consequently, a prerequisite of educational progress is the full practice of our heritage by informing ourselves as to its nature.

The third requisite of educational advance is the kind of teacher-training programs which will best assure educated teachers. If our people do not understand our cultural heritage well enough to communicate and advance, accountability rests with those professional educators whose point of view has come to prevail in the establishment of so many of our teacher-training programs. These people have become so enamored of the process, the method, and means of educating that to them that one aspect of education is education. Consequently, their prescription for the prospective teacher is a tablespoonful of methods and technique courses, usually the same medicament, to be taken over and over again throughout the four-year college course. Often the graduate of such a program misses the real prescription the filling of which is so necessary to his development and the cure of our educational ills: a truly general or liberal education afforded by study in the humanities, the sciences, and
in those fields of education which have intellectual content, such as the history and philosophy of education.

Shifting the train of thought rather abruptly, I should now like to consider some material which may at first seem foreign to the subject at hand. But as the exposition proceeds, it should become apparent that this material further amplifies and makes clearer my second and third suggestions for educational advance. The subject to which we now turn is the place and importance of the history of education in the training of teachers.

The history of education, in the comprehensive sense of the term, "embraces the story of the rise and progress of human culture as a whole and its transmission from the older to the younger generation." Today, as in times past, the main task of education remains that of transmitting to the young the cultural heritage. Since the teacher is largely responsible for this accomplishment, he must be familiar with the social heritage. In it lie the insights, the ideas, the principles, the values which constitute the resources for his teaching. From it he has been taught. By means of it he himself should become educated. He who would educate others must himself be educated; and, I maintain, the teacher cannot be considered educated if he does not know the cultural heritage—a precious inheritance so often unknown or misunderstood by the majority of people, so often talked about but so seldom acted upon to enhance daily living. Although his entire previous schooling contributes to the prospective teacher's acquaintance with his heritage, perhaps no other humanities course gives him the over-all survey of the rise and progress of human culture better than does the course in the history of education. This course should be of immense benefit to the prospective teacher, as I shall attempt to show.
In order to show the place and importance of history of education in the education of teachers, I shall present one part of a unit in the history of education and then point out the benefits that the prospective teacher may derive from such study. This procedure will amplify and make clearer my third requisite for educational progress: better teacher-training programs. The materials chosen for this purpose perform a double duty and serve yet another purpose. They contribute to that understanding of the nature of our heritage necessary to the full practice of it—the second requisite for educational advance. When more of us perceive the living, growing, dynamic nature of our heritage, we shall be capable of a real advance in education.

Nowhere is the dynamic nature of our heritage more vividly discernible than in that part of our Judeo-Christian tradition which portrays the Hebrews’ growing comprehension of God. “The working out of this exalted knowledge of the one God . . .,” says Eby, “is the grandest achievement of human thought.” These are the materials I have selected to serve the purposes mentioned. Let us trace the Hebrew transition from Yahweh to God, first considering two widely separated stages of the development and then filling in the gaps to complete the story.

When we read the story of Naaman, the Syrian general who was cured of his leprosy by the prophet Elisha, we are puzzled by his strange request of Elisha: two mules’ burden of earth to take back to Syria. But, capitalizing on literary-historical criticism and scholarship, we come to see in this passage the expression of the Hebrew conception of their god Yahweh at this particular stage of a spiritual advance from naive and crude beginnings to spiritual maturity. Naaman’s tribe has its gods even as the Sidonians have their goddess Ashtoreth; the Ammonites, their Moloch; and the Moabites,
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their Chemosh. But his native gods cannot prevail over the leprosy with which he is inflicted. In the land of Israel, so Naaman’s wife is informed by a captured maiden from that land, dwells Yahweh, the powerful god of the Hebrews. He can perform the desired miracle. So Naaman journeys to Israel, meets Yahweh’s prophet Elisha, dips himself seven times into the muddy waters of the Jordan, and regains his health. This experience leads Naaman to the conclusion: “Behold, I know that there is no God in all the earth but in Israel.” But why does he request two mules’ burden of Hebrew soil? The answer is that, to Naaman, Yahweh is Israel’s god and only Israel’s god, the god of the Israelitish soil. To worship him one must be on his soil, even if it be transported soil! In contrast, notice the Fourth Gospel account of Jesus’ answer to the Samaritan woman at the well:

But the hour is coming, and now is, when the true worshippers will worship the Father in spirit and truth, for such the Father seeks to worship him. God is spirit, and those who worship him must worship in spirit and truth.

