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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The term "progressive education" has been one of reverence to many and it has been one of anathema to many professional and lay persons for many years. The term has, with some success eluded precise definition. Progressive education has meant different concepts to different people.

There is little doubt, I believe, that it has had a profound influence upon education. In the preface to his book Progressive Education at the Crossroads, Dr. Boyd H. Bode wrote: "It can hardly be denied that the progressive movement has contributed much of great and lasting value to American education."¹

Nevertheless, progressive education, the idea, sponsored and advocated by a national association which was founded in 1919 has been a force in American education for more than thirty-five years. In my thinking the idea is not dead--indeed it will never die.

The same cannot be said for the organization which sponsored it. The Progressive Education Association was dissolved in 1955, thirty-six years after its founding. From a charter membership of eighty-five persons the Association enjoyed an orderly growth until its members numbered nearly 11,000; its members were representative of every state in the Union, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, and some foreign countries; its conferences were attracting in excess of 17,000 persons annually at the organization's zenith. Throughout all but the first five years of its history the
Progressive Education Association published a quarterly or monthly magazine. The Association sponsored summer institutes, regional conferences and study conferences in addition to its annual conferences. The Association attracted the allegiance of such persons as Dr. Charles W. Eliot of Harvard, Dr. John Dewey, Dr. William H. Kilpatrick, Dr. Harold Rugg, Dr. H. Gordon Hullfish and scores of other respected members of the teaching profession.

The Association weathered a serious depression and World War II, but in spite of its vigor and influence the Association collapsed in 1955.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to investigate the circumstances surrounding the disintegration of the Progressive Education Association. I propose first to present an historical background of the Progressive Education Association from its founding in 1919 until its demise in 1955 as reflected by its published journals for the years 1924 through 1954 and such other studies of the Association as have been made and are available. I also propose to deal at some length with the purposes or philosophies of the Association at different stages of its history.

**Limitations of the Study**

This study will not be concerned with organizational structure of the P.E.A., nor with its financing, relative influence at different periods, nor with any outside forces which may have affected the decline of the Association.

**Definitions**

P.E.A.: In this study the initials will be the abbreviated form of the Progressive Education Association.
N.E.F.: New Education Fellowship; this has been defined as the European counterpart of the Progressive Education Association and is to be so defined in this study.

A.E.F.: American Education Fellowship, a temporary designation of the P.E.A. from the year 1944 to 1953.

In his Progressive Education at the Crossroads published in 1938 Dr. Boyd H. Bode criticized some of the principles of progressive education and suggested ways which he said would place the future of American education in its hands. He suggested that progressive education's absorption with child centeredness had become a new absolutism which he decried and said that progressive education had turned to the child for guidance instead of to the ideal of democracy. Bode wrote: "Unless progressive education is content to be simply a method which is available to any teacher and for any purpose, it had better play out its string and become the exponent of that specific way of life for which the name "democracy" is as good as any."²

Dr. Bode criticized progressive education's adherence to individualism, its rejection of subject matter per se and its lack of an adequate philosophy of education which, he averred, had not given young people a gospel to live by.

Bode suggested that:

Progressive education stands at the parting of the ways. The issue of democracy is become more insistent in all the relations of life. It implies a sound and educational philosophy which needs to be formulated and applied. If progressive education can succeed in translating its spirit in terms of democratic philosophy and procedure, the future of education in this country will be in its hands. On the other hand, if it persists in a one-sided absorption in the individual pupil, it will be circumnavigated and left behind.³
Dr. Bode would have progressive education become the avowed exponent of a democratic philosophy of life because as he says "[that] is the last remaining hope that the common man will eventually come into his own." 4

Another view of progressive education from the vantage point of an insider was written by Stanwood Cobb for Progressive Education in 1929. Mr. Cobb was a charter member of the Association and was its president in 1929 and 1930. The article by Mr. Cobb carries the title The Romance of Beginnings and is helpful, not as a critical study of progressive education, but as a source of information on the founding of the Association and upon some of the notable events during the first decade of the P.E.A.

Mr. Cobb tells of the first meetings of the organization, of the selection of a name for the Association, the formulation of its original principles, the early growth of the Association and how its first magazine became a reality. He describes meeting with Dr. Eliot when the latter was offered the presidency of P.E.A. and he pays tribute to the early presidents of the Association, its magazine editors and executive secretaries.

The Romance of Beginnings will not help the student of educational movements to appraise progressive education because it is a biased and sentimental view of the Association; it will, however, provide the researcher with helpful historical data concerning the first ten years of the Progressive Education Association.

In her Ph. D. thesis, Berdine Jackman Bovard purports to recite the history of the Progressive Education from 1919 to 1939. In reality Dr. Bovard presents the history of the Association for the first ten years of
that span of two decades. The second ten-year period of the twenty-year span is limited to an exploration of the scope, mechanics and findings of its various commissions and committees which were carrying on research activities during that period. Dr. Bovard includes a chapter on membership and financing which extends through the year 1939, but historically the thesis does not live up to its title.

The Bovard study places the roots of progressive education in the remote past—in the eras of Plato, Comenius, Montaigne, Rousseau, Pestolozzi, Herbart, Froebel and others. Then she credits Colonel Francis W. Parker, Dr. John Dewey, Marietta Johnson, Hans Froelicher and others with being the modern progenitors of the idea of progressive education.

Dr. Bovard tells of the early founding of the Progressive Education Association and of its early years. She deals at length with the research and activities of the commissions and committees of the Association and with its workshops and conferences.

The thesis concludes erroneously that "the philosophy of the organization veered during this time [1924-1929] from an emphasis on the child and on methodology to an intensive concern with economic and social problems."5

Earlier in her thesis Dr. Bovard provides the contradiction to the above quoted statement. She wrote: "These [original] seven fundamental tenets were not seriously challenged as being representative of progressive philosophy until 1929. The anniversary number of Progressive Education of that year issued a brief statement that the tenets were to be reviewed and reformulated. Since that time recurring efforts have been made to formulate a statement of philosophy which would be acceptable to an extended membership with heterogeneous educational ideals. Several committees have been appointed
to accomplish this purpose, the most recent having published a tentative report in 1938. This report by the committee on educational philosophy of the Progressive Education Association has never been adopted by the Association itself."

The original seven tenets of the P.E.A. was the child-centered commitment of the Association. Just how the Association's philosophy veered from this commitment after 1924, and yet was not seriously challenged until 1929 and then was not presented a new philosophy until 1938 which was turned down is reminiscent of Winston Churchill's description of Russia as being "a mystery wrapped in an enigma." Actually, the philosophy of the Progressive Education Association did not change until the 1940's.

The Bovard thesis is based largely upon an unpublished manuscript written for Dr. Bovard by Stanwood Cobb, minutes of P.E.A. directors, various boards and committees, P.E.A. commission reports, P.E.A. publications and articles in Progressive Education.

Robert Holmes Beck wrote a dissertation titled American Progressive Education 1875-1930. Mr. Beck's choice of the year 1875 as the beginning of his study coincides with the year in which Colonel Francis W. Parker became superintendent of the Quincy, Massachusetts, schools and introduced innovations there which were similar to those practiced by teachers later who considered themselves to be progressives in education.

Mr. Beck agrees with John Dewey who credited Colonel Parker with being the father of progressive education in the United States, although he quotes Stanwood Cobb, one of the founders of the Progressive Education Association as writing: "I should like to emphasize particularly that the Progressive Movement in various Experimental Schools throughout the country was spontaneous
and flowed from widely different sources, totally unconnected, each from each. It cannot be ascribed to any one educator."7

The Beck study portrays the progressive movement in the United States as being completely indigenous and without any one platform--without any one leader.

Much space in Beck's study is devoted to the methods used in the Cook County Normal School when Colonel Parker headed that school, and to Felix Adler's Ethical Culture School [first called the Workingman's School] which was opened in 1878 for children of the poor and whose ideal was "to develop people who would be competent to change their environment to greater conformity with moral ideals; to put it boldly, to train reformers."8 Mr. Beck explores the John Dewey Laboratory School of the University of Chicago and tells how the interests of the children in the school were used as launching pads for the construction of a curriculum. Mr. Beck describes the programs of other experimental schools and recites the circumstances surrounding the founding of the Progressive Education Association. According to Beck's study, Stanwood Cobb was asked by Mrs. Marietta Johnson [founder of the organic school at Fairhope, Alabama] to found an organization to popularize her theory of education but that Mr. Cobb came to believe that an organization founded to support the work of any one person was doomed to fail. Then, others who were interested in newer methods of education were gathered together for mutual exchange of ideas and out of this group the Progressive Education Association was formed. Mr. Beck concludes his study by stating: "There is nothing "dated" about progressive education. It will continue to prosper as a movement providing that its goals are communally supported, scientifically substantiated and philosophically understood."9
The person who appears to have been the most responsible for the founding of the Progressive Education Association, Stanwood Cobb, has written a brief story of the founding and early years of the Association. Appropriately the Cobb story is entitled *The Founding and Early Years of the Progressive Education Association*. Mr. Cobb tells how the group of founders was brought together in common purpose, how they relied upon lay support and states that it was lay support which sustained the P.E.A. during its first four or five years. Mr. Cobb wrote:

We who organized the Progressive Education Association were, for the most part, a handful of nobodies, educationally speaking. We had no great appreciation or respect from the standard educational field, including the schools of education and the universities; nor did we care greatly about this--our support came chiefly from the lay public and a few outstanding liberals in education. Later the educational officialdom was glad to claim kinship with the movement which was beginning to demonstrate its value for education and for society.10

The Cobb manuscript also mentions what he believed to have been milestones in the Association's early years--its first annual conference and the beginning of the publication of the Association's magazine, *Progressive Education*. The Cobb manuscript is very similar to, though more brief than his article entitled *The Romance of Beginnings* which appeared in *Progressive Education* in 1924.
FOOTNOTES


2 Ibid., p. 12.

3 Ibid., pp. 43-44.

4 Ibid., p. 122.


6 Ibid., p. 43.


8 Ibid., p. 36.

9 Ibid., p. 217.

10 Stanwood Cobb, "The Founding and Early Years of the Progressive Education Association" (unpublished manuscript, Teachers College, Columbia University, undated), pp. 3-4.
CHAPTER II

A CURSORY HISTORY OF THE PROGRESSIVE EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

Ideas about educational reform began to coalesce in a group of educators and lay people in Washington, D.C., during the winter of 1918-19. This group met frequently in the home of Mrs. Laura C. Williams for the purpose of providing focus for the scattered and unharnessed attempts in behalf of educational reform then in existence in different parts of this country.

