

research quality” called for by the What Works Clearinghouse?

Conrad says that the framework is invoking neuroscience literature “in misleading ways” to promote “pseudo-scientific claims” about progressive-education math instruction improving pathways in the brain. The framework wrongly cites a paper to promote the general use of “invented strategies” (that is, students devising their own strategies) as a proven approach to learning standard algorithms.

Conrad finds that the framework distorts citations in a way that indicates “an ideological (rather than evidence-based) opposition to acceleration.” He points out that “there is extensive literature with conclusions opposite” that cited in the framework, “but these are barely ever mentioned.”

As Wurman and I have written before:

State-adopted education programs and recommendations are supposed to be “research-based.” This does not just mean an article or 2 in a peer-reviewed journal. It means there is a consensus or strong evidence of effectiveness in the published research. If no strong evidence exists, a practice should not be broadly recommended. . . .

If the framework writers had wanted solid evidence, they would have relied on the final report and subgroup reports of the 2008 federal National Mathematics Advisory Panel. They would have made even more use of the federal Institute of Education Sciences practice guides, which are designed for teachers and curriculum writers.

3. REJECTION OF ALGEBRA I IN 8TH GRADE

The revised framework rejects (as did its earlier iterations) the time-honored aim of preparing students to take Algebra I in eighth grade. Eighth-grade algebra is the policy in high-performing foreign countries whose inhabitants will compete with America’s children in the future—and that eighth-grade goal was expressly part of the 1999 and 2006 California math frameworks. This current framework recommends ninth grade as when almost all students should take Algebra I.

Students who plan to go to selective colleges and universities or who plan to major in STEM fields in college need to pass calculus in high school. Taking algebra in eighth grade allows them to do so.

Education journalist John Fensterwald points out that:

To discourage widespread enrollment in eighth-grade algebra, the framework’s diagram laying out STEM and non-STEM course pathways omits eighth-grade algebra as an option.

There are possible (but laborious and bureaucratically troublesome) workarounds for STEM-inclined students, like double-booking math classes in one year. But the system is not friendly to the workarounds, and they are discouraging to students. As Conrad points out, the framework authors (who are ideologically opposed to acceleration) had three years to come up with a way to accommodate those who need to take calculus in high school, but they didn’t do it.

The recent effort in San Francisco Unified to make all students take Algebra I in ninth grade, was, as Conrad points out, “a total failure, exacerbating the very inequities it aimed to prevent.”

4. SUBSTITUTION OF WEAK DATA SCIENCE FOR RIGOROUS ALGEBRA II

The framework promotes the idea of students taking math-lite data science courses instead of Algebra II. Students who take such math-lite courses will be ill-prepared for math and other STEM courses when they get to college.

In his report on an earlier draft of the math framework, Conrad says of the pro-

motion of these data science classes: “Whatever author is responsible for such a myopic view of mathematics should never again be involved in the setting of public policy guidance on math education.”

5. KNEE-JERK OPPOSITION TO TRACKING AND ACCELERATION

I have previously mentioned the framework’s opposition to acceleration. It also opposes tracking. As Conrad points out, the framework uses “citation misrepresentations” to promote its “anti-tracking narrative” of heterogeneously-grouped classrooms at all levels.”

Homogeneously-grouped classrooms allow teachers to work more effectively without the need to teach students who are at widely different levels. Students can be evaluated on their achievements in different subjects and placed in accelerated classes only in the subjects where they excel. This avoids the misplacements inherent in across-the-board multi-subject tracking. The framework displays an ideological rather than empirical opposition to ability grouping.

6. CLASSES IN WOKENESS INSTEAD OF MATH

In Chapter 2, the framework pushes teaching methods in math class that emphasize radically egalitarian “social justice” goals. Not only is radical egalitarianism ethically dubious, but math class should be for math, not for political indoctrination.

For example, the current framework contends that mathematics is to be used to “both understand and impact the world.” It argues that math teachers should hold the political position that “mathematics plays a role in the power structures and privileges that exist within our society and can support action and positive change.”

Furthermore, according to this official California framework, teachers should use mathematics politically “to analyze and discuss issues of fairness and justice.” In an elementary school classroom, teachers would, for example, have students “studying counting and comparing to understand fairness” in the context of current and historical events.

The framework recommends the fringy methods of “trauma-informed pedagogy,” which encourage students to suggest “recommendations and taking action.” Teachers should also, it says, provide “curricular examples” that provide students with a mathematical toolkit and mindset “to identify and combat inequities.” According to the framework, students are “to use mathematics to highlight inequities.” Then they should learn to use mathematics to transform the world—a rather inappropriate task for math class.

CONCLUSION

There are close to 6 million students in California. What is done in California public schools influences practices in the rest of the country. Parents and taxpayers want math to be taught sensibly. It’s just a scientific reality that children need to learn math facts and standard algorithms. This current California counterproductive math instructional framework will produce a repeat of the Math Wars of the 1990s or a deeper rebellion against public schools and in favor of parental choice.