Why did not Elisha, “the man of God,” so inform Naaman as to the nature of God? Elisha simply did not know this. His conception of God was as provincial, nationalistic, and isolationist as that of Naaman.

Tribal monolatry with polytheistic elements describes the Hebrew religion at this stage of development. Monotheism has not yet been attained. At its best the Hebrew conviction was that there was only one god, theirs, for them, called Yahweh. Other tribes had their gods, but Yahweh was the Hebrew god, guiding the Hebrew destiny, just as Chemosh worked for the Moabites. As Jephthah, the Hebrew chief and warrior, expressed it to his Moabite opponent: What your god Chemosh wins for you is yours; what our god Yahweh has won for us is ours. That the Hebrew people believed in
The number who worshipped the cult of the Baals, gods of the Canaanitish soil responsible for its fertility, when the nomadic children of the wilderness entered Canaan as a rustic enters the city. It is also illustrated by Solomon's actions. After he finally built the temple in Jerusalem and gave the Ark of the Covenant a resting place, Solomon, we are told, built in the "high places" shrines to the gods of his many wives and worshipped Ashtoreth, Moloch, and Chemosh. Although there were other gods, Yahweh, to the Hebrew mind at this stage, was a superior and powerful god who worked miracles over nature, who brought forth fertility and earthly prosperity, who insured victory over tribal enemies. He was especially the god of battles. Yahweh could be worshipped only at certain shrines; or, as we have seen in the story of Naaman, only on Hebrew soil; or, later, only at the temple in Jerusalem. While the place of worship furnishes a clue to the adequacy of one's conception of deity, a more significant test is the way in which one is to worship. At this stage the Hebrew concept was that Yahweh was to be worshipped by burnt offerings and sacrifices, through set ritual, and through ceremony.

Today, because of the rich insights that are available to us, we can look back upon this stage in the religious development of the Hebrew people and describe it as a naive and crude conception of deity. But it was preceded by a conception even more naive and crude. Although many examples are available in the Scriptures to illustrate the earlier stage, one illustration will suffice for our purpose. To Abraham, sitting at the door of his tent by the oaks of Mamre, appeared three men, one of whom was later revealed as Yahweh. To Abraham, Yahweh was as any human being on a journey:
his feet must be washed; he must rest; he must be refreshed by a meal prepared by Sarah. Moreover, Yahweh was going to Sodom to verify for himself the reports he had received of great sin in Sodom and Gomorrah. But after the meal, Abraham perceived that Yahweh and his companions were looking toward Sodom as if pondering the way. So “Abraham went with them to set them on their way,” we are told. But we are further enlightened about Yahweh’s nature. We find that he is open to argument: Abraham argued with him and persuaded him not to destroy Sodom if ten righteous individuals could be found there. Other stories indicate that Yahweh was conceived to have other human characteristics: he was likely to change his mind, he was jealous, his notions of justice reflected the barbarity of his worshippers. Such stories, including that of Jacob wrestling with Yahweh as with a man, reveal man’s anthropomorphic expression of his idea of God, man’s moulding of the idea of God in his own human image. This is the early stage in the Hebrew religious development.

Elisha, the product of the earlier developments and of his own time, could not better inform Naaman as to the nature of God because the significant and creative insights of the eighth century prophets and of Jesus were yet to be made and become available to mankind. Amos, Hosea, Micah, Isaiah, and Jeremiah led the advance from the tribal-national idea of Yahweh to real ethical monotheism, “the worship of a universal god in personal relation to seekers after righteousness wherever found.”

