

Forcing God Out Of The Schools

It's The Soviet Way

By ✦ J. F. N.

751281

Forcing God Out Of The Schools

It's The Soviet Way

**OUR SUNDAY VISITOR LIBRARY
HUNTINGTON, INDIANA**

Published in U. S. A.

By

OUR SUNDAY VISITOR PRESS

Huntington, Indiana



Deacidified

Brief History Of The Movement To Rob Education Of Religion

When is a School truly American?

IS it one from which religion must by law be excluded, or which may not, in any way, cooperate with religion? If it is, then the schools from colonial days through the school days of Abraham Lincoln were not only un-American but anti-American. If religion has no place in education, then Harvard and Yale and Princeton and a dozen leading universities of our day were built on an anti-American foundation, because their origin was religious, and because, even to this day, they teach courses in theology.

For a long time after the present school system was established most teachers were also Sunday School teachers, and were able, through the schools, to recruit their religious classes in the churches. But a strange evolution has taken place in the schools since that time, as one can note from headlines which appear with great regularity in the daily newspapers. On a single day recently a newspaper carried these headlines:

“Board of Education, Baltimore, Takes Action against Reds Teaching in City Schools”; “Communists Throughout the World Must Fight the Teaching of Religion in Schools”; “Communist Government in Hungary will Nationalize All Schools and Outlaw the Teaching of Religion”; “Board of Church of the Brethren Deplores Action of Supreme Court Endangering Released Time Instruction.”

Twenty-five years ago, when the “International Sunday School Council of Religious Education” deplored the fact that 27,000,000 children were receiving no religious instruction whatsoever either in the day school or Sunday school, editors of American newspapers seemed to receive a shock and attributed the growing juvenile delinquency of that time to the utter lack of religious and moral training. Then the following year *Collier's* polled the American people to ascertain what they would like to have the schools do about it. And on November 1, 1924, its editor wrote:

“Judges, financiers, doctors, psychologists, editors, farmers, laborers, teachers, lawyers, penitentiary officials, detectives, traveling men, government officials, politicians, plain folks—Catholics, Jews and Protestants—fathers and mothers—their letters lie in huge envelopes in *Collier's* editorial rooms. Nearly all say they

are deeply interested. It would seem as if each had been waiting for someone to say what they all knew . . .

"It seems as if it had been on the tip of America's tongue to say what *Collier's* has printed about the lack of moral training for our children.

"Suppose an enemy had secretly turned poison-gas streams into the school houses of America and were slowly, day by day, wearing down the health of our children. Suppose a scientist analyzed the air in the school rooms and gave warning of the danger. The people would hardly respond more energetically than they have responded to *Collier's* disclosure of the danger that confronts the country because of the lack of moral training in the public schools."

But it seems that nobody felt that it was his job to crystallize the longings of the American people. Hence since that time 30,000,000 more youths have gone through school without learning the A.B.C.'s of religion and morals.

In fact, it would seem that the publicizing of this poll so irritated enemies of the Church that they decided it was not enough for the American school to be merely neutral, it must be anti-religious. Textbooks were written by professors of Social Sciences at Columbia for introduction into the schools for the purpose of subverting not only the Christian but the American way of life. A summer course for teachers was introduced at Columbia, attended, according to its own publication, by as many as 10,000 teachers at a time, from every part of the United States. The Master of Arts Degree which they sought was available only to those who took that course.

Communists saw an opportunity to indoctrinate these teachers, and indirectly the children whom they would instruct. In Volume I, number three, of the *Educational Vanguard*, published by "The Teachers College and Columbia Units of the Communist Party," we read:

"The Communists at Teachers College are faculty members, staff, office and service workers and graduate students.

"Contrary to the William Randolph Hearst stereotype, the Teachers College Communists are not 'wild-eyed foreigners imported from Moscow'; nor are they 'termites seeking to undermine our nation's schools.'

"Ninety-five per cent of the membership of the Party at Teachers College are native born Americans from all sections of the United States, with a majority of them coming from the Middle West and South."

In the August 10, 1936 number of this same publication the following appeal was made to teachers:

"In a few days more than 10,000 teachers, principals and superintendents, will get into bus or train and return to every section of the United States. The Communist units at Teachers College and Columbia join in wishing every student of the summer session a memorable trip home.

"To many, this publication undoubtedly was the first direct contact with the Communist Party. Perhaps the *Vanguard* and the *University of the Street* have made you just a bit more conscious of many wrongs, and of the necessity for organization to correct these injustices.

"When you return to your home town, wherever that may be, join the Communist Party."

When an effort was begun to organize the more radical-minded teachers into a Teachers' Union in 1916 "The American Federation of Teachers" was chartered by the American Federation of Labor. By the year 1936 the Red Party had pretty much control of that organization as we learn from the press reporting proceedings at the Philadelphia Convention that year:

"At that Convention a place was refused in the Assembly Hall to the American flag, while a huge red banner was displayed.

"Orvel Johnson, Lt. Col., a member of the Bar of Oklahoma, wrote at the time: 'Socialist, Communist and Communist-Controlled organizations surged in the convention hall with their elaborate displays of subversive and inflammatory literature. Thousands of pieces of printed matter, frankly subversive of American institutions, were furnished the teacher-delegates to be disturbed back home.'"

The American Federation of Teachers that year elected as its President Jerome Davis, author of the work entitled "Studies of Soviet Russia," published by the Communist Vanguard Press.

The Convention denounced Congressman Blanton, of Texas, who had said on the floor of the House that there exists "a conspiracy or plot to Sovietize school children throughout the nation." This Congressman also called attention to textbooks used in the schools, notably those of Professor Harold Rugg. Since that time Dr. Rugg's books have been widely used, and during the late war, when our country was an ally of Soviet Russia, it was very common for movies, which glorified Soviet Russia and belittled our form of government, to be shown in the public schools.

As late as August, 1948, John W. Studebaker resigned as United States Education Commission because he alleged: "The Federal Security Administrator tried to 'tone down' my anti-Communist campaign in the public schools of the United States." Studebaker's charges were contained in a lengthy letter sent by

him to Representative Keefe of Wisconsin and Senator Noland, of California. Studebaker also declared that the office of the F. S. A. objected to an anti-Communist speech he delivered at the University of California last March because it would "bring unfavorable reaction from a large number of educators."