RECOGNIZING THE PATRIOTISM OF JEWS DURING THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

HON. BRIAN K. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 2023

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the contributions of a scholarly article recently published by the Jewish Review of Books, titled “When Freedom Began to Ring.” Authored by Paul Finkelman and South-Eastern Pennsylvanian Lance J. Sussman, this article explores how the patriotism of Jews during the American Revolution contributed to political equality and a national policy of religious liberty in the newly formed nation. Religious liberty is a critical component to our identity as Americans and this research highlights the important contributions of Jews in shaping this culture of religious tolerance in our Republic. I include in the RECORD the full article by Paul Finkelman and Lance J. Sussman.

WHEN FREEDOM BEGAN TO RING

(By Paul Finkelman and Lance J. Sussman)

In his famous 1790 letter to the Jewish community of Newport, Rhode Island, George Washington wrote that “the Government of the United States, which gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance, requires only that they who live under its protection should demean themselves as good citizens, in giving it on all occasions their effectual support.” These words were not the kind of quid pro quo sometimes offered by European Enlightenment leaders of the time to Jews; it was not an implicit warning that they ought to behave themselves if they wanted to be tolerated.

President Washington, under whose leadership many Jews had fought during the Revolutionary War, was simply recognizing that America only required of its Jews what it required of all its citizens. At the founding, America was already not a Christian nation, and this was in large part because of its Jews.

Everywhere else in the world, prior to the American Revolution, Jews were disfranchised, politically isolated, and vulnerable. Even where they were relatively secure, such as in England, they were not full citizens. In 1775, on the eve of the Revolutionary War, English Jews could not vote, serve on juries, serve in Parliament, be military officers, attend a university, engage in some businesses, become barristers, or practice some other professions. Jewish immigrants had to pay special “alien” taxes forever, because they could not naturalize. And as aliens, immigrant Jews were prohibited from owning real estate or seagoing vessels, and from engaging in colonial or foreign trade.

Things had been somewhat better in England’s North American colonies, where momentum toward full equality built as the Revolution grew nearer, in part because of Jewish support for the patriot cause. In 1765, ten Jewish merchants in New York City, along with nearly two hundred Christian businessmen, signed a non-importation agreement to boycott British goods. Jewish merchants in Philadelphia and Newport, signed similar agreements. Others, most famously Haym Salomon, joined the Sons of Liberty. Gershom Mendes Seixas, the spiritual leader of New York’s Shearith Israel—the first synagogue in what became the United States—actively supported Independence. In 1774, Francis Salvador had won a

seat in South Carolina's Provincial Congress. He was reelected in 1776, thus becoming the first Jewish elected public official in the new United States. He served until he was killed in battle that August.

Most Jews in New York, Philadelphia, Newport, Charleston, and Savannah—where the Revolution was brewing—joined the cause early. In doing so, they staked their claim to political equality as a right, not a set of privileges to be granted.

As they did nowhere in Europe, Jews served as officers in the patriot armies. Mordecai Sheftall, a Savannah businessman, was a full colonel, then the third highest rank in the American army. David Salisbury Franks rose to the rank of Lieutenant Colonel, served as a diplomat to France and Morocco during the war, and later became the assistant cashier of the Bank of the United States. Solomon Bush, whose father had signed a non-importation agreement, ended the war as a Lieutenant Colonel and the deputy adjutant-general of the Pennsylvania militia. His younger brother, Captain Lewis Bush, died in combat. There were no Jewish officers in the British army or among the Hessian mercenaries during the Revolutionary War. (However, Alexander Zuntz, a Hessian civilian commissary, served as the Hazzan of Shearith Israel congregation while the British occupied New York City. Impressed with American religious liberty, he stayed in New York after the war, and eventually became president of the synagogue.)

In the independent United States, every new state constitution granted Jews the right to vote, though nine of the first eleven of them originally limited office holding to Protestants or Christians. A few states retained established churches or special state benefits for some faiths. Religious tests for office directly denied Jews full political equality. These state establishments did not deny Jews religious liberty or legal rights, but they made them (and members of other non-favored faiths) less than equal citizens. This situation, however, was not destined to last very long.

When Pennsylvania's 1776 constitution, for instance, required state legislators to "acknowledge the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be given by Divine inspiration," the state's Jews protested. Members of Philadelphia's Congregation Mikveh Israel studied and annotated all state constitutions, noting where Jews faced discrimination, and then published letters in newspapers calling attention to the new constitutions' objectionable features. In late 1783, Philadelphia's Jewish leaders petitioned the Pennsylvania government to allow Jews to hold public office. Seven years later, Pennsylvania's new constitution removed the religious test for office holding.

In 1787 Congress, operating under the Articles of Confederation, passed the Northwest Ordinance, the forerunner of subsequent laws regulating the settlement of western territories and the creation of new states. The Ordinance provided for "extending the fundamental principles of civil and religious liberty" in the national territories. Written before the Constitution, this was the first national guarantee of religious freedom. The Confederation Congress, which included no Jews and only the occasional Catholic, could have easily established some kind of non-denominational Protestantism or Christianity. But it did not do such thing.