The group set about the task of developing a set of principles and choosing a name which could serve as a hub for similar movements in education. Eugene R. Smith, then head of the Park School in Baltimore, Maryland, is credited by Stanwood Cobb as having made the most significant contribution toward development of the principles of the new organization which eventually adopted the term "progressive" as most descriptive of its policies and objectives.

The statement of principles adopted by the group were seven in all. Briefly, the principles advocated self-discipline, full opportunity for self-expression, interest-centered learning, scientific study of child development, greater attention to children's physical development, cooperation between school and home, and encouragement of worthy, new ideas in education.

At its organizational meeting in Washington Public Library on March 15, 1919, eighty-five members contributed eighty-five dollars for
membership, and Mrs. Williams added several hundred dollars more and the Progressive Education Association was launched. In its early years secretarial work was contributed gratis and memberships were secured on a chain-letter type basis. Members would suggest names of other prospective members and so on, and the membership list grew and kept the Association alive and growing.

Important to the early growth and influence of the Progressive Education Association was the beginning of the publication of the Association's magazine in 1924.

Mrs. Avery Coonley who had organized private schools of her own in the suburbs of Chicago moved to Washington, D.C., and her assistance was recruited in behalf of the Progressive Education Association. After aiding the Association for a whole year, Mrs. Coonley offered to subsidize a magazine for the P.E.A. The magazine was appropriately named Progressive Education and in its early years it was published quarterly. The magazine carried articles by educators which dealt largely with new educational procedures. Progressive Education served as a collector, clearing house, and dispenser of progressive ideas in education. Shortly after the launching of the publication, the Progressive Education Association moved from its modest quarters to an imposing suite of rooms at 10 Jackson Place which overlooked Lafayette Park in Washington, and this again through the generosity of Mrs. Coonley.

The revered president of Harvard University, Dr. Charles W. Eliot, was sought as the first president of the Association, but he declined to accept the office because of his stated inability to travel in connection with his expected duties, but he did consent to serve as honorary president of the organization. Dr. Eliot's association lent dignity and substance to
progressivism at a crucial time in the Association's history.

The death of Dr. Eliot in 1926 left a vacancy which was filled, fortunately for the Association, by Dr. John Dewey, the noted educator, philosopher, and author.

One of the major activities of the Progressive Education Association was the holding of its annual conferences. Educators and interested lay people gathered at these conferences to hear major addresses by leaders in the progressive movement, and there were exchanged ideas and the results of educational experimentation. Often, schools in the vicinity of the conference site were opened for visits by the conferees and exhibits of work done in progressive schools were displayed. Officers of the Association were elected by members in attendance at the annual conferences until 1938.

By June 1, 1927, the Association boasted a membership of 5,172 and it was operating on an annual budget of $40,000.²

During 1929 the Association announced to its members a drive to increase its membership to 10,000 by the beginning of 1930. The entire country was zoned into districts, quotas were established and membership chairmen were appointed. The Association also announced in 1929 that the quarterly issues of the Association's magazine would be replaced by eight issues published monthly between October and May.

Early in 1930 the Association announced that members could secure joint memberships in their own organization and the New Education Fellowship, the latter being described as a great European movement working for progressive education abroad.

During 1930 the membership in the Progressive Education Association increased to 7,400 and the annual operating budget advanced to $43,500.³ The executive secretary stated that there was no indebtedness except that
which had been incurred during the Association's spring conference. Advertisers were using up to twenty-four pages in the magazine and the year appears to have been a good one for the P.E.A. The members were advised that increasing numbers of teachers and parents were calling upon the Association for advice in seeking to solve home and school problems; parents were seeking information relative to the establishment of progressive schools, and the Association was even operating an informal bureau for bringing together progressive teachers and superintendents who were seeking such teachers.

The executive secretary urged the executive committee of the Association to establish permanent contact centers in various cities . . . "to work for increased membership; to enlist members to take all opportunities for speaking and writing for publicity purposes in behalf of progressive education; to build up summer school contacts by persuading authorities to offer courses in progressive education; to engage in printing monographs on progressive education principles and practices; [to establish] a series of objectives which should engage our attention for the next five or ten years; and to employ at the earliest moment a field secretary."4

The secretary closed his report with the hope that several interested foundations might aid the P.E.A. and that an organization of high character might be used to conduct a financial campaign to aid the work of progressive education.

The Progressive Education Association was incorporated on March 26, 1931, because the officers of the Association felt that legal protection would cover bequests, business transactions, and individual financial responsibility.5

A complete breakdown of membership in 1931 indicated a total of 6,302 persons belong to P.E.A., a drop of approximately one thousand from
the previous year. Members still represented every state and the District of Columbia. The membership drop may have been caused by the settling in of the Great Depression which was in its second year.

Beginning in the year 1931 the P.E.A. Commission on the Relation of School and College and the Commission on the Secondary School Curriculum, which was established in 1933, received sizeable grants from the Carnegie Foundation and the General Education Board. "In all, almost three-quarters of a million dollars have been provided by educational foundations for the execution of this study."6

Much of the research of the P.E.A. was directed toward secondary education after 1930. This was due in part to the desire of some persons to provide continuous progressive education practices through the secondary schools. It was also due to the limitation of research studies to the level of secondary education by the educational foundations which were willing to subsidize research by the P.E.A. Commissions.

The objective of the Commissions on Relation of School and College and Secondary School Curriculum was, as Dr. Bovard stated it: "A complete revamping of the secondary curriculum, organization and procedure."7

The two commissions secured the cooperation of a sufficiently large number of colleges and universities to make possible its study, and thirty schools of "the highest character and excellence" were selected. The thirty schools were to be agreeable to undertaking significant and thoroughgoing experiments in a generally progressive direction. In the study, colleges and universities which were cooperating were to accept graduates of the thirty schools without regard to high school subjects studied or high school credits accumulated but rather upon the attestation of the high school principal that the student was sufficiently intelligent to profit by
college work, was serious of purpose and had demonstrated ability in at least one area in which the college offered instruction. The first group of students whose performance in college was to be a part of the study entered college in 1936. The results of the study which were not inimical to the cooperating thirty "progressive" schools are contained in *Adventure in Education; Volume I, The Story of the Eight-year Study.*

The Progressive Education Association and the New Education Fellowship became allied in 1932. Members of the P.E.A. would automatically become members of the N.E.F. for the same membership fee. The Progressive Education Association would retain its name, but its publication would indicate that the P.E.A. was also the American Section of the New Education Fellowship. The P.E.A. assumed responsibility for a share of the cost of maintaining an international N.E.F. Headquarters and would have a representative to act as a liaison between the two organizations.

The magazines of the P.E.A. were being printed on poorer grade paper, illustrations were fewer, and the publications averaged about twenty pages fewer than previously. Commenting upon complaints from members, the Association's journal carried the note: "The necessity for strict economy required these changes . . . as soon as our resources permit, we expect to improve the appearance of the magazine." Commenting further the journal stated: " . . . the Association faces a serious financial crisis . . . to carry on, we must have two thousand new members by January 1." As the depression years 1933 and 1934 unfolded *Progressive Education* publications became even smaller. Some issues had fewer than fifty pages. President Willard W. Beatty relayed to the membership the findings that, because of the depression, two thousand schools in the United States were
closed, thousands of other schools had shortened their terms, 200,000 teachers were without jobs, and that one out of every five employed teachers was receiving less than $750 per year. Little wonder that P.E.A. was cutting costs to the point where news of the headquarters was being curtailed.

P.E.A. moved its national headquarters to New York City in 1935. The headquarters was a four-story building on West 90th Street and the Association, its commissions and editorial staff were occupying the entire building.

In addition to the two P.E.A. Commissions already referred to, other commissions and committees were studying other facets of education. One commission which was established in 1935 was seeking the advancement of educational freedom. Dr. Laura Zirbes of the Ohio State University and a committee were working on the problem of educating teachers for progressive schools; and five other committees or commissions were studying other topics for the improvement of education.

By 1936, the P.E.A. was holding nine regional conferences in addition to its annual conference. In April of 1936 the Association announced that about 4,500 persons, lay and professional, had attended the annual conference which had been held in February, the largest number in the Association's history. Nine regional conferences were announced for the spring of 1936, and "in view of the growing activities of the Association and their extension into every state of the Union" the P.E.A. began electing three regional vice-presidents.