From them went forth to the Hebrew people the call to righteousness. Burnt sacrifices, formal and legalistic rituals, ceremony—these are no way to worship Yahweh; these will avail you nothing. Proclaimed Amos:
I hate, I despise your feasts, and I take no delight in your solemn assemblies. Even though you offer me your burnt offerings and cereal offerings, I will not accept them, and the peace offerings of your fatted beasts I will not look upon. . . . But let justice roll down like waters, and righteousness like an everflowing stream.17

Yahweh is an ethical being, a God of righteousness who is not to be worshipped in these ways but in ways of righteousness. So Amos advises:

Seek good, and not evil, that you may live; and so the LORD, the God of hosts will be with you. . . . Hate evil, and love good, and establish justice in the gate; it may be that the LORD, the God of hosts, will be gracious to the remnant of Joseph.18

And Micah asks: “and what does the LORD require of you but to do justice, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with your God?”19 As a god of righteousness and justice, Yahweh would not refrain from punishing a people who did not repent of their sinful ways and live the righteous life. The punishment would be destruction. And so Samaria was destroyed by the Assyrians in 722 B.C., and the ten northern tribes were carried into exile and so effectively dispersed among the Assyrians that they became “the Ten Lost Tribes of Israel.”

Impressed by the force of the prophetic teaching and shocked by Samaria’s fall, the priests of the Temple of Jerusalem in the southern kingdom of Judah carried out the Deuteronomic reform and suppressed many of the abominations done in the name of religion. This stage may be called that of Monoyahwism: the religion of the one Yahweh of the Temple. Yahweh was to be worshipped only at the one place. The belief was that so long as Yahweh was worshipped in his only temple, though the people lived unrighteous lives, they would be saved from the impending Babylonian attack.
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The prophet Jeremiah proclaimed this an immoral conception of God and warned: "Do not trust in these deceptive words: 'This is the temple of the LORD, the temple of the LORD, the temple of the LORD.'" What effrontery of man to think that God needed unrighteous worshippers; he does not need Jerusalem! Thus Jeremiah grasped ethical monotheism. The Lord God was not only a god of righteousness, but he was a universal deity. "Yahweh is not merely Israel's god, nor even a god above all gods. He is God, and the others are no gods at all." God's relations to men are personal, moral, and universal whether men be in Jerusalem or in Babylon.

Seditious and treasonable though this lone voice may have appeared to the priests of the temple, Jerusalem fell to the Babylonians in 586 B.C., and the Hebrews began their exile in Babylon—an exile that forced upon them a critical religious problem. For evidently the creative insight of Jeremiah was not permitted to reach the people. Thus the nameless poet of Psalm 137 tells us that the Hebrew people sat down by the rivers of Babylon, hanged their harps upon the willows, and pondered the question: "How shall we sing the Lord's song in a foreign land?" The priests who carried out the Deuteronomic reform had enforced the idea that worship of the national deity Yahweh was possible only at the Temple in Jerusalem. How, then, could the Jewish exiles worship him in faraway Babylon?

The travail of the exile drove home to the Jewish people the monotheistic idea. Messages of new hope came to them from new prophets such as Deutero-Isaiah:

Comfort, comfort my people, says your God. . . . Have you not known? Have you not heard? The Lord is the everlasting God, . . . He does not faint or grow weary, his understanding is unsearchable.
The new message was that God had used Assyria and Babylon to punish his unrighteous and disobedient people; but He is a God of mercy and will forgive his worshippers who truly repent. So the Hebrew people were told: "prepare the way of the LORD, make straight in the desert a highway for our God," and "My house shall be called a house of prayer for all people."

The course of history reveals a number of instances in which some summit of experience is attained by the few. These ideas, ideals—creations of the human spirit and often demands on reality—remain on the mountain-top unperceived by the masses of mankind who plod along the lower paths of apathy and indifference—yielding to the drag of inertia, to the impulse or appetite of the moment, to the unquestioned dictates of custom or of some authority. As in other aspects of life, so in the religious development of the Hebrew people. We have mentioned some of their summit experiences. Despite these higher aspirations, the mass of the people were not freed from the constricting bonds of priestly legalistic ritualism. This ritualism, stressing strict adherence to the letter of the law rather than to the spirit, increased in the post-exilic period. Moreover, the dictators of the mass conscience were influential in preventing the mass of the people from outgrowing the nationalistic conception of Yahweh. Universalism, much as internationalism today by some people, was given a peculiar interpretation. The priests interpreted Universalism to mean that all nations were to bow down to Israel's god. For this reason many Jews expected the Messiah to establish a kingdom which would be the regeneration, renovation, or renewal of Jerusalem. Jerusalem would be the capital of the world. Israel's king would be served by all peoples, nations, and languages; and Israel's
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people would come into their dominion and glory.