Because anti-Catholic organizations direct their assaults against the Catholic Church, it is easy for them to win the cooperation of a prejudiced Protestant ministry, and to procure active support from the editors of sectarian magazines, who are more anti-Catholic than they are anti-Communist or anti-atheist. We were not surprised, therefore, when clergymen who had a long record of antipathy towards Rome and of sympathy towards Moscow, were inveigled into cooperation with one part of the Communist campaign, namely, to check the influence of the Catholic Church in the American nation and in the world.

You will recall how seven leading ministers and editors visited Marshal Tito at his own invitation and expense, and how most of these same persons and others formed an organization known as "Protestants and Other Americans United for the Separation of Church and State," and under that slogan worked with the Atheist and Freethinker organizations for the abolition of religious instruction from the public schools, and for similar instruction under released time.

The first communication sent by this organization to members of Congress and to members of all state legislatures then in session was accompanied by a pamphlet entitled "Shadow Over Our Schools," whose purpose was to convey to those who make our laws the glaring falsehood that the Catholic Church has designs on the public schools, would destroy them if it could, and is striving to place its teachers in public schools for the purpose of proselytizing students. The letter accompanying this pamphlet sent from the Washington office read as follows:

"Busy as you are, won't you please read carefully the enclosed startling story of 'Shadows Over Our Schools.'

"This situation is repeated widely in varied ways in many places in the land. Public funds in aid of education, both Federal and State, should be used in strict adherence to the Constitutional principle of separation of church and state.

"This letter is not arguing pro or con for the bill passed by the Senate (Taft, S. 472), or the pending House bill (McCowan, H. R. 2953). We do urge such construction of this legislation as will assure that church and state stay separate.

"With highest respect for you personally, and feeling certain

of the careful attention the Congress will give this vital matter, I am on behalf of millions in America,

“Yours sincerely,

“J. M. Dawson”

About the seven clergymen who visited Yugoslavia, Ruben H. Markham, writing in *The New Leader*, October 4, 1947, observed: “These Protestant preachers did not go to see how the few Yugoslavian Protestants were getting along . . . They were told by Tito’s agents in America that if they went to see Tito they could get something on Catholics.”

Patriots?

Dr. Edwin McNeill Poteat, head of the “Protestants and Other Americans United for the Separation of Church and State,” was only recently (August, 1948) mentioned in a report (No. 1115) issued by the House Committee on un-American Activities. He was a member of the initiating committee of the Communist-front Civil Rights Congress, which put up bond for Red leaders indicted only a year previously. He and the Methodist Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, Dr. J. A. Mackay, President of Princeton Theological Seminary, Dr. L. D. Newton, President of the Southern Baptist Convention, and Dr. Clayton Morrison, former editor of *The Christian Century*, were signers of the Manifesto issued by “Protestants and Other Americans, etc.”

One of these gentlemen only recently joined 200 ministers in calling on the youth of our nation to refuse a draft summons, and recommended that all young men presently serving in the army and navy resign.

A long-time apologist for “Separation of Church and State” and an equally long-time antagonist of all schools other than the public, is *The New Age*, official organ of the Scottish Rite Freemasonry 33° Southern Jurisdiction. This organization claims the credit for having organized a movement to make attendance at public school compulsory in Oregon, California and Michigan, and if success had been obtained in these states would have private schools throughout the nation closed by law. It won in the State of Oregon, but the Supreme Court of the United States declared the Oregon law unconstitutional.

In the latest number (August, 1948) the editor of *The New Age*, after saying that the Catholic schools could not exist if their teachers were better paid, observed: “If this condition continues it is a mathematical certainty that, unless the Roman Catholic Hierarchy can get its hands in the public treasury for maintenance of the Catholic schools, Roman Catholic children will be forced back into the public schools.”

It recently carried an article designed to show that Catholic schools produce more criminals proportionately than do the public schools. It cited the Missouri State Penitentiary whose inmate personnel, it claimed, was 95% Catholic. But the chaplain of this institution, in refutation, pointed out that there are 275 Catholics among 3,000 prisoners in that penitentiary, which is 9.2% and not 95%. Of the 275 Catholic prisoners, there are only 90, according to the chaplain, who received any training in a Catholic school, and these 3% spent only from one to three years there. In fact, 69 men in that prison, who expressed their preference for the Catholic religion, had never been Catholics.

Father Schlattmann, chaplain of the prison to which reference is made in the *New Age*, declared that it would be more correct to say that 95% of the inmates have no religion at all—and his observation corresponds to conclusions promulgated by judges in many courts after personal interviews with juvenile delinquents.

Widely circulated is a "Bulletin—Friends of the Public Schools," in nearly every issue of which the Catholic school is denounced and the Catholic Hierarchy criticized without any warrant whatsoever.

All Not That Way

Of course, we would not leave the impression that the entire Protestant ministry, much less the entire Protestant body in the United States, approves of Communism or atheism or even of religious prejudice in the public schools; or that those among them who know the parochial schools are in opposition to it. Hardly had "Protestants and Other Americans United" been formed when twenty-four Protestant clergymen, leaders in their respective denominations, criticized that organization as well as the Supreme Court of the United States for "its interpretation of the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States." They prepared a statement which differed greatly from the "Protestant Manifesto." Its text reads as follows:

"Recent decisions of the Supreme Court have extended the meaning of the constitutional prohibition of an establishment of religion so that any action by the state that is intended to benefit all religious bodies without discrimination is forbidden.

"This development of the conception of separation of Church and State seems to us to be unwarranted by the language of the First Amendment, and to bring about a situation in which forms of cooperation between Church and State that have been taken for granted by the American people will be endangered. We believe that, whatever its intention may be, this hardening of the idea

of 'separation' by the court will greatly accelerate the trend toward secularization of our culture.

"We favor the separation of Church and State in the sense which we believe to have been intended in the First Amendment. This prohibited the state from giving any Church or religious body a favored position, and from controlling the religious institutions of the nation. We contend that Jefferson's oft-quoted words 'wall of separation' which are not in the Constitution, but which are used by the court in the interpretation of the Constitution, are a misleading metaphor.

"Cooperation, entered into freely by the State and Church, and involving no special privilege to any Church and no threat to the religious liberty of any citizen, should be permitted. As Protestants we desire to affirm this interpretation of the American doctrine of separation of Church and State, and to protest against the interpretation that has been formulated by the Supreme Court.

"The situation created by these decisions of our highest court makes clear that it is important for our great religious communions, without obscuring their differences of faith and policy, to explore the possibilities of working together. Only as we realize such possibilities shall we succeed in maintaining the religious foundations of our national life."