P.E.A. President Willard W. Beatty wrote in the February, 1937, issue of Progressive Education that the Association had weathered the depression, that the Association was out of debt, and that the membership of the Association had doubled. From what figure it had doubled, he did not say but
membership figures indicate that at the end of January, 1937, 8,548 persons belonged to the P.E.A.\textsuperscript{13}

The Association indicated by a series of resolutions passed by its annual conference in St. Louis in February, 1937, the extent of its interests. P.E.A. was aggressive and looking well beyond its avowed field of interest in new educational practices.

One resolution sought to determine why a St. Louis Board of Education regulation which prohibited the employment of teachers who belonged to organizations affiliated with organized labor had not been repealed. Another resolution endorsed legislation to take the profit out of war. A third resolution approved transmission of the Association's endorsement of the child labor amendment to all legislatures considering the amendment during the year 1937.\textsuperscript{14}

It appears that the variety of issues which interested the Association at this time was indicative of its vitality and self-esteem.

The year 1938 was a big one for P.E.A. Eighteen study conferences were organized, twenty-three regional conferences were held, four summer workshops were conducted for the purpose of familiarizing teachers with progressive education practices, and twenty discussion meetings were held for members and friends in the Pacific Coast states. The P.E.A. sent six delegates to the New Education Fellowship convention which met in Hawaii.

Beginning in 1938, the Association, in order to make the election of its officers more democratic, mailed ballots to its members. Previously, officers had been elected at the annual conferences and thus only a small part of the membership had been participating in the process of electing the officers of the Association.
The Resolutions Committee presented to the members assembled in annual conference in February, 1938, a resolution which hailed the original principles of the P.E.A. as a "children's bill of rights" which had served to guide the Association successfully for two decades. But the resolution took cognizance of the social and economic scene of 1938 and reminded members that millions were jobless, millions were on relief and millions of youth had no opportunity to make any contribution to the culture. Further, the resolution voiced fear that democracy, in view of the totalitarian conditions in some countries, was approaching a supreme test in the United States of America. Deploiring huge armament programs, inadequate financial support for schools, child labor, and the dependence of aged persons upon others for support, the resolution urged laws for the organization of agriculture and industry which would guarantee a continuous flow of goods and services sufficient to meet human needs at a comfort level. The resolution asked that its statement be used as a basis for study and discussion and suggested that by the time of the 1939 annual conference, there might be adopted "A new design of educational practices so that we achieve the democratic values to which we give our allegiance." Thus, after twenty years of its espousal of principles which underlay progressive education, the Association was urged by one of its committees to consider a new policy which had at its core the concepts of social and economic reconstruction.

The conference defeated the general tenor of the resolution by a small margin, but it did vote to make the resolution the subject of discussion and study throughout the following year.

The 1938 report of the resolutions committee appears to be the first rocking of the boat which had hit the P.E.A. since its founding. For twenty
years the Association had enjoyed healthy and orderly growth. Its original statement of principles could not easily be faulted; it was truly a national organization; it was influencing thousands of teachers across the country. Perhaps it was the belief that the Association was sufficiently established which led its more aggressive members to strike out in the direction set forth in the 1938 resolution in the belief that such a policy would achieve more striking results than would be achieved under the adherence to the more staid original statement of principles.

In the June, 1938, issue of Progressive Education there appeared a statement by Jessie H. Newlon of Teachers College, New York, approving the statement of the resolutions committee and immediately following, a statement by Eugene Randolph Smith which disapproved. Mr. Smith wrote:

It is not the business of the Association to prejudge moot questions such as many involved in these resolutions; it is not its business to commit its membership to the support of any particular movements or methods of social reform, however good they may seem to be; it has no moral right, short of change of its announced purposes and complete reorganization of its membership, to become a pressure group for any particular social policy.¹⁷

It may be well to recall that the Mr. Smith quoted immediately above was the same Mr. Smith who contributed so significantly to the original statement of principles for the infant P.E.A. in 1919.

Two years passed without public word or hint about a new philosophy for the P.E.A., but within the Association forces were at work developing a philosophy which was to become the "spirit" of the Progressive Education Association. The new statement of philosophy appeared in a twenty-eight page supplement to the issue of Progressive Education for May, 1941.

This philosophy will be discussed more fully in Chapter III. It will suffice here, in order to provide chronology to the history of the Association, to say that the new philosophy was not a great departure from
the original seven principles of the P.E.A., but it added a commitment to the democratic way of life, urged schools to cooperate with other social agencies and urged schools to become integral parts of their communities.

The committee which prepared the statement was composed of Harold Alberty, H. Gordon Hullfish, Alice V. Keliher, Daniel Prescott, Louis Roths, Paul B. Sears, Paul Witty and Laura Zirbes. The philosophy itself may well have been a sop to the more aggressive forces within the Association who were responsible for the presentation of the statement on philosophy by the Resolutions Committee in 1938. The new philosophy fell short of committing the P.E.A. to social and economic reconstruction which had characterized the proposal made in 1938.

During the year 1943 the P.E.A. changed its name to American Education Fellowship. There were two reasons for the change. Progressive education had come under widespread attack from conservative forces who assailed educational methods which were described, rightly or wrongly, as progressive. Some persons within the P.E.A. felt that a change in name would sidestep the attacks on progressivism in education. Dr. Ruth Streitz wrote: "I now believe that changing the name to the American Education Fellowship will do much to dispel the criticism of the vested interest groups in the country." An Ohio State University colleague of Dr. Streitz, Dr. H. Gordon Hullfish was of a different mind. Dr. Hullfish wrote: "I find myself more than a little disturbed by the suggestion of the Board to change the name of the Association. I have no objection to what is implied in the particular recommendation, American Education Fellowship. Many people, however, are certain to regard such a change as a retreat under sharp fire and I'll be damned if I want to play into the hands of our critics."
Others who favored changing the name of the P.E.A. probably felt as did Frederick Redefer who wrote: "While I favored the change in name in 1943, I did so for an entirely different reason than the one which seem [sic] to motivate the Board. I felt that a new frontier in which the P.E.A. must pioneer was the international field." 

The Progressive Education Association had been the American Section of the New Education Fellowship since 1930.

A new policy to accompany the new name of the organization was published for the membership in May, 1944. The new policy stated that education must join with all types of citizens who wish to build "schools for the people". It urged that education must cope with community problems and help to determine what the future of every community is to be like. It stated further that there should be a close relationship among schools, parents, interest groups, adult education and all aspects of the community which surround the child and curriculum and which largely determine whether schools are or are not to function as peoples' schools.

The objectives and program of the A.E.F. were spelled out for the membership in October of 1944. The stated purpose of the Fellowship was to define what good education was and to direct the fight of its membership toward the achievement of it. Good education was defined as "That process of learning and living by which the child becomes an understanding adult citizen with strong concern for the development of a world in which free men can and will act together, and fight if necessary, for the common good of all." 

Progressive Education, the publication of the P.E.A. which continued to be the official organ of the Fellowship said that society must provide adequate health services, recreation, good housing, a chance for
employment, and religious and racial tolerance.

The new policy was similar to the rejected report of the resolutions committee of 1938. Apparently it was not what the members of the Fellowship wanted or thought they wanted.

In late 1946 a committee of the A.E.F. composed of Dr. Ernest Melby, Theodore Brameld, Dr. Edward Lindemann, Dr. Harold Benjamin and Dr. Harold Taylor was working on a new program and policy for the A.E.F. All of these men were of the upper echelon in education. At an early meeting of the committee in New York City on November 30, 1946, a general discussion was held concerning the future of the Fellowship and what its program should be. Dr. Brameld held to the view that the committee should reformulate the policy of A.E.F. and stated that many persons felt that since the change in name of the organization [in 1943] it had been difficult to justify the existence of the A.E.F. partly because other organizations were advocating the same things originally advocated by the A.E.F. and partly because the purposes of the Fellowship had not been fully defined. Others suggested a need for the A.E.F. to address itself to the needs of international ties; or world-mindedness, that A.E.F. should remain a minority organization—not one to please everybody, a need to press "hammer and tongs for world government", that progressive education must be concerned with the education of adults and children and with current problems such as juvenile delinquency, getting people out to vote, consumer education, and with extension of the school's activity program into community life.22

Even though a committee of six was to write a new policy for A.E.F. it developed that the policy became recognized as the Brameld statement. A.E.F. Director Vinal H. Tibbetts in a letter to the chairman of the policy committee, Dr. Ernest Melby, wrote of the "Brameld report" in April, 1947,
before it had been distributed for general reading to the membership. Tibbetts wrote: "You see I had told DeBoer that I thought it would be disastrous either to publish the Brameld report in the Journal [Progressive Education] or to send it around the country in its present form. I still think so. It is too long. It is too long and too wordy and too general." Director Tibbetts did not say why dissemination of the Brameld policy statement would be disastrous. Certainly it would not have been disastrous either to publish a lengthy statement nor would it have been disastrous to reproduce the statement and mail it around the country, presumably to the A.E.F. Board of Directors. Mr. Tibbetts evidently saw something else disastrous in the Brameld policy. Mr. Tibbetts' choice and use of the word disastrous was prophetic.

Also prophetic was an excerpt from a letter written by A.E.F. President John DeBoer to Harold Rugg on November 18, 1947, a few days before the A.E.F. national conference was to meet in Chicago. Wrote Mr. DeBoer: "I understand that the New York University group plans war-like measures. I thought A.E.F. had escaped the characteristic malady of liberals who like to fight each other much better than they like to fight reaction." Mr. DeBoer was obviously referring to the new policy and the intentions of the policy committee, whose chairman was on the staff at New York University, to try to force acceptance of the Brameld statement.