Jesus of Nazareth, whose views we have anticipated and who ushered in the next stage of religious development, brought a different message. God's blessings are not material blessings,

nor is his kingdom a material kingdom. God is a spirit; his worship is a worship in spirit and in truth; his blessings are spiritual; the Kingdom of God is within us.²⁵

By means of this teaching and through giving us the ideal of the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man, "Jesus removed the last vestige of provincialism and nationalism and materialism in religion."²⁶ Moreover, he taught "the unique and infinite worth of man's soul, any man's soul." And, above all else, he indicated for us that God is love and that love is the divine dynamic in the world.

Thus have we traced the development of one of the most significant creations of the human spirit in an advance from crude beginnings to spiritual maturity. This creation is a part of the story of the rise of culture which is the business of the history of education to portray. This is representative of the kind of subject-matter treated in the history of education course and to which the prospective teacher should be exposed. A relevant part of our Western tradition, inheritance, and culture, which should influence our present and our future, it has significant meaning for our citizens, our teachers, and our children.

Pertinent to this exposition is the influence the experience of tracing this development will have upon the teacher. The prospective teacher who, in his history of education course, grasps and truly understands this part of our Western tradition should be immensely benefited.

He should perceive that, while education's task is that of
transmitting the social heritage, our Western heritage is liberal rather than conservative. Vital, living, growing, dynamic—these are the words which characterize our heritage and mark the liberal perspective. Static, fixed, rigid, constricting—these words characterizing the extreme conservative outlook denote those things which man has overcome as, in his creative moments, he has attained those summit experiences which mark his higher realization and point the way toward still higher human potentialities. Such attainment, self-realization, and potentialities are denied the individual (and thereby the society) who is restricted by the extreme conservative outlook. Only the teacher who has the kind of perspective which fosters his own higher development can communicate to the pupil a dynamic perspective so vital to his development. The greatest blight to a democratic society would be teachers who have a closed perspective; democracy's greatest blessing, its teachers who have, in keeping with its heritage, dynamic perspective.

These characteristics of our cultural heritage are also characteristics of all real knowledge and truth. The prospective teacher benefits from the study we have outlined here to the extent that he perceives and appreciates the living, growing, self-reconstitutive character of knowledge and truth. One aspect of our heritage, the foundation of the democratic society, is expressed in the Scripture statement: “You shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.” But today many of us must have overlooked this principle, or our purposes are better served if we forget it, or, perhaps, we have a perverted conception of the nature of truth. But surely we demand of the teacher that he be able to distinguish between truth and error, between apparent knowledge and real knowledge. The prospective teacher who has under-
stood fully the religious development of the Hebrew people
should gain thereby an appreciation of the nature of truth
which has been so concisely stated in these words:

No real truth is rigidly final; rather does it express the
summed-up meaning of experience, of experience ever-ex-
panding, which just by this expression comes to a fuller
realization of itself and in thus maturing points to an expres-
sion still more adequate and so to a higher and deeper
truth.27

Another learning-product that the prospective teacher
should acquire from this study is an appreciation of scholar-
ship. Many of our students, I dare say many adults as well,
are ignorant of the development which has just been sum-
marized. For although we open our Bibles at Genesis and
read it through in order, the main story it tells—of a develop-
ing religion of a growing people—may yet escape us. Notice,
for example, the third, fourth and fifth books of the Old
Testament: Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy. As we
have them, these books are neither of Mosaic authorship
nor in chronological order. The Books of Leviticus and
Numbers are post-exilic and contain the priestly legislation
promulgated after the exile when attention was given to
strict adherence to the letter of the law. In its present form
Deuteronomy is the work of the priests who, after the fall
of Samaria in 722 B. C., carried through the so-called Deu-
teronomic reform and designated the Temple in Jerusalem
as the single sanctuary where Yahweh could be worshipped.
The Bible itself has a history which has been largely dis-
closed to us by modern scholarship, which made tremendous
advances in the 19th century. The prospective teacher who
understands this should have a healthy respect for scholar-
ship. The person who does not like to study, who does not go
beyond the text-book to read and study the books from which
text-books are written, should not enter the teaching profession. The teacher-training program should stimulate this desire and respect and should provide the experiences which cultivate these attitudes.