One Group Opposes The Other

This manifesto was signed by Protestant Bishops and clergymen, more prominent than those who formed "Protestants and other Americans United."

Other Protestant leaders are becoming quite peeved over the destructive rather than constructive work of Protestant organizations. Dr. Luther Wesley Smith, President of the International Council of Religious Education, speaking in Milwaukee in June, 1948, pointed out that Protestantism was heading for danger by asking members to "work off our emotions" against the Roman Catholic Church. "We can heartily agree with the Roman Catholic Bishops, that the root of all our present ills in civilization is secularism, leaving God out of our thinking and living, as individuals and as nations. We should be humbly grateful that in this recent year the Roman Catholic Church has stood out adamantly in condemnation of atheistic Communism, the most dangerous and powerful enemy Christianity has known in its 1900 years of history."

Criticize The Court

The "Department of Christian Education of the National Council of the Protestant Episcopal Church" has also criticized

the Supreme Court's ruling on religious instruction. The Resolution speaks of "efforts now being made by groups inimical to the interests of the Christian cause to further released time education by legislation and administrative powers.

Rev. Frank C. Leeming, of Peekskill, New York, commenting on the position of his Church, said:

"The world is in the state it is today because men have forgotten their Creator. So long as man remembered that God was the Creator and man only the created one, the world had peace.

"Hundreds of years ago the Church took on the task of education. However, there came a time, particularly in this country, when the Church quietly and without fanfare began to hand its children over to the State to be educated.

"Powerful forces of evil are at work in this country to try to make it impossible for us to teach any Christian principles in the public schools. Indeed, they have gone so far as to say we have no right to take children out of the public schools even one hour a week to teach them religion. The recent Supreme Court decision about the teaching of classes in religion in the public schools, instead of being hailed by some religious leaders as an act of Divine Providence, should be condemned by every Christian in the land."

Why Follow Russia?

Isn't the best argument for religion in education the opposition to it in Russia, Yugoslavia, and all countries controlled by the Soviet Union, and the attitude Hitler took towards the religious school?

In Russia, and in every country dominated by her, Communist leaders, according to *Religious New Service* (May 29, 1948) have as their chief program the elimination of all church or private schools. The program is in full effect in Yugoslavia, Rumania and Bulgaria, and it is well under way in Hungary and Czechoslovakia.

In Poland, the Minister of Education has been working on a Bill aimed at liquidating completely all religious schools. Yugoslavia and Bulgaria were the first to set up systems under which even children in the earliest elementary grade will be given the "right" political indoctrination, which means, of course, Communist doctrine. The new state Constitution in Rumania, where there have been 2,000 parochial schools, declares, "No congregation or confession can open or support general educational establishments."

News dispatches from Prague indicate that the Czechoslovakia government is planning to nationalize all private schools. The government of Hungary has taken similar measures, not

only against Catholics, but also against the Hungarian Reformed and Lutheran Churches. The same policies are now being pursued in the Russian occupied zone of Germany. Both Catholic and Protestant private schools have been banned throughout the entire Russian ruled region, except in the Russian section of Berlin, where they are temporarily tolerated. However, the Kommandantura—the four power body that controls Berlin—recently voted to limit Protestant and Catholic private schools in the entire city area to one school for each organization.

The Evangelical Church leaders in the Russian occupied territory of Germany even charge the Soviet secret police with sending agents to spy on their congregations. The policy of Sharnov is to have Communists “use” the churches in Germany for their own ends rather than openly to persecute them.

According to Methodist church officials in Saxony, “the Russians try to limit church activities to regular church services.” No meetings of the congregation are permitted without official sanction. No youth activities are allowed.

The Evangelical Bishop, Otto Debelius, who visited the United States last year, wrote a pastoral letter recently to be read in all churches of the Berlin-Brandenburg Province, in which he called upon church members to “take up the battle against any pressure on our convictions and conscience.”

One would never have supposed, twenty years back, that the American people would permit their representatives in Washington, much less the highest court in the nation, to deliver the public school system over to atheism by the direct exclusion of God from the classroom.

We are reminded of what M. Thiers, of France, long a Free-thinker, wrote back in 1869. He had helped organized irreligion to de-Christianize his country by closing all religious schools, but when he saw the effect he was driven to advocate the other extreme, namely, the education of all the youths of the nation by the clergy. Here are his words:

“It is all nonsense trying to establish an anti-religious government in these times. If I had my way, instead of diminishing religious influences, I would place the control of elementary religious schools in the hands of the clergy. If you dechristianize the masses, they will rise up and murder you. There must be some higher authority for right-doing than that of M. le Ministre. M. de Maire, or M. le Maitre d’Ecole; and I defy anybody to produce anything better than the Ten Commandments, with their august authority and their majestic history. If ever the Republic is again established in France, it will have to avoid the pit-fall

of anti-religion; if it does not, it will sooner or later come to grief."

On another occasion he said:

"I do not believe laymen can teach the poor half so well as the clergy and the Sisters. The legislator who tries to make a religion of atheism is a madman, who eventually must ruin the country he misleads by his fanaticism."

France recovered from this attack of irreligion, but at the turn of this century President Combes and his Prime Minister Viviani, high up in the councils of the Grand Orient, which France's atheistic Freemasonry is called, used all the power of the State to abolish religious schools, disband Religious Orders and to secularize education completely. Even textbooks in the schools were altered, and the name of God and of Christ removed from them. The next generation was indoctrinated with irreligion in the public schools of France. The effect was felt during both World Wars, and now that portion of France which is not Communist is recommending the restoration of the Christian way of life.

To the many editors and publishers in the United States, to our federal and state legislators, to our radical college and university professors, to all, to whom is entrusted the education, guidance and direction of our youth, we would declare in Mr. Thier's words: "If you dechristianize the masses, they will rise up and murder you."

Opponents of "religion in the public schools" are proportionately few in our country, but they are so vociferous, they are so well organized, they take such advantage of the press, they keep such contacts with members of State Legislatures and of Congress, that their voice is mistaken for the cry of millions.

They are the organized atheists and freethinkers, the agnostic professors, the Socialists and Communists in our midst—none of them "patriots."

Doesn't it seem very strange that we should imitate Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany in their chief program, while opposing these "isms" otherwise? In order to destroy religion in Russia, the Soviet forbids any child under eighteen to receive religious instruction. In Nazi Germany, all religious schools were closed. How, therefore, can we expect to fight what is most wrong in Russia and Germany while copying their anti-religious policy in our own country?