In the latter part of November, 1947 the new policy which has already been referred to as the Brameld policy was presented to the A.E.F. national conference in Chicago. The policy statement called for strong social emphasis in progressive education, and a systematic study in the schools of the world-wide trend toward increased governmental responsibility for the
public welfare. The statement also [stressed] the need for international as opposed to national sovereignty.

The Brameld policy was a center of contention from its inception. In a letter to President DeBoer in November, 1947, F. C. Rosecrance wrote: "There was considerable argument pro and con about the Brameld statement. Rugg supported it, as did Redefer, Zilliacus, and Speer. Others attacked it sharply including Thayer, Melvin, Constance Warren and others. Here the old division in our group once more revealed itself. There are those who believe that we should step out vigorously with a society centered education, that time is short, that we cannot build a new social order by rearing a new generation of young people. There are others who believe that Progressive Education has not touched the colleges, scarcely influenced the high schools, and in reality reaches a minority of elementary schools. They believe that much remains to be done to implement the child-centered school."^{25}

In writing of the meeting which adopted the Brameld statement John DeBoer stated: "There was spirited debate over the new program, but at the end the Brameld Policy Statement, with certain revisions, were [sic] accepted unanimously."^{26}

At least one A.E.F. member, the late H. Gordon Hullfish who was to be the last president of the A.E.F.^[P.E.A.] indicated that the policy was foisted upon the A.E.F. through fraud. Dr. Hullfish in opposing the ratification of the Brameld policy wrote: "I am enclosing my vote against the adoption of the new policy. In the first place, I am in considerable doubt as to what the policy means. Its internal confusion was illustrated when it was discussed at the Chicago meeting. Since the statement in no way reflects the discussion at Chicago, the matter is just where it was. It is right here that I have my second objection. The Board was instructed by motion to
change the statement in accordance with the discussion on the floor at Chicago. This point really disturbs me.²⁷

In any event the Brameld Policy was adopted by the national conference as was indicated above. That it was adopted contingent upon changes which were not incorporated in the statement as Dr. Rullfish said seems reasonable in view of the intense controversy that the policy sparked within the organization.

The new policy was submitted to the A.E.F. membership for ratification and in the October, 1948, issue of Progressive Education appeared the announcement: "balloting on the A.E.F. policy ... was regrettably small. But the vote ran well over two to one in favor of the new policy."²⁸

The Brameld policy alienated two groups within the Fellowship. The one group was composed of those who wanted the Association to continue its commitment to the child-centered school or to the principles of progressive education as enunciated during the first two decades of the Progressive Education Association. The other alienated group was composed of those in the organization who were educational liberals, but politically not so liberal as adherence to the new policy would require.

With the adoption of the Brameld policy the Fellowship began a decline from which it never recovered. Speaking for those who wanted the organization to continue its struggle to get progressive educational policies adopted in the elementary schools, Ruth Streitz, a professor of education at the Ohio State University wrote to A.E.F. President DeBoer: "I must admit that some of us have been very much distressed that the Association has never accomplished its fundamental purpose, which was to affect both the administration and the teaching practices of the elementary schools of this country."²⁹

In the same vein A.E.F. member Bess Lane alluded to the organization's
preoccupation with the University group. She wrote: "It has seemed to me, perhaps mistakenly, that in recent years the A.E.F. has been directing its attention almost exclusively to the professional group and of the professional group, to those on the college and university level. It may be that at present with our limited resources, and college education in need of stimulus in a liberal direction, it is wise to concentrate on the "upper" levels; but that does leave high schools, elementary schools and parents without a guiding organization."30

In addition to the old guard within the organization whose views were similar to those of Dr. Streitz and Bess Lane, the moderates in the organization were alienated either because the Brameld statement was too liberal or because their positions in the schools were sufficiently close to the grass roots as to be in jeopardy so long as they were affiliated with a group whose goals were so liberal as the A.E.F.'s.

On February 28, 1948, Paul J. Misner, Superintendent of Glencoe, Illinois, public schools, withdrew his support from the A.E.F. with the stinging comment: "Until I am convinced that the A.E.F. intends to be more than a popular front for P.C.A., I cannot with integrity support it."31

The next month Harold Shane, Superintendent of Winnetka, Illinois, schools wrote A.E.F. President DeBoer of his intent to resign as a board member of the A.E.F. at the end of the first year of his three-year term.32 Three days later, March 23, 1948, Mr. Shane wrote of the resentment among his teachers toward the new Brameld policy: "Frankly, I was severely taken aback by the violent reaction of even so liberal a public school staff as ours. So hot and heavy was the debate regarding 100% support for P.E.A. [A.E.F.] in the future (a tradition here) that only the strongest of
personal appeals resulted in a majority vote of the Teachers' Council to continue on a bloc membership basis."

A further rip in the A.E.F. seams appeared in June, 1948, when Edward G. Olsen, the A.E.F. Northwest vice-president and director of school and community relations in the Washington [state] office of the superintendent of public instruction resigned from the A.E.F. and from its office of Northwest vice-president.34

There were reported rumblings from Denver when Supervisor of instruction in the public schools there wrote on August 18, 1949: "The last year has been uphill going because of the extreme left reputation of the organization."35

A.E.F. state representative for Minnesota, R. H. Glasson, a Minneapolis principal expressed a desire to be no longer considered a state representative for A.E.F. and voiced the hope that his name no longer appear in the magazine as the holder of the office.36

On October 18, 1950, Emily V. Baker of the Arizona State College in a letter to A.E.F. headquarters said: "I called together three of our strongest A.E.F. members. None are members of our faculty. Two of them think serving would be dangerous for them. One with deep pathos in his voice said, "But when are we going to stop running?" He would make a good chairman, but he feels he cannot assume the responsibility. Moreover, all three advised against our trying to go on as an A.E.F. group at all. They advised me to withdraw entirely from the Commission and to call no meeting of our local A.E.F. For the foregoing reasons, I feel it wise for me to withdraw from the Southwest Commission."37

Caroline Barron, the Principal of the Sheridan Elementary and Junior High School in Minneapolis wrote on December 5, 1951: "He (Bob Beck) wants
the local group to continue and would like to keep his association with it, but he wishes to resign from the national group because he does not approve of the policy statement.

"Our members have been attacked as they are being attacked in other cities and there are many who feel as Bob does and who will not renew their membership because they do not support the policy statement. Some, of course, become fainthearted in the face of attack and find it easier to withdraw than to continue their membership. Many, however, are not afraid of criticism and have a strong allegiance to A.E.F. but would not wholeheartedly support the policy statement. As I recall the Philadelphia meeting such feelings are pretty general throughout the membership."\textsuperscript{38}

Finally, a letter from Superintendent Kenneth E. Oberholtzer of the Denver Public Schools dated January 2, 1951, read: "Thanks ever so much for your invitation to be a sponsor for the Mid-Century National Conference of the A.E.F. I believe, however, that I prefer not to have my name included as one of those sponsoring the meeting."\textsuperscript{39}

When A.E.F. Director Vinal Tibbetts opined that publishing the Brameld policy statement would be disastrous, he was on target. Carleton Washburne summed up the chaos in the A.E.F. when he wrote: "It \textsuperscript{[the Brameld statement]} has been seriously divisive, has resulted in inactivity by formerly active groups and resignations from the A.E.F. on the part of some of its former officers and most active leaders. It has likewise increased greatly the attacks on the A.E.F. and it has not in any way increased the effectiveness of the organization."\textsuperscript{40}

The attrition by defection in the A.E.F. had reached such proportions that the members assembled for its annual conference in Philadelphia in 1951 took up the question of policy revision. A.E.F. President Kenneth Benne
wrote to Roma Gans of the Teachers' College, Columbia University, in October of that year:

"You will recall that there was considerable discussion at the National Conference in Philadelphia of what changes, if any, are required in the policy statement of the A.E.F. adopted in 1947. The business meeting referred action in working out revisions to the A.E.F. Board. At the Board meeting it was decided:

1. To remove the abridged policy statement from the book cover of *Progressive Education*, pending revision process.

2. To include a statement in the magazine that revision processes are under way.

3. To print a series of statements representing various points of view on needed policy revisions in the magazine.

4. To invite reader correspondence in reaction to the discussion in the magazine.

5. To appoint a committee to draft a revised policy statement, making available to them all member statements and reactions collected.

6. To refer the draft statement to a referendum of the membership.

Point 1 has been accomplished with the April issue of the magazine. Point 2 will begin in the October issue. I hope you will help with point 3. I believe it desirable to begin the discussion in the November issue, certainly no later than the January issue."  

Roma Gans' reply was printed in the January, 1952 issue of *Progressive Education* under the title "A New Policy for These Times Is Needed".

Roma Gans criticized the 1947 policy on the grounds that it was critical of the U.S. economic system but was not critical of Russia's disregard of civil liberties. She also thought a policy for the A.E.F. should spell out how to deal with a penetrating understanding of personality development and the behavior of groups.
Carleton Washburne felt that the 1947 policy spelled out our problems and then provided answers rather than pointing to the process of selecting an issue, facing it, analyzing it and moving toward a solution to it. He also felt that the 1947 policy was considered by many to be a commitment to social action and which was beyond the proper province of an educational organization. Mr. Washburne wrote:

"The New Policy was written by university professors on tenure. It disregards the effect its statements are bound to have—and have had—upon school boards and the general public that elects them. I can personally name one superintendent of schools after another who had been active in the Progressive Education Association and served as officers, and who felt it necessary to become inactive or resign when the New Policy was accepted. At the recent New York meeting of the A.E.F., as a further example, a superintendent in a nearby progressive school system not only refused to sponsor the meeting, but would not consent to having one of his teachers serve on a panel."