Prerequisite to teaching success is the ability to "get along with" others—students, parents, teachers, principals, and administrative personnel. This ability stems from an attitude which the teacher should glean from this study—an attitude of respect for the innate worth and dignity of human personality, which is expressed in consideration of others and in abiding by the rules of fair play. Plato expressed this, but Immanuel Kant put it in unforgettable form:

> Man and, in general, every rational being exists as an end in himself and not merely as a means to be arbitrarily used by this or that will. In all his actions, whether they are directed to himself or to other rational beings, he must always be regarded at the same time as an end.28

So the practical imperative for the moral life, says Kant, is to "act so that you treat humanity, whether in your own person or in that of another, always as an end and never as a means only."29 As we have seen, this lies at the heart of the teaching of Jesus. Whether the student of the history of education acquires it from Plato, Kant, or Jesus, he should grasp the vision of the "unique and infinite worth of man's soul."

These learnings which the teacher should acquire as the outcome of his study of the religious development of the Hebrew people imply certain qualities of character which the teacher must acquire and the educational program stimulate. What do these imply: a cultural heritage—living, dynamic, growing; knowledge and truth—advancing, ever-expanding, self-reconstitutive; scholarship—uncovering what was hidden, solving old problems, creating new ones?

For ourselves as well as for our teachers, humility is de-
manded. He who is surest of his wisdom, we may be sure, has it not. As Plato has Socrates say: “This one of you, O human beings, is wisest, who, like Socrates, recognizes that he is in truth of no account in respect to wisdom.” This bite from the gadfly of Athens should warn us against being too sure of ourselves, too confident that we and only we have the right and only true answer. Such an attitude should prevent our becoming dogmatic and authoritarian. Being humble, we would refrain from using our position or forces we may command to force our version of the truth on others. This is a call to the higher dutiful life which demands open-mindedness, a willingness to examine objectively our views, biases, and prejudices and to give the other side a hearing—all to the end that truth may prevail over error. This, as well as the very nature of our social heritage which contains error and evil along with truth and good, demands proficiency in the art and science of critical reasoning. We need ability and skill in understanding what we read and hear, in determining what some writer or speaker is attempting to prove, in detecting the reasons advanced in support of the conclusion, and in evaluating arguments to see if the reasons advanced do in fact justify the conclusion. In this manner we attain the reliable knowledge necessary to right action. Once we have thought something through, then we need the courage of our convictions, which lets the best we know be expressed in action. Flexibility also is required, and we must be willing to modify our views and actions as changing conditions and new facts warrant such changes. Furthermore, changing events necessitate new decisions which must be made upon the basis of a reliable and justifiable scale of values. In the formulation and continual re-formulation of our scale of values, we are ever challenged to determine what truly mat-
ters in life, what things come first, what second, what third. In this pursuit and progressive attainment comes the savor of life, its meaning and its significance. Whether that savor be sweet or bitter depends upon us.

Such are a few of the attitudes, abilities, and qualities required of the teacher—and the citizen—today. They are not to be sought primarily in educational methods courses, but in logic, ethics, philosophy, literature—in the humanities and in the sciences. They should be the outcome of the entire educational process. They come to fruition in good character which is expressed and realized in enhanced living. Are not these what we really value? Are they not the earmarks of a truly liberal education? Is not their development what we ask education to accomplish?

Whatever our answer, today we are challenged to determine intelligently what we value and to assume our duties as citizens responsible for education. "On some anvil the iron is glowing hot, and the hammer ours alone."
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