If Stalin and their ilk are wrong, then the Christian philosophy of education and its position towards the religious basis of citizenship are right; those enemies of society, in order

to succeed with their nefarious purpose, made their first attack on religious schools, hoping to dethrone God as the Supreme Ruler over men.

Genuine citizenship is based on justice, as is also a sound social and economic order, but there can be no justice without religion.

Good citizenship presupposes the training of youth along the line of virtue, but most of the children of our nation are not receiving such training, with the result that one out of every eight youths is attracted to crime.

Honorable citizens should produce stable and happy homes, but our nation now leads all the world in broken homes.

Virtuous citizenship is impossible when moral ideals wane; and that the ideals of youth are waning is evident from the character of the books and magazines which they read.

Let America bring God back to the schools in order that He may once more live in the minds and hearts of all its citizens.

What Former Presidents Thought

George Washington

EVERYONE is familiar with George Washington's farewell address in which he observed:

"Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. . . . Whatever may be conceded to that influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principles."

Thomas Jefferson, the father of American democracy, although oftentimes referred to as an agnostic, actually defended the fundamentals of the Christian faith, as is so evident in his recognition of a Creator and of the rights of man emanating from the Creator. He firmly believed that democracy would endure only in a Christian society, where material values would be subordinated to spiritual values.

Thomas Jefferson

The Supreme Court in passing on the McCollum case appealed to Thomas Jefferson, who is alleged to have said: "There should be a wall of separation between the Church and State," but that Jefferson was badly misinterpreted is clear from a very definite statement he made on another occasion, in which he actually advocated the release of students from school for week day religious instruction.

October, 1822, while President of the University of Virginia: "The want of instruction in the various creeds of religious faith existing among our citizens presents . . . a chasm in a general institution of the useful sciences." Then Thomas Jefferson offered a remedy in these words: "The various sects should be invited to establish their religious schools within the confines of the University, so that the undergraduates could have the benefit of religious instruction and worship."

These words from the "Writings of Thomas Jefferson, Memorial Edition, 1904," evidently favor "released time religious instruction."

Abraham Lincoln

Abraham Lincoln, although not affiliated with any particular religious organization, was deeply religious, and honestly believed that he would be a failure in office if he acted the part of an in-

dividualist without the assistance of Divine Providence. Many times, during his term of office, he called on the people to pray, and even promulgated a day of fast and abstinence to dispose the nation for Divine guidance. He never dreamed that the day would come when the moral law would be ignored in the school and college classroom, or when teachers would be trained in accordance with purely materialistic philosophy.

Theodore Roosevelt

President Theodore Roosevelt, in 1902, during a speaking tour through New England, observed in one address:

"No one-sided development can produce a really good citizenship—as good citizenship is needed in the America of today. If a man has not in him the root of righteousness, if he does not practice honesty, if he is not truthful and upright, clean and high-minded, fair in his dealing both at home and abroad—then the stronger he is, the abler and more energetic he is, the more dangerous he is to the body politic."

The same President, in the year 1904, gave utterance to the following conviction:

"There is no word in the English language more abused than the word 'education.' It is a fine thing to be clever, to be able, to be smart. But it is a better thing to have the qualities that find their expression in the Decalogue and the Golden Rule. We must have education in the broadest sense,—education of the soul as well as of the mind . . . The future of this country depends on the way in which the average boy and girl are brought up."

On January 29, 1905, President Theodore Roosevelt spoke, in part, as follows, at the dedication of a Lutheran edifice in the city of Washington:

"In the last analysis the work of statesmen and soldiers, the work of public men, shall go for nothing if it is not based on the spirit of Christianity, working in the millions of homes throughout the country; so that there may be that social, that spiritual, that moral foundation, without which no country can ever rise to permanent greatness. For material well-being, material prosperity, success in arts, in letters, great industrial triumphs—all of them, and all of the structure raised thereon, will be as evanescent as a dream, if it does not rest on the 'righteousness that exalted a nation.'"

President Coolidge

Speaking in Washington in October, 1925, President Calvin Coolidge made the following observation:

"An intellectual growth will only add to our confusion unless

it is accompanied by a moral growth. I do not know of any source of moral power other than that which comes from religion.

"The government will be able to get out of the people only such virtues as religion has placed there. If society resists wrong doing by punishment, as it must do unless it is willing to approve it through failure to resist, for there is no middle ground, it may protect itself as it is justified in doing by restraining a criminal, but that in and of itself does not reform him. It is only a treatment of a symptom. It does not eradicate the disease. It does not make the community virtuous. No amount of restraint, no amount of law can do that. If our political and social standards are the result of an enlightened conscience, then their perfection depends upon securing a more enlightened conscience.

"I have tried to indicate what I think the country needs in the way of help under present conditions. It needs more religion. If there are any general failures in the enforcement of the law, it is because there have first been general failures in the disposition to observe the law. I can conceive of no adequate remedy for the evils which beset society except through the influences of religion. There is no form of education which will not fail, there is no form of government which will not fail, there is no form of reward which will not fail. Redemption must come through sacrifice, and sacrifice is the essence of religion.

"It will be of untold benefit if there is a broader comprehension of this principle by the public and a continued preaching of this crusade by the clergy. It is only through these avenues, by a constant renewal and extension of our faith, that we can expect to enlarge and improve the moral and spiritual life of the nation. Without that faith, all that we have of an enlightened civilization cannot endure.

"But there is another and more basic reason why the government cannot supply the source and motive for the complete reformation of society. In the progress of the human race, beliefs were developed before the formation of governments. It is my understanding that government rests on religion. While in our own country we have wisely separated the Church and the State in order to emancipate faith from all political interference, nevertheless the forms and theories of our government were laid in accordance with the prevailing religious convictions of the people.

"The great revival of the middle of the eighteenth century had a marked influence upon our revolutionary period. The claim to the right of freedom, the claim to the right of equality, with the resultant right to self-government—the rule of the people—have

no foundation other than the common brotherhood of man derived from the common fatherhood of God.

"The righteous authority of the law depends for its sanction upon its harmony with the righteous authority of the Almighty. If this faith is set aside, the foundations of our institutions fall, the citizen is deposed from the high estate which he holds as amendable to a universal conscience, society reverts to a system of class and caste, and the government, instead of being imposed by reason from within, is imposed by force from without; freedom and democracy would give way to despotism and slavery. I do not know of any adequate support for our form of government except that which comes from religion."