In that same year, on behalf of Congregation Mikveh Israel, Revolutionary War veteran Jonas Phillips wrote to George Washington, who was then serving as the presiding officer of the Constitutional Convention, requesting the Convention protect Jewish political rights. As it turned out, the Convention had already agreed to prohibit

religious tests for office holding, but the willingness of Philadelphia Jews to lobby for their rights further illustrates American Jewry's newfound boldness.

On July 4, 1788, Philadelphia held a parade to celebrate the ratification of the new constitution. The Grand Federal Procession was led by an interfaith group of clergymen, including a rabbi, their arms interlocked. Later, when George Washington took the first presidential oath of office in New York City, Hazzan Gershom Mendes Seixas joined other clergy from the city as a witness.

The First Amendment, ratified in 1791, confirmed the right of religious free exercise for all Americans and guaranteed separation of church and state. Under the Constitution, Jews held federal offices, even where they could not hold offices under existing state constitutions. Thus, in 1801 President Thomas Jefferson appointed Reuben Eting to be the US marshal in Maryland, even though he would not have been allowed to hold any office under that state's constitution until 1826. Joel Hart and Mordecai Manuel Noah served as diplomats under Jefferson and Madison. Noah was later the sheriff of New York City, the "boss" of Tammany Hall, and a local judge.

The Constitution did not preclude individual states from barring Jews from public office. Maryland, Massachusetts, and New Jersey repealed these rules before the Civil War, while North Carolina did so during Reconstruction. New Hampshire finally abolished the practice in 1877. Nor could the constitutional expansion of Jewish rights end social antisemitism. Antisemitism, rooted in Christian theology, nationalisms, bigotry, private fears and ignorance, and the rantings of demagogues and conspiracy theorists, will, of course, never be abolished by government decree. A political system can regulate behavior and even promote tolerance, but cannot end private intolerance and hatred. In the Old World, however, anti-Jewish prejudice was often encouraged, supported, or even mandated, by governments. In America, from the outset, the law was on the Jews' side.

Furthermore, America's unprecedented acceptance of the Jews helped to induce other western nations, including Revolutionary France and mid-nineteenth-century Great Britain, to grant Jews similar rights, although the process in both countries was piecemeal, halting, and incomplete for many years. In Britain, for example, Lionel Rothschild won multiple elections to Parliament starting in 1847 but was unable to take his seat until 1859, after the Jews Relief Act had been passed. Full Jewish political equality in Britain was not achieved until 1871.

As we approach the 250th anniversary of the American Revolution, on July 4, 2026, it is important to recall how the patriotism of Jews led to their political equality and a national policy of religious liberty. The United States became the first western nation to prohibit any religious test for national public office, have no national or official faith, have no laws restricting Jewish secular life or religious observance, and allow for freedom of worship and belief on a broad national scale.

When George Washington wrote to the Newport Jewish community, this process was not yet complete, but the holdouts were few and relatively insignificant. The Revolutionary era set the stage for the ensuing two and a half centuries of Jewish flourishing in a country where, to return again to the words of Washington's historic letter, minorities enjoy religious freedom not because mere tolerance has been extended to them but because "all possess alike liberty of conscience and immunities of citizenship."

HONORING UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH CHANCELLOR PATRICK GALLAGHER ON HIS RETIREMENT AFTER A DECADE OF SERVICE

HON. SUMMER L. LEE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 2023

Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Patrick Gallagher of Pittsburgh, PA.

After nearly a decade serving as Chancellor of the University of Pittsburgh, a tenure that included tremendous gains in Pitt's academic profile and demand, solidified the University's role as a community partner and anchor, and elevated Pitt's research stature, impact, and activity to near-peerless echelons of excellence, Mr. Gallagher will step down on July 15, 2023.

Over the course of Mr. Gallagher's Chancellorship, he enhanced the University of Pittsburgh's reputation as an economic engine for Pennsylvania. One out of every 32 Pennsylvania workers earns their degree from Pitt, resulting in \$5.2 billion in economic impact during his time. He has also positioned Pitt to continue this record, shaping the University's future through facilities like The Assembly, Pitt BioForge, and Victory Heights.

These future projects are part and parcel of Mr. Gallagher's commitment to the University's student body. Pitt student-athletes flourished under Patrick Gallagher's watch, earning 4 ACC championships in volleyball, 2 College Cup appearances for men's soccer, 1 conference championship in football, and 1 national wrestling championship. And while the University's applications for admission rose to record highs under his tenure, he ensured that tuition rates would remain affordable for Pennsylvanians through Pitt's strong relationship with the Commonwealth.

Under Mr. Gallagher's leadership, the University provided unprecedented support to its world-class researchers and its surrounding community. Today, the University ranks third in the country in terms of funding from the National Institutes of Health and secured its status and is one of just 24 universities nationwide to reach and exceed \$1 billion in sponsored research expenditures.

With these numerous accomplishments, Mr. Gallagher departs with the sincere appreciation and respect of the Board of Trustees as well as the admiration of Pitt's administration, faculty, staff, students, and alumni. Now, therefore, let it be proclaimed that the retirement of Chancellor Patrick D. Gallagher by celebrated and commended by all for exemplary leadership and remarkable contributions to higher education in Pennsylvania.