In early 1952 a committee was established for the purpose of examining A.E.F. policy for possible revision, soliciting suggestions for revision and writing a policy for the A.E.F. for submission to the membership for adoption or rejection. One section of the committee was called a working committee composed of members in the Metropolitan New York area. The other section was a corresponding committee whose function it was to initiate revisions, solicit revisions and criticize proposed drafts. The full committee worked under the chairmanship of Dr. Miles E. Cary, Director of the Ethical Culture Schools of New York City. Dr. H. Gordon Hullfish became president of the A.E.F. in 1952 and in October of that year, through the pages of Progressive Education, Dr. Hullfish
asked the membership to indicate their feelings about (1) retaining the name American Education Fellowship or changing the name from American Education Fellowship to Progressive Education Association and (2) adding to the qualifications for membership in the Association the provision that "anyone [would be rejected from joining] who would use education as a means of promoting the ends of communism, fascism, or any other view that denies to the young person the essential freedom which, as the democratic aspiration has shown, is necessary for his full development as an individual."  

Later, the Board of Directors voted to rename the Association to its original name of Progressive Education Association and at the same time members were advised that the Board had adopted the further restriction on membership.

The January, 1953, issue of Progressive Education was devoted almost exclusively to policy revision. Dr. Isaac Berkson theorized that progressive teachers could not help but have positive social goals and felt that A.E.F. policy should have such goals provided that they be realistic and consonant with democratic values. Dr. E. V. Sayers argued that A.E.F. policy should be a commitment to a concern with methodology of democratic social reconstruction, but not to specified changes of an institutional or structural nature. Dr. Theodore Brameld defended the policy of the A.E.F. arguing that the pursuit of definite economic goals was perfectly defensible and consistent with contemporary democratic education. Carleton Washburne urged adoption of a policy which would be a uniting force among education liberals and suggested a policy which would content itself with helping students to face controversial economic issues realistically and use sound reasoning in drawing conclusions. John J. Brooks spoke of the need of a policy which would seek to build democratic personalities in school and community life and which
would eventually achieve a world system. Alain Locke and H. Henry Giles urged consideration for equal opportunity for all; William Heard Kilpatrick wanted A.E.F. to encourage the study and emanation of the best in education practices, encourage schools to take active interest in socially useful community undertakings, and encourage interest in controversial issues without indoctrinating or taking sides.\textsuperscript{46}

Dr. Miles E. Carey, chairman of the Committee on Policy Revision wrote to the Editor of Progressive Education on August 4, 1953, concerning a forthcoming policy statement: "The statement, as it stands does not have the official approval of all the New York Working Committee. Time did not permit this. Drs. Berkson and Brooks and I criticized the material in its final stages. Dr. Berkson did a considerable job of editing. However, the statement, in a way, is Harold Rugg's statement."\textsuperscript{47}

The proposed statement of policy appeared in the November, 1953, issue of Progressive Education. The statement paid tribute to the early successes of the Progressive Education Association, affirmed a commitment to capitalism, racial and religious equality, urged the use of education to help achieve world peace and an economic system which would result from thoughtful inquiry and which would bring a life of abundance, tolerance and beauty. It urged a commitment for teachers to deal with controversial issues, to interpret the social heritage and to pursue inquiry without interference. The proposal espoused a shift of emphasis from elementary to secondary schools and colleges and called for organization of adult groups to study modern life to the end that a national network of such groups emerge.\textsuperscript{48}

The previous issue of Progressive Education, October, 1953, had informed members that the 1947 Policy had been rescinded by the Board of Directors by a vote of 14 to 1.
Apparently the discussion about a new policy for the P.E.A. was an exercise in futility, for there was to be no further policy for the Association. Mr. Cremin stated it well when he wrote concerning the policy discussions; "But it was all much ado about nothing; the members, the money, and the vitality had long since vanished, and all that remained was a small coterie of academics arguing over creed."

A committee of the P.E.A. headed by Paul R. Klohr which was to study the situation in which the Association found itself reported in December, 1954, that:

1. There is a growing sentiment to abolish P.E.A.

2. There is strong feeling that the publication Progressive Education should be continued.

Some weeks later P.E.A. President Hullfish, in a report to the officers and Board of P.E.A. said:

First, all replies that I have received (and I did not hear from everyone) agreed that The Progressive Education Association should be dissolved. No one was happy about this; nor am I. There is no alternative, however. Second, all replies agreed that we should try to save the magazine.

In March, 1955, President Hullfish informed the officers and Board of the P.E.A. that he was taking the steps necessary to dissolve the Association.

In June, 1955, Dr. Hullfish and Dr. B. O. Smith met at the University of Illinois and with proxies from other members of the Board of Directors voted to support a series of resolutions that recommended the ending of the Association's activities.

The actions of the Board were approved the following month. The Champaign News Gazette reported:

The Progressive Education Association came to the end of its distinguished history Saturday when a meeting of the members approved
the action taken by the Board of Directors and Officers June 25 looking toward dissolution.

... The members present, a mere handful, voted to authorize dissolution and to empower the Officers to proceed with the steps required to bring this about. They supported the recommendation of the Officers and Board, also, to turn all assets of the Association over to the John Dewey Society, a not for profit educational association, which is to publish the magazine, Progressive Education. Two hundred members returned proxies to President Hullfish. Six opposed the actions proposed, the remaining concurring.52

Thus, on July 23, 1955, the once vibrant, vigorous, and vocal Progressive Education Association tiptoes, almost unnoticed, into history.

Commenting upon the demise of the P.E.A., Dr. Hullfish in a memorandum which was apparently supplying background material for a news story wrote:

The dissolution of the Progressive Education Association at this time is in some measure related to the social climate created by the all-out effort needed to carry World War II to a successful conclusion (insofar as victory represents this) and confused by the anxieties of a post-war period in which the term "progressive", appropriated as it has been by the totalitarians to serve their limiting purposes, has been used by some intemperate citizens to intimidate school people generally. This may be putting it mildly. It ought to be said, however, that this is but one factor. A second factor is the success of the progressive education movement. This movement was not limited to "progressive schools", nor to a single level of education. In consequence, teachers and administrators have found the character of the professional associations to which they normally belong by virtue of their special interests changed. These groups are themselves progressive, even when they may feel called upon to deny this, as is educational practice generally. The gap between traditional education and progressive education has been, so far as the general atmosphere of schools is concerned, and specifically with reference to practice, markedly narrowed.

Whatever the cause, or combination of causes, (for the past ten years or so the Progressive Education Association has been somewhat uncertain about its role, as its change of name in 1944 to the American Education Fellowship and later to the New Education Fellowship--United States Section--incorporated would indicate, not to mention the continuing discussions about policy).53 The fact is that the peak membership of the 30's, an impressive 10,000 or more, when the Association was fully engaged in the promotion of experimental programs and of exciting and challenging regional and national meetings, has fallen off to approximately six hundred.54
And Frederick L. Redefer, writing for the Nation said:

Although the P.E.A. continued to exist until 1955, in effect, except as the publisher of *Progressive Education*, it died long before that time. In its last five years, it held no conferences and the Board of Directors seldom met.
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CHAPTER III

THE CHANGING PHILOSOPHIES OF THE P.E.A.

The Original Philosophy

As the writer stated in the introductory paragraphs of this study a part of the thesis would be devoted to the philosophies of the Progressive Education Association. It was necessary to allude to the different philosophies of the Association in the previous chapter because the statements of philosophy were so thoroughly inter-twined with the growth, development and decline of the P.E.A. In this chapter, it is the purpose of the writer to present the philosophies or purposes of the Association or a summary of each and to suggest reasons for the changes in the objectives of the P.E.A. at the time the philosophies changed.

The first statement of principles adopted by the P.E.A. was a simple and concise list of seven purposes. The P.E.A. originally advocated:

1. Freedom to develop naturally.
2. Interest, the motive of all work.
3. The teacher a guide, not a taskmaster.
4. Scientific study of pupil development.
5. Greater attention to all that affects the child's physical development.
6. Cooperation between the school and home to meet the needs of child life.
7. The progressive school—a leader in educational movements.

These principles were printed in each issue of the Association's journal.
which were published during the years 1924 through 1928. Following each statement was a brief elaboration of it.

These principles, it may be recalled, were adopted by an infant Progressive Education Association composed largely of persons who were parents of children in private schools. It would not be a simple task to take issue with any one of the seven principles presented above. For example, the first principle placed the Association in favor of freedom to develop naturally. Who would wish to argue that the child should develop unnaturally? And thus with each of the remaining six statements.

There is no evidence to indicate that any dissatisfaction with the purposes of the P.E.A. existed until 1938. During the years following 1919 the Association had attracted a wide following, its purposes were easily understood and not easily faulted. All kinds of people could subscribe to this statement with ease, be they Republican or Democrat, Conservative or Liberal.

It is quite possible that the original statement of principles of the P.E.A. led some teachers who believed themselves to be progressive to interpret the principles rather liberally. Terms which became associated with progressive education such as teacher-pupil planning, the child-centered school, creative expression, the whole child, felt-needs, etc. can be traced to the statement of principles even though such terms were probably born long after the statement of purposes had been adopted by the P.E.A.