Speaking at South Dakota State College in September, 1926, the same President declared:

"We have been exceedingly busy seeking for information that could be turned to practical advantage in the matter of dollars and cents, rather than for that wisdom which would guide us through eternity . . . We must come back to the query contained in the consecrated wisdom of the ages, 'What shall it profit a man to gain the whole world and lose his own soul?' All of our sciences and all of our arts will never be the means for the true advancement of our nation, will never give us a civilization and a culture of worthy and lasting importance, unless we are able to see in them the outward manifestation of an inward reality. Unless our halls of learning are real temples, which are to be approached by our youths in an attitude of reverence, consecrated by the worship of truth, they will all end in a delusion. The information that is acquired in them will simply provide a greater capacity for evil . . .

"The human soul will always rebel at any attempt to confine it to the physical world. Its dwelling place is in the intellectual and moral world. It is unto that realm that all true scholarship should lead. Unless our scholarship, however brilliant, is to be barren and sterile, leading toward pessimism, more emphasis must be given to the development of moral power."

Speaking at Phillips Academy in May, 1928, Pres. Coolidge noted that the whole foundation of enlightened civilization rests on religion. "Unless our people are thoroughly instructed in its great truths, they are not fitted to understand our institutions, or to provide them with adequate support."

"For our independent colleges and secondary schools to be neglectful of their responsibilities in this direction is to turn their graduates loose with simply an increased capacity to prey upon one another. Such a dereliction of duty would put in jeopardy the whole fabric of society. For our chartered institutions of learning

to turn back to the material, and neglect the spiritual, would be treason not only to the cause for which they were founded, but to man and God."

President Coolidge further observed:

"Our doctrine of equality and liberty, of humanity and charity, comes from our belief in the brotherhood of man through the fatherhood of God. The whole foundation of enlightened civilization, in government, in society, and in business, rests on religion. Unless our people are thoroughly instructed in its great truths, they are not fitted either to understand our institutions or provide them with adequate support."

Franklin Roosevelt

President Franklin Roosevelt committed himself in almost the same way in a message sent to the National Conference of Church-Related Colleges, in 1937:

"If the Catholic schools prepare youth for better citizenship; if our country will be immensely benefitted by a character formation built on the eternal principles of religion and morality, then they are rendering a public service, and since these schools are not operated for profit, they are in reality public schools."

Other Statesmen

Daniel Webster

DANIEL WEBSTER, speaking on the Girard Will case, declared: "It is a mockery and an insult to common sense to maintain that a school for the instruction of youth, from which Christian instruction by Christian teachers is sedulously and rigorously shut out, is not deistic and infidel both in its purpose and its tendency"

Governor Marshall

Governor Thomas Marshall of Indiana, later Vice-President of the United States, was a firm believer in religion in education. Speaking at the laying of the cornerstone of the new school of St. Mary's parish, in Indianapolis, he said:

"I stand here today believing that religious training is absolutely necessary to rear boys and girls to be good citizens and useful members of the community. Good citizenship does not depend entirely on legislative action, nor on court decisions, which may or may not make things right, but good citizenship depends on the training of the individual. It is necessary to have the statutes and laws, of course, but the most important thing for the welfare of this commonwealth of Indiana is the respectful and loyal obedience of her citizenship, by that, I mean, the reverence that is due to the decrees and orders of the Almighty God.

"I congratulate this church or any other on erecting such an institution as this to engender this loyalty in the citizenship of which I speak. I want to congratulate this church on its effort to start its children in the right path, and train them toward loyalty to God, loyalty to the State and loyalty to the family, for I am more and more impressed with the necessity of beginning the training of man when he is a boy. I feel that this school will prove a blessing to the community. When it begins to dawn on a child that here's a great world and—as I believe—a great hereafter, then is his liberal education beginning."

Speaking on another occasion at St. Joseph's College, Rensselaer, Indiana, the same governor observed:

"In my opinion no man is educated for citizenship unless trained in body and mind and heart to reverence the omnipotent God. He must know that God reigns and that Jesus Christ is the Supreme Ruler of mankind. In our day there are too many who forget that it is the unseen things—the things that are God's—that weigh. In your educational institutions you keep these truths before the mind of youth, and, holding the opinions which I hold,

why should I not feel proud to participate in the joys of this dedication?"

The Governor did not change his mind about the need of Christian education after he became Vice-President of the United States for he had this to say about it:

"Christian education will make a philosophy of life which will calm the troubled waters of America. For unless the churches Christianize men and women the world is going back to barbarism. I have serious doubts of the common school being the hope of the nation. If rightly run, yes; but if wrongly run it will prove the curse of the nation. It is a bad thing when the churches relinquish the education of the young and turn them over to public schools."

Governor Whitman

Governor Charles S. Whitman, of New York, said on September, 1916:

"Out of an experience as a judge, a district attorney, and governor, I have brought a deep conviction that there is no greater mistake than (the) common belief that people can be made good by law. It is in the individual life that improvement must be made. It is in the soul of man that the great fight must be waged against evil and all uncleanness."

Governor Green

Governor Dwight H. Green, of Illinois, speaking at Springfield on September 21, 1941, said:

"The collapse of our civilization, which is now so seriously threatened, is primarily the collapse of ideals. It is the loss of respect for Christian standards and principles. Conduct itself, alike of men and of nations is secondary—secondary to the ideals by which it is motivated. Ideals come first—when they are lost, therefore, all is lost.

"The place of religion and religious ideals in our American Democracy is traditional and must be permanent if we are to continue to share in the blessings of God upon this country. Let us never forget that as Americans we are the heirs of a precious heritage. The fathers of our Country who laid the foundation of its greatness were men of faith and trust in God and committed to God's care the new political experiment which was destined to be the ideal exponent of democracy.

"In our American Democracy today religion should animate us in all our civic activities for a citizen who loves his Creator must

love his neighbor and render unselfish service to the righteous cause of his fellow-men."

Governor Brown

Governor Brown, of Missouri, addressing a Convention of the Teachers National Association, said:

"It is very customary in declarations to pronounce that education is the great safeguard of republics against the decay of virtue and the reign of immorality, yet the facts scarcely bear out the proposition . . . Nowadays, certainly, your prime rascals are educated rascals, and it is at least doubtful whether education in itself, as now represented and confined merely to the acquisition of knowledge, has any tendency to mitigate the vicious elements of human nature."