By 1938, a committee of the P.E.A. presented a blueprint for a new statement of philosophy. No lengthy discussion of the proposed policy is appropriate here. Reference has been made to it on pages 18 and 19. The proposed change in policy does however, indicate that influential persons within the P.E.A. were eager to redirect the organization and its members
into the paths of economic and social reform—a wide departure from the Association's original objectives. It is repetitious though not costly in space to say once more that the proposed policy change was defeated by the P.E.A. in annual conference in 1938.

The Second Philosophy of the P.E.A.

The second philosophy of the Progressive Education Association was announced in Progressive Education for May, 1941.

The statement had been worked out by a university-level group of educators. It was a strong commitment to democracy and summarized, it said that the dominant ideals of our democratic culture, continuously reinterpreted and redefined, provide central direction [for education].

Specifically the statement held that:

1. The school should be exemplification of democratic living at its best.

2. There should be greater recognition of and cooperation with other social agencies on the part of educators.

3. If the school is to be an integral part of the community it must be organized in terms of those responsibilities.

4. When educators believe that the democratic way is the best way of working together, they will re-make their professional values in these terms.

5. Education should deal directly with the values individuals hold as they enter educative experiences.

6. Educators should be interested in the history of the growth and development of each individual.

7. The significance of the view herein developed of the individual as a dynamic and unitary organism is far-reaching.

8. The educator should recognize that his efforts create active patterns of behavior.

9. The educator has the responsibility to help individuals select values and purposes in terms of what may properly be called "their surrounding reality".
10. If we are to entertain real hope for the progressive advancement of democratic values, our present practices in the education of teachers must be reconceived and reconstructed.

This second philosophy of the P.E.A. was announced when much of Europe had fallen to totalitarianism. Its commitment to democracy is easily understandable. In its introduction the committee which prepared the statement acknowledged that there were widely divergent views within the Association relative to just what the philosophy of the P.E.A. should be. It acknowledged that the depression and the spread of totalitarianism had made intriguing the notion that education should deliberately set about creating the desired society and that at the other extreme, there was interest in educative practices that would help to establish a "cooperative workers' society". It explained that the statement would not battle for either extreme but would set a direction for education.

It seems that the committee which prepared this statement was seeking to offset the more aggressive proposal which had been offered to the P.E.A. in 1938.

**The Third Philosophy of the P.E.A.**

In a message to the members of P.E.A. in January, 1944, issue of *Progressive Education*, Director V. H. Tibbetts explained that the tensions of the time and the attacks upon progressive education by pressure groups made it necessary that there be unity of purpose in the ranks of progressive education to the end that education and society be improved. He announced that the Board of Directors had prepared a new statement of aims and purposes which would be submitted to the membership in the near future.

The statement of objectives of program of the A.E.F.[P.E.A.] were spelled out in the October, 1944, issue of *Progressive Education*. The
stated purpose of the A.E.F. was to define what good education was and then to enlist and direct the fighting interest of its membership to achieve good education for all children and youth. Good education was defined as "that process of learning and living by which the child becomes an understanding and adult citizen with strong concern for the development of a world in which free men can and will act together, even fight if necessary, for the common good. Good education, in its broadest sense, concerns itself not only with the school and schooling, but with the community in which the school must thrive and its children grow up and be citizens."¹

The new policy further contended that the society which would nurture good education "must provide adequate health services, recreation, good housing, a chance for assured employment, and democratic civic practices which will do away with religious and racial intolerance."²

The statement then specified that A.E.F. stood for and the eight principles are presented in summary here.

1. Equal educational opportunity for all youngsters.
2. Give "higher education" to all capable of absorbing and using it.
3. Make schools so vital and well-supported that they will attract and hold the services of the best teachers.
4. Establish a youth program for young people to help carry them from school life to service and active participation in community life.
5. Use schools as community centers during off-school hours.
6. Cooperate with all community agencies which help to build a truly democratic society.
7. Continue educational experimentation and research.
8. Make the school a part of the community by attracting to it parents, community leaders and professional workers.

The A.E.F. stated its intention to seek the achievement of its goals
through the use of publications, radio programs, workshops, by organizing grass-roots chapters and by providing materials for adult discussion groups, by appealing to parents and youth and by operating a teacher placement bureau.

The writer senses a desire on the part of the A.E.F. Directors to present a program in understandable language which would appeal to the masses, whose support at a very critical time the A.E.F. needed. World War II was in its last year, attacks upon progressive education were continuing and its leaders must have sensed that the ending of the war and its aftermath were going to be times when the forces of reaction and progress would by vying for the minds of men. This 1944 policy then, was evidently an attempt to give new life to those forces in education who would seek a better life through an enlightened democratic citizenry. It is not difficult to visualize the unfolding of the plan which A.E.F. leaders had in mind.

There would be the radio programs in the afternoon featuring three or four A.E.F. teachers and parents discussing some vital community issue and setting the stage for the public meeting and discussion in the local school that evening, the school would be a hub-bub of activity preparing for the evening meeting, press representatives would give coverage to the meeting and all sides of the issue discussed. The vested interests would have to fight not only their opponents, but an interested and enlightened townspeople. The A.E.F. headquarters would be rolling out research findings on future topics to be discussed at meetings throughout the country. Its materials would be geared to youth and to all levels of education. Enlightenment and democratic action would be on the march and the forces of reaction would be fighting a desperate rear-guard action. It might very well have worked and certainly would have been exciting.
Reference has already been made to the adoption of what has been called the 1947 policy on page 24.

The policy statement argued that the A.E.F. objectives toward achievement of more democratic schools and that there was growing consensus among educators everywhere in support of many of the practices that A.E.F. had first formulated. It continued that perhaps A.E.F. members could possibly spend their efforts in other organizations, larger and richer than A.E.F. who were advocating the same objectives, or whether A.E.F. should continue its historic role as a spearhead organization.

Then the policy explained that the responsibilities facing the schools [in 1947] were greater than those which faced the schools in the years following World War I. Whether or not the schools would meet their new and compelling responsibilities was uncertain, the statement said, but the obligation to do so was certain. This new obligation facing the schools then was to be the job of the American Education Fellowship.

This was the challenge then to the A.E.F. as the policy statement interpreted it. Do you people in the A.E.F. want to sit around and talk about your past accomplishments or do you want to recognize the new challenge which confronts us and do something about it? The policy then defined the challenge.

The first was "the fact of an unstable and precarious economy, with its accomplishment of insecurity, inflation, its cycles of boom-and-bust". The statement compared the late 1940's with the 1920's--"we are living and spending recklessly, allowing big business free rein, permitting further concentrations of economic power, building a top-heavy profit structure which, if it rises unchecked, will again inevitably crash." It was contended that in many parts of the world common people were demanding that
the destructive fluctuations of the industrial system should end and that there be such public controls over the economic system that stability be guaranteed, a greater decentralization of wealth be achieved, and that a rising standard of living be realized.

In spelling out the first challenge, there was unbridled criticism of alleged evils in the American economic system. There was expressed the belief that another depression might undermine many economic systems elsewhere. Education was ignoring these "facts" the statement argued.

The second challenge lay in the international area. The policy said that schools did not help students to see the contradictions between the need for international cooperation on the one hand and the desirability of United States supremacy on the other; they are taught to pay lip service to the ideal of equality, freedom, and brotherhood; and yet their beliefs that Christians are superior to Mohammedans and Jews are left unchallenged.

The statement then said that educators had the right and duty to participate in active political life. Then, it argued that "two great constructive purposes have first claim on our active support."

1. The reconstruction of the economic system in the direction of greater social justice and stability; a system to be secured by whatever democratic planning and social controls experience shows to be necessary; a system in which social security and a guaranteed annual wage sufficient to meet scientific standards of nourishment, shelter, clothing, health, recreation and education are universalized; a system in which the will of the majority with due regard for the interests of all the people is the sovereign determinant of every basic economic policy.

2. The establishment of a genuine world order, an order in which national sovereignty is subordinate to world authority in crucial interests affecting peace and security; an order therefore in which all weapons of war and police forces are finally under that authority; an order in which international economic coordination of trade, resources, labor, distribution and standards is practiced parallel with the best standards of individual nations;
an order which must be geared with the increasing socializations and public controls now developing in England, Sweden, New Zealand and certain other countries; an order in which all nationalities, races and religions receive equal rights; an order in which "world citizenship" thus assumes at least equal status with "national citizenship".

The policy statement then listed fourteen specific educational tasks which, it said, would implement the two major goals. In the interest of brevity the fourteen points will not be listed verbatim here. The tasks to be carried out included the study of evolving economic and political systems, the study of the successes and failures of attempts to achieve a genuine world order, help people to understand propaganda, study experiments and institutions such as Tennessee Valley Authority, the postal system, consumer cooperative movements, social security programs in the United States and Europe, help achieve an understanding of the full import of the concept "one world", and study of the status of minorities.

This policy was the last policy of the A.E.F. or P.E.A. as it was renamed in its last years. This was the policy which sought a reconstructed economic system and a genuine world order, and upon these two goals the membership would not unite in committing itself.
FOOTNOTES


2 Ibid.

3 See Appendix, page
CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

It is appropriate now, after recounting the history of the Progressive Education Association, to consider analytically its development and to state concisely the circumstances which surrounded its disintegration.