William Jennings Bryan

Speaking at Winona, Indiana, William J. Bryan remarked:

"I believe that there is assurance of the life that is, as well as of the life to come; and I am anxious that this life should be brought to the consciousness of every human being. The heart has more to do with human destiny than hand or mind. The pure of heart shall see God . . . I want my boy, if he is to dig ditches, to begin his digging with the best education that the country can give him, but the education of the heart is above the education of the head."

On another occasion he said:

"Christians must in every state of the union build their own colleges in which to teach Christianity; it is only simple justice that atheists, agnostics and unbelievers should build their own colleges if they want to teach their own religious views or attack the religious views of others . . . Christians do not desire less education, but they desire that religion shall be entwined with learning so that our boys and girls will return from college with their hearts aflame with love of God and love of fellowmen, and prepared to lead in the altruistic work that the world so sorely needs."

James J. Davis

Similar thoughts were expressed by James J. Davis, United States Secretary of Labor, when he wrote in *Good Housekeeping* in October, 1927:

"The soul of this nation will die if we do not instill into the minds and hearts of our children some proper form of religious and moral sense . . . Men may say what they will, but we shall never have a morality that respects the rights of others unless our morality has a religious sanction. To put morality on anything but a religious basis is to build on sand. Today our

children come out of their schools, uncertain whether it is not a superstition to speak of such a thing as the soul, still more uncertain how to regard the Bible which inspired their fathers . . . Teach a boy that he is nothing but an animated clod, that he is living in a godless world made up of a few gasses and other elements, and what is there to inspire him to live a creditable life? It was Ruskin who said, 'All education should be moral first, intellectual secondarily.'"

General Crawford

Brig. General James B. Crawford, U.S.A., speaking at Camp Davies, near Washington, on July 21, 1941, said:

"Soldiers can be issued the finest equipment and trained until they are letter perfect in the use of that equipment, but even then an army cannot succeed unless it has a high morale. Religion is the foundation of morale."

Chinese Ambassador

The Chinese Representative at Washington, twenty-five years ago, observed:

"Unless I am grievously mistaken, your system of education is directed merely to mental training. In other words, you develop the students' brains; teach them useful subjects which enable them to gain a livelihood. Is that the only subject toward which education should be directed? I think that morality ought to be cultivated. I have seen the most learned men, through lack of moral principles, reduced to mere wrecks of what they might have been. In China we teach respect to heaven, reverence to our sovereign rulers, parents and teachers. In America you have in your educational system everything except moral teaching."

Business Men Want It

IN July, 1941, The United States Chamber of Commerce set up a committee to cooperate with a similar committee of the American Association of School Administrators, whose purpose it would be to establish local groups of business men and school officials to consider ways and means of developing a religious background for American education

This joint Committee reflected the belief that education, if it is to be effective in meeting the grave problems which confront all nations, cannot be wholly divorced from religious training. The Committee declared, among other things:

"The fundamental bases of American citizenship are political and religious freedom. Therefore, understanding of the Bill of Rights, the Constitution and the fundamentals of our economy go hand in hand with an understanding of the Bible itself.

"There has been too little appreciation that an intelligent belief in God is the greatest obstacle that dictatorship has to overcome. Yet it is a sad commentary that in the United States some sixty-five million people have no religious church affiliation. This is a definite challenge to the community. We must return to early fundamentals, i.e., each God-fearing family must see that its members clearly understand the tenets of its particular faith. While the responsibility is that of the family and the church, the schools must facilitate their work. A truly God-fearing nation is a strong nation.

"In order that the schools may play an increasingly effective part in our complex life, and that their work may be brought home to the community, it is proposed that local committees of business men and superintendents of schools adopt programs which are in keeping with the present-day problems and needs of their respective communities. It is also proposed that a creed should be prepared in suitable language which will state what children might with propriety receive from their school training. This creed should be built around a belief in God and America, and founded on a knowledge of the necessity for observance of the fundamentals of the Constitution, the Bill of Rights and our form of government and economy."

Various Organizations Endorsed Chamber of Commerce View

Early in 1942, Harrison S. Elliott of the Union Theological Seminary, New York, and President of the Religious Educational Association, conducted a country-wide survey for the purpose of

ascertaining the reaction of various groups to each of the following four proposals for the religious education of youths in school:

(1) Official recognition of religious education in the general educational scheme through "released" time, school credits, and the like; (2) inclusion of religion within the program and life of the public school; (3) making religion an integral part of education through parochial or private schools; and (4) concentrating on strengthening religious education in church and synagogue.

The "International Council of Religious Education," which met in Chicago at the same time, (February 8-15, 1942) urged its 100,000 interested men and women to do all in their power to bring religious instruction to the millions of youths not frequenting Sunday School. It noted that 169,207 Protestant Sunday Schools were very poorly patronized.

Sometime prior to that year, the "Institute on Social and Religious Surveys," which was directed by America's foremost educators, conducted a three year canvass at the expense of \$100,000.00 to find the correct answer to the question: "How honest are American youths?"

Although juvenile delinquency was light then as compared to today, the directors of this Institute observed:

"More than half of our American school children have, under temptation, an unethical outlook on life. More than half of them, under the stress of choice, will act dishonorably or dishonestly—to speak plainly, they will lie and cheat and steal."

Commenting on the result of the survey the *Milwaukee Journal*, noted:

"The demonstration is clear that character building can be taught, through instruction in ethics, in religion, or in a combination of the two. It is significant that the Boy Scouts of America, who get instruction in both religion and ethics, ranked highest in the tests; and it is equally significant that the public schools, where neither ethics nor religion is taught as a subject, ranked lowest. We are here face to face with the problem 'Shall we teach ethics and religion in the home, in the schools, or shall we reap an ever-increasing crop of dishonor and dishonesty?'"

Nicholas Murray Butler

On November 28, 1940, the late President Nicholas Murray Butler deplored the effect of the exclusion of religious education from the public schools, in these words:

"This generation is beginning to forget the place which religious instruction must occupy in education if that education is to be truly sound and liberal. We seem to forget that until

some 200 years ago religious instruction everywhere dominated education; religion guided education, shaped education and selected the material for education in every part of the world; in the Orient, Europe, and the Americas. Then began, as a result of the rise of Protestantism and the spread of democracy, those sharp differences of religious opinion and of religious worship, which unfortunately exhibited themselves in highly controversial form. One consequence was to lead men to turn aside from religious study and religious teaching in the attempt to avoid those contentious differences which had become so common *Then particularly in this democracy of ours, a curious tendency grew up to exclude religious teaching altogether from education on the ground that such teaching was in conflict with our fundamental doctrine as to the separation of Church and state.* In other words, religious teaching was narrowed down to something which might be called denominationalism, and therefore because of differences of faith and practice it must be excluded from education. The result was to give paganism new importance and new influence."