First, and paradoxically, the growth of the Association contributed to its collapse. In its early years the P.E.A. was composed of professional and lay persons who were largely representative of the private schools. Such a supporting membership could afford to be innovators in educational methods. They were not responsible to Boards of Education and they could easily ignore criticism of press and public. But there was sufficient sympathy for the objectives of the Association to support its growth and in time almost eleven thousand persons became members of it. As the P.E.A. grew it took in people who were representative of all kinds of schools. The Association ceased to be an organization primarily of private school people and became instead an Association of public elementary and secondary teachers, private school people, private religious schools and college and university educators. As the Progressive Education Association grew it enrolled persons of more diverse points of view and persons more vulnerable to the breezes of criticism from press and public than was true of the early P.E.A. membership.

A second major circumstance surrounding the break-up of the Association
also appears at first glance to be paradoxical. This second circumstance was the attraction by the P.E.A. of many upper-level educators. While this gravitation of college and university educators toward the Association would appear to be a winning over of the educational elite by an Association founded by a "handful of nobodies" as Stanwood Cobb phrased it, it turned out to be the winning over of a force which would, in the end, help to destroy the Association. This is not to demean the loyalty or the sincerity of the university converts.

Among the upper echelon educators who joined the Association were persons who were very aggressive and highly articulate. Many of the professional group became officers and directors of the P.E.A. and it appears that some of the group saw in the Association a ready vehicle for redirecting the efforts of the membership in channels of their own choosing.

Thirdly, there is some evidence to indicate that the university group included some persons who were both uncompromising and disdainful of democratic processes. One recalls the complaint of Dr. Hullfish as he explained his negative vote on the 1947 policy. According to Dr. Hullfish the policy was to have been changed before its submission to the membership, but the changes were not incorporated in the 1947 policy. If this complaint of Dr. Hullfish were true, it smacks not only of disdain for democratic processes but also of fraud. Another indication of the lack of compromising spirit was noted by Robert Koopman in a letter to Dr. Thut of the John Dewey Society in February, 1949. Mr. Koopman wrote:

I feel the only reason there is a lack of the positive, aggressive movement in education, unequivocally dedicated to the promotion of democracy through education is because the present leaders . . . will not cooperate in setting up a new organization.

The determination of some of the university groups within the P.E.A.
to choose the path which the Association should follow, and their lack of sympathy for the ideas of those who disagreed with them seems to have constituted a tension which tended to weaken the P.E.A.

Lastly, the 1947 policy--the policy known as Brameld policy--was more than the P.E.A. could absorb. The liberal and politically oriented tone of the Brameld policy caused many public school officials to withdraw from the P.E.A. The policy caused others to drop their memberships. According to some members the statement caused an increase in attacks upon the Association. Some college and university professors may have wallowed luxuriously in the limelight of the attacks upon P.E.A. as a result of the Brameld policy. While their tenure emboldened some of the university group the public school people were vulnerable to public criticism, and at a time when the Red scares were prominent it is little wonder that many members of the P.E.A. were unwilling to be the subject of criticism which attacked their patriotism in their own communities. The harmful effects of the Brameld policy upon the P.E.A. has already been indicated. (see footnote 140) Important public school officials felt it advisable to withdraw from P.E.A. while others were chagrined that the policy committed the organization to political and economic objectives when the original objectives of the Association had not been fully attained.

The Brameld policy created deep chasms within the ranks of the Progressive Education Association. A letter written by Roy Durham when he was associated with the Kansas State Teachers College to Progressive Education editor B. O. Smith illustrates this point:

I only know four or five in the state who were interested [in progressive education] and their interest may have diminished somewhat by the Red scares, and the general hysteria which has been generated by fascist head-hunting people in this country. There seems to be a tendency on
the part of the teachers to hedge a bit, to be less certain about what he believes and a great deal less certain to stand up and be counted.\textsuperscript{2}
FOOTNOTES

1 Letter from Koopman to That, dated February 11, 1949, unpublished material, P.E.A. papers, Ohio State University.

2 Letter from Durham to Smith, dated March 15, 1959, unpublished material, P.E.A. papers, Ohio State University.
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APPENDIX
A NEW POLICY

Since 1919 the American Education Fellowship (formerly called the Progressive Education Association) has served a distinctive role in the educational world. Its record of pioneering is long, its achievements influential. Few, if any, persons familiar with the last quarter-century of school history would deny this assertion, even though they may at times criticize some of the methods or outcomes for which the organization has been responsible. Nor would they deny that, directly or indirectly, its influence has extended far beyond the United States; throughout the World—China, South America, Australia, Europe—educators have studied and often adopted theories and practices developed by its own commission, published in its many pamphlets and volumes, and demonstrated by its members through projects, research, and school reorganization.

While it is impossible to summarize here in an adequate sense a list of its accomplishments, the AEF from its inception has stood first of all for a dynamic conception of education as vital experience in democratic learning and living. Therefore it has, on the one hand, opposed all forms of school autocracy—whether in the form of administrative organization which denies genuine participation to teachers, students, and parents; or in the form of classroom authoritarianism which places the child in a position of meekness and passivity, and which assumes that learning is chiefly an absorption of predetermined subject-matters. On the other hand, the organization has vigorously supported a great variety of efforts to make the school a living symbol of democracy in the way that superintendents and other officials share their own responsibilities and decisions with the entire personnel; in the way that students join in curriculum planning, rule-making, and school activities; in the way that the whole school radiates its influence through the community by utilizing resources, by influencing civic policy, by drawing adults into its program.

Many of these efforts, while they have by no means succeeded in transforming the entire traditional pattern, are bearing rich educational fruits. Not only have countless schools been modified. Other organizations of large membership have increasingly advocated and stimulated educational experimentation of kinds which were often initiated by the American Education Fellowship. This is not at all to assert, of course, that the AEF is solely responsible for recent progress toward a more workable conception of democratic education; what is asserted is that, in addition to its own very
considerable responsibility, school leaders everywhere have of late been converging more and more toward the major objectives which it first clearly formulated in America. The AEF welcomes this convergence wholeheartedly; it will not only continue to exert its own efforts in behalf of more democratic schools as it has defined them, it will seek to cooperate with all other educational groups dedicated to their establishment.

But the historic role of the AEF as a spearhead organization, is no longer fulfilled sufficiently by these types of effort. The degree of consensus about the criteria of sound public education in a democracy is now sufficiently large, at least in principle, so that many of the experiments which were earlier quite unique, even heretical, are no longer so regarded. Since accordingly we may predict that, given enough time and financial support, American education will move forward along the lines earlier advocated, the question arises whether the AEF has completed its pioneering work—whether its membership and resources could not now better be utilized by dissemination among other organizations larger and richer. This is not only an honest question at the present juncture, it is crucial.

It is crucial, however, not merely or even chiefly because upon its answer depends the further existence of the AEF. Organizations of this sort, like others, can in no sense justify themselves merely because they have had an honorable career, or because many loyal members would feel sad if they dissolved. No, the answer is crucial because America and the world have entered a new period in their evolution—a period which creates unprecedented educational tasks because it generates unprecedented problems of great magnitude and danger. In an important sense, indeed, the responsibilities which education faces today and tomorrow are vastly more serious, more compelling, than after the first World War. Whether the schools will assume their responsibility remains uncertain. That they have the obligation to do so, is, however, utterly certain. And it is precisely this obligation which provides the imperative for a reconstituted and rededicated organizational frontier.

The American Education Fellowship can and must therefore become this kind of organization. It can and must prove to teachers, parents, students, administrators, and to the public, that never in history has civilization itself been in greater jeopardy. At the same time, it can and must demonstrate that the opportunity is available to empower education, as never before, with vision and strength on behalf of a peaceful and humane world for the masses of mankind. Here is the vanguard task of the American Education Fellowship in the quarter-century we are now entering.

II

To examine and specify the main characteristics of this period should be one of the first lines of responsibility of the new AEF. That is, it should assist education on every level to understand how fraught with tension, friction, and overt conflict are both our domestic and international relations. Nothing short of the utmost realism and forthrightness will help citizens—young and old alike—to reorganize the depth, breadth, and obstinacy of
contemporary problem. The habit of much education still to gloss over these problems because controversial or complex, still to ignore training in propaganda analysis and other techniques essential to their understanding, is proof enough that here alone the AEF could make a tremendous contribution.

The complexities of the social, political, and economic relations of this period should not, moreover, be an excuse for denying that they gravitate around two fundamental and related facts. The first is the fact of an unstable and precarious economy, with its accomplishment of insecurity, inflation, its cycles of boom-and-bust. The second is the fact of national rivalry and hostility with their potential of atomic war accompanied by the horrors of destruction and death on a scale never before imagined.

Yet despite their indisputability, neither of these factors receives a fraction of the attention that education, ostensibly devoted to freedom and truth, should be giving them. To consider the first a moment further, memories are not so short, of course as to forget the economic events following World War I--the years of reckless prosperity and high living, of growing corporate power and disparities of wealth, followed by years of devastating depression, hunger and fear. During the 'thirties' some American educators became sufficiently concerned to voice their anger at this tragedy through the pages especially of one journal, THE SOCIAL FRONTIER, and through the volumes especially of the Commission of the Social Studies; (American Historical Association.) They courageously analyzed the failures of a system which could cause such havoc, and they demanded thorough going changes to eliminate those failures. Yet, as the depression waned and we became preoccupied with winning World War II, even their voices softened to a whisper. It was almost as though those theorists were right who have said that education is always chiefly a reflector of the social order--rather than a critic, leader, and re-creator of social order and culture. At the present moment, it is true that no section of American education is calling attention strongly and clearly to the fact that the prosperity of this decade is, in no essential way, different from that of the 'twenties'--that again we are living and spending recklessly, allowing big business free rein, permitting further concentrations of economic power, building a top-heavy profit structure which, if it rises unchecked, will again inevitably crash.