American Bar Association Speaks Out

The "American Bar Association" does not like the recent Supreme Court's decision outlawing religious instruction in public schools. It believes that "America may come to regret that decision." In fact, the Bar Association goes so far as to say that the violators of the Constitution are not the school authorities, but rather the eight members of the Supreme Court themselves, because their decision interferes with the "free exercise of religion" guaranteed in the nation's basic law.

The Bar Association observes further that the programs in school districts in eleven states have been rendered "definitely unconstitutional." . . . Programs in thirty-four states, in which religious instruction is conducted off school premises, but without active cooperation of the school authorities, are regarded as "unconstitutional."

The *Journal* of the Bar Association notes: "It is difficult to see how the Constitution was violated by what the local community and school board did. Did it constitute an 'establishment of religion'? Was the free exercise of religion denied by what the court did rather than by the state law?"

The *Journal* quotes James Madison's interpretation of the clause in the First Amendment to mean, "Congress should not establish a religion, nor enforce the legal observance of it by law, nor compel men to worship God in any manner contrary to their conscience." Such would seem to be the very evident meaning of the First Amendment. The schools are intended to serve parents,

and when parents request religious instruction of their children, their request should be granted. That is an entirely different thing from "forcing" religious instruction on the children of unwilling parents. In fact the Bar Association is far more critical of the Court than any religious organization has been. It believes that the Supreme Court, without thinking about it, endorses the anti-religious propaganda clause in the Soviet Union Constitution, and observes, "Nothing in our Constitution commands that 'freedom of religion' shall be 'freedom from religion.'"

Dorothy Thompson's words should be seriously considered by every American. She wrote, after the Supreme Court's decision, "Woe unto the nation that destroys its altars! For new altars will surely be built to idols with terrible faces and bloody hands, carrying whips and swords. Such is the judgment of history, ancient and modern." Those who would destroy our nation are the ones most interested in keeping religion out of the life of children.

How Canada Has Solved The Problem

SOCIALISM, Communism and other divisive forces have never met with success in Canada chiefly because religious principles inculcated in the schools are too deeply rooted in the people.

In the Dominion of Canada the conduct of education is left to each of the nine Provinces, with the result that there is no national system but as many systems as there are Provinces.

The Fathers of the Confederation, in 1867, recognized the right of the people themselves to provide for the instruction of their children in all things.

According to the *Canadian Year Book* education is provided for as follows:

“Under the British North American Act, 1867, the right to legislate on matters respecting education was reserved exclusively to the *provincial* legislatures, subject to the maintenance of the rights and privileges of the denominational and separate schools as existing at the time of union or admission of provinces. In general there are two fundamental systems of education throughout Canada, one that of the Protestant communities, free from control of religious bodies, and the other that of the Roman Catholic French and Irish communities in which education is united with the religious teaching of the Roman Catholic Church.

Quebec

“In Ontario, Roman Catholics, Protestants and colored people have each the right to establish ‘Separate Schools’ for elementary education, the local rates for the support of these schools being separately levied and applied.

“In Quebec, the religious minority in any municipality, whether Roman Catholic or Protestant (the Jews being ‘Protestants’ for all the purposes of the School Law), may dissent and maintain its own elementary and model schools and academies or high schools, the taxation of the minority being separate from that of the majority for the three classes of schools, except that in the case of the assessment of corporations, the taxes are levied by the majority and divided between the majority and the minority in proportion to the number of children of school age. In Saskatchewan and Alberta a separate school may be established by the minority, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, subject, however, to identical regulations as to courses, certificates, inspection, etc.

In the remaining provinces there are special provisions for the education of Roman Catholics in the larger cities and towns."

Quebec Fair To Protestants

Although Quebec is predominantly Catholic the Government has been most friendly to Protestants. According to the *Statistical Year Book of Quebec* (1922):

"The greatest freedom in connection with education exists in the Province of Quebec and the religious beliefs of individuals are respected. There are two categories of institutions, the Catholic and non-Catholic. Each of these groups organizes schools, assures their maintenance and chooses its teachers. English and French are taught in all the schools. The subsidies voted by the Legislature for schools under the control of commissioners or trustees are apportioned by the Superintendent of Public Instruction, proportionately to the number of pupils enrolled during the previous year. The proceeds of taxes from joint stock companies, are distributed between the Catholics and Protestants of a municipality in a like manner."

The Council of Public Instruction consists of two committees: a Catholic and a Protestant one. They make the regulations respecting the administration of the public schools of their respective religious beliefs. Before these acts and regulations can be put in force, the former must be passed by the Legislature and the latter sanctioned by Order-in-Council. In the Province of Quebec the system has worked most satisfactorily and the relationship between the organizations has been of a happy character. Said one observer:

"Although frequently sneered at, Quebec will soon lead the Dominion in educational matters. While other provinces were discussing ways and means of developing the child's religious nature, neglected by their school for thirty years, pupils in the Protestant schools of Quebec had been given half an hour a day for religious training, while clergy are permitted to give instruction for an hour a day to those of their own flock who are attending Normal School. Quebec Protestants were slow to appreciate this opportunity, for while some communities availed themselves of the opportunity others neglected it."

In the year 1924 the Jews were authorized to establish separate schools for their own children in the Province of Quebec.

Ontario Law A Fair One

The Ontario law has been eminently fair from the beginning. The act of 1841 provided for "separate schools for Roman Catholics and Protestants respectively"; but owing to language and religious

differences this Act was repealed in 1943, and the schools of each Province were organized in a manner more in harmony with the wishes of each Province. We quote from the *School System of Ontario*, prepared by Sir William Ross, when Minister of Education. Sir William Ross notes that the 1843 Act allowed:

“Separate schools for the minority. Wherever the teacher of a school happened to be a Roman Catholic, the Protestant inhabitants had a right to establish a school of their own religious persuasion, upon the application of ten or more resident freeholders or land owners; a similar privilege was allowed to Roman Catholics. Schools under these conditions were to be entitled to their share of the Government grant, the same as other schools established under the Act, subject to the same visitations, conditions, rules and obligations as other common Schools.”

In 1846 a new Act provided that clergymen of all denominations, having pastoral charge, were constituted statutory visitors of the schools.

By an Act of 1871, which is still in force, the following concessions were made to Catholics, a minority group:

(1) The right of Roman Catholics to establish separate schools for their children:

(2) The right to appoint teachers of their own faith;

(3) The right to public monies for the maintenance of their own schools;

(4) The right of members of a Religious Order to be recognized as teachers without examination.

Should Protestant families settle in a school district where there had been only a Catholic school, they have the right to establish schools of their own on the same terms. There was agitation during 1941, backed by newspapers, for religious instruction in the public (non-sectarian) schools one day each week.

The *Statesmen* (of Canada) commenting on a weakness in the Ontario schools noted:

“Neither the study of birds nor the study of nature, however humanizing they may be, can be a substitute for the moral law of God; and if these do not prevail in the schoolroom and out of the schoolroom, all our education is vain and useless, and only makes for dust and ashes in our lives.”

On April 18, 1941, the Trustees and Ratepayers Section of the Ontario Educational Association, for the most part made up of non-Catholics, at its annual meeting, went on record as recommending that greater stress be placed on religious education in Ontario schools. Religion is taught in the Separate (Catholic) schools, but it is not part of the curriculum for the Public schools.

The question of religious education was the topic for discussion in several sections of the Educational Association.

R. C. Wallace, Principal of Queen's University, a non-Catholic and head of one of Canada's greater non-sectarian universities, told the Commercial Teachers' Section that education in Ontario was weakened without religion.

During June 1941 there was held in Toronto, Canada, the first "North American Ecumenical (inter-church) Conference," in which thirty-five Protestant denominations participated. One committee report called for the unsecularization of education:

"The part played by religion in education must be restored . . . Christian laymen, now largely illiterate, must be educated."

The editor of the *Canadian Churchman* (Protestant) wrote in May, 1898, in defense of the English, Canadian and Irish policy:

"Wherever any religious denomination shall set up a school in which its children are taught in a satisfactory manner the ordinary parts of a secular education, the government grants in support of the school shall be allowed."

England Wants Religion In Education

WHEN the editor of the London *Times* on February 17, 1940, wrote a lengthy article condemnatory of the English policy of excluding religious instruction from the schools, and noted that "religion must form the very basis of any education worth the name, and that education with religion omitted is not really education at all," he was flooded with congratulatory replies from all sides.

On that occasion the *Times'* editor made these observations:

"The common argument that while the provisions and supervision of 'education' must be the business of the State, 'religious instruction' must be considered as altogether the affair of the churches, is not only worthless, but mischievous. It is mischievous because it encourages the fallacy that essential education can be completed by secular instruction alone, and that the teaching of religion is merely a kind of optional supplement.

"The truth is, of course, that religion must form the very basis of any education worth the name, and that education with religion omitted is not really education at all.

"Yet in some of the schools provided by the State there is no religious teaching. In some of the secondary schools it is provided for the junior pupils only, and dropped, as a subject comparatively unimportant, when they reach the upper forms. Under the system governing the elementary schools it is treated as a subsidiary subject, to be disposed of in a preliminary half-hour before the real work of the day begins.

"In every other subject the educational authority rightly demands a high standard of competence from its teachers. But if those who give religious instruction have had no training for the work, or if a head teacher is openly antagonistic to Christianity, the State regards such matters as outside its purview, and does not interfere.

Spiritual Principles Must Guide Nation's Life

"While it maintains that the teaching of religion should be left mainly to churches, it will only admit representatives of the churches exceptionally and under severe restrictions to teach religion in its schools. Again and again the odious fallacy recurs that education is one thing, and religious instruction quite another. It is a right purpose of national education to produce men and women with healthy bodies and intelligent minds, and the immense sums devoted to this purpose are well spent. Yet the highest educational aim is to produce good citizens. The basis of good citizen-

ship is character, and a man's character depends upon his beliefs. *How, then, can the State afford to ignore these simple truths, and to view the teaching of religion as a task with which it has no direct concern? . . .*"

The *Times'* editor wrote of the work done by religious bodies in evacuation areas during the war and observed:

"If the war has emphasized the deficiencies of our present educational system, something more than war-time expedients will be needed to remedy them. *More than before it has become clear that the healthy life of a nation must be based on spiritual principles.* For many years we have been living on spiritual capital, on traditions inherited from the past, instead of providing for the future. Christianity cannot be imbibed from the air . . .

"It is upon such lines, with a bold disregard of obsolete controversies, that our State system of education needs to be recast. The highest of all knowledge must be given frankly the highest of all places in the training of young citizens.

"It will be of little use to fight, as we are fighting today, for the preservation of Christian principles if Christianity itself is to have no future, or at immense cost to safeguard religion against attack from without if we allow it to be starved by neglect from within."

The *Times* in a later issue carried this very apt observation:

"If the Christian doctrine of personal immortality be true, the theory of any educational system which cares for mental and physical culture, but neglects the culture of the soul, is demonstrably false."

Editor's Views Widely Endorsed

On February 21, 1940—only four days after this article appeared—the *Times* reprinted a great many letters received endorsing the attitude of the editor. We have space to reprint only a few of these:

The Anglican Bishop of St. Albans wrote:

"It is a grim fact, as you, Sir, remind us 'that in a country professedly Christian and a country which at the moment is staking its all in defense of Christian principles, there is a system of national education which allows the citizens of the future to have a purely heathen upbringing.' The present system of national education . . . is . . . indefensible, both on educational and religious grounds."

Lord Hambleden wrote on Feb. 21, 1940:

"There is much talk of the need for a Christian spirit in education, of a new outlook which will challenge the muddled

thought of today, but very few writers have been bold enough to attack the grave lack of religious teaching in our schools, or to insist that active Christianity cannot become an established fact unless religious teaching is a definite part of any new educational programme."

Lord Shaftesbury, St. Giles House, Wimborne, had this to say:

"Your admirable article of February 17 on 'Religion and National Life,' which has rightly been described as 'most timely,' must have been appreciated by vast numbers of the community who have read it . . . To millions of God fearing people in this country the system of religious instruction, as provided in our State schools, must stand condemned . . . Then again, I need hardly stress the value and importance of our 'non-provided' schools, which have a definite religious atmosphere, schools that must be maintained at all costs."

E. W. Davies, of King's School, Lamberhurst, Kent, wrote:