In only one great respect--though a most crucial one--the present decade differs from the 'twenties'. While America seems to have learned little from its recent economic experience, other parts of the world have learned much. All over the earth powerful movements of the common people are demanding that these absurd and destructive fluctuations of the industrial system should end--that public controls be exerted over economic processes of sufficient strength and rationality to guarantee stability, much greater equalization of wealth, and the securities of a rising standard of living which the proven potentialities of abundance make entirely feasible. America is too much out of step with the world. Yet her position is of such power and strategic importance that, if and when another and worse depression comes, she will shake and probably undermine many economic institutions elsewhere. Here, too, are facts which education ignores at its own peril and the world's.
The second fact—national rivalry and suspicion—receives, to be sure, a modicum of analysis in the schools. The roots of this terrifying reality, themselves largely economic, are seldom exposed, however, to the sunlight of honest scrutiny, and the solution of international order is too often treated both romantically and superficially. Once more the record of the past quarter-century is helpful; in the 'twenties', thousands of schools studied the League of Nations and propagated in behalf of peace. But they usually failed to show how any League was bound to fail sooner or later so long as national sovereignty remained intact, so long as bitter competition for foreign markets and natural resources was practiced by the same nations which hypocritically paid lip-service to internationalism. Thus when war came again, the disillusionment of millions of young men and women was in no small way the only clear effect of all efforts by the schools on behalf of peace.

And yet today it is important to inquire whether the only important "contribution" they are making is not, again, chiefly a repetition of the past. They may study and endorse the United Nations, to be sure; and that is helpful. But they seldom face the contradiction between highminded objectives for all nations and the still dominant power of sovereignty of each nation. Students are taught that internationalism is desirable; they are also taught that the United States is supreme in its own right. They are taught that all countries must co-operate; they are also taught that we should keep the secret of atomic energy. They are taught that we should support the efforts of common peoples in other parts of the world to rise in power; they are also taught to be uncritical of a foreign policy which serves to thwart those efforts in countries like Greece, China, and Spain. They are taught the slogans of equality, freedom, and brotherhood; yet millions of them are taught (if in no other way than by failing to study alternatives) that the white race is superior to other races, that Christians are superior to Mohammedans or Jews.

III

Inasmuch as the forces that shape society are those that determine education as well, educators must understand what is taking place in the community, and must take stands as adult citizens on controversial issues of the day. It is their right and duty to participate in active political life.

As a result of the analysis made in Sections I and II, we are of the opinion that two great constructive purposes have first claim on our active support:

1. The reconstruction of the economic system in the direction of greater social justice and stability: a system to be secured by whatever democratic planning and social controls experience shows to be necessary; a system in which social security and a guaranteed annual wage sufficient to meet scientific standards of nourishment, shelter, clothing, health, recreation and education are universalized; a system in which the will of the majority with due regard for the interests of all the people is the sovereign determinant of every basic economic policy.

2. The establishment of a genuine world order, an order in which
national sovereignty is subordinate to world authority in crucial interests affecting peace and security; an order therefore in which all weapons of war and police forces are finally under that authority; an order in which international economic coordination of trade, resources, labor, distribution and standards is practiced parallel with the best standards of individual nations; an order which must be geared with the increasing socializations and public controls now developing in England, Sweden, New Zealand and certain other countries; an order in which all nationals, races and religions receive equal rights; an order in which "world citizenship" thus assumes at least equal status with national citizenship.

IV

In implementing the above outlook, in teaching practice, there should be no attempt to indoctrinate for any political party or for any given economic system. It is vital to maintain democratic and intelligent discussion and decision but also to make sure that the process will lead to conclusions. This can only be done by an informed teacher who has convictions of his own--convictions which he does not foist upon students but which at appropriate age levels he shares with them. The task is to experiment with techniques of learning through social agreement, not by superimposing prejudices. Only thus can majority rule eventually become rule by an informed majority who understand what they want and how democratically, to get what they want. The school should become a center of experimentation in attaining communities of uncoerced persuasion.

The two great guiding principles which we have formulated previously, involve a multitude of specific educational tasks to which the American Education Fellowship should now devote itself. Their precise delineation should involve every member, and the closest cooperation with all groups and forces which share generally in its purposes. In this statement of policy, it is possible only to suggest that some of these tasks may be.
1. A subject of first importance in the reconstructed curriculum must be the study of evolving economic and political systems characterized by developments both in our own country and in other countries.
2. Of great importance also is the study of both the successes and failures of present attempts to move toward a genuine world order.
3. As indicated in section II, there is desperate need to prepare realistic materials regarding the economic system, and for skill in penetrating propaganda.
4. There is need to develop consciousness in students, teachers, administrators, and other citizens of the meaning and content of the values which govern new social purposes.
5. There is need for extensive educational practice in building detailed social designs which come to grips with problems arising in, for example, economic planning. Intensive study of experiments and institutions already under way, such as the Tennessee Valley Authority, the postal system, the consumer cooperative movement, the social security programs of America and Europe, are examples. Psychological problems such as motivations and incentives; political problems such as bureaucracy and reorganization of state and federal governments; social problems such as family life and the role of women; economic problems such as the place of private property in an evolving
democracy: the problems of civil rights such as those raised by the Presidents Committee on Civil Rights—these are equally important.

6. There is pressing need for a new conception of discipline—intellectual, moral and social—which can be developed in schools governed by the evolving purposes of a democratic society.

7. Contributions of the arts and sciences should be examined and integrated with the social studies. Community planning, the development of community theatres and symphony orchestras, the social potentialities of science for health, home designing, communication and transportation, are but sample illustrations.

8. The full import of the concept of "One World" and of "World citizenship" requires extended attention. Such complex problems as the retention of legitimate cultural variety by a country committed to inter-national order should be explored, as should such issues as immigration, international educational and health standards, atomic control, worldwide exchange of students and teachers. Study of the present structure of the United Nations should be supplemented by exploration of the improvements needed to strengthen that structure both in regard to police power and socio-economic leadership.

9. Equally extended attention should be paid to the problem of intercultural relations within nations. The status of minorities such as the Negro or Jew should be realistically studied, and the meaning of cultural equality clearly understood. Cooperation with organizations such as the Bureau for Inter-cultural Education should be greatly expanded.

10. Close cooperation with educational movements of other countries working toward similar objectives, is imperative. The most promising of these for the American Education Fellowship is, of course, the New Education Fellowship, of which the AEF is already a section. It should work much more intimately with the NEF, not only in order to benefit by the advances of some sections which are moving ahead of the American section in their economic and political orientation, but also in order to lend its full support to experimental movements in countries less advanced educationally. Wide circulation of the NEF journal, New Era, should be encouraged in America, and contributions to it by American educators should be frequent. Active representatives of the AEF should function on the NEF board of officers, and should attend important official meetings without fail.

11. The AEF should sponsor an international NEF conference in the United States within one year. This conference should have represented educators from as many countries as possible, should raise the most fundamental and controversial issues of economic planning and world order, should meet in a series of cities across the continent, and should include large numbers of laymen as well as teachers. In addition, city and regional conferences on a smaller scale, and many new chapters should place the new policy before as large an American audience as possible.

12. The AEF should involve itself in the work of other education-organizations and seek to influence them to experiment with its new materials and methods. The most important of these at present is UNESCO, which is only beginning to operate and accordingly is weak. Influential representatives of the AEF should become affiliated with UNESCO, help to expand and strengthen its program, push for recognition by the United Nations of the need to lift UNESCO above the present purely advisory status. Cooperation with the United States Office of Education is also important, looking toward crystallization of its own objectives and toward the provision of more authority to assist
to assist in improving the public schools. The National Education Association, American Federation of Teachers, Association for Childhood Education, and American Association for Adult Education should learn of the new AEF program, and should consider its reformulated ends and means just as they have done during the earlier period of AEF history.

13. Support for the democratic potentialities of the labor movement, the consumer cooperative movement, quasi-political groups of sufficiently similar intent is important. This cooperation should be in two directions; participation by AEF members in their activities with the aim of improving their own educational services; participation by their members in the AEF with the aim of improving its services and influence.

14. The editorial content of Progressive Education, should be explicitly geared to these purposes. It should give much more consideration to fundamental analysis of social, economic, political, scientific, aesthetic, and philosophic issues arising from them, and it should assist teachers in putting AEF purposes and methods to work by providing actual materials and examples of where and how it is being done.

V

In making these important recommendations, the American Education Fellowship will continue, it should be reiterated, to support the kind of experimentation for which it is most famous. It will continue to emphasize "learning by doing," "community schools," "the integrating curriculum," "teacher-pupil planning," "child development," and other objectives of "progressive education" as these now become more widely accepted. These types of experimentation should emphasize the social-emotional development of children and adolescents, and parent education.

But such objectives are now subordinate even while indispensable to, the larger, more audacious and magnetic objectives impelled by a World in crisis. Faced by the alternatives of economic chaos and atomic war, on the one hand, of world-wide plenty and enforceable international order, on the other hand, this organization should become the clearest, most purposeful educational spokesman for the second of these alternatives. Thus, and only thus, can it become even more the great vanguard influence which it has been for nearly three decades—an influence which, as before, is certain to extend far beyond its own membership and even its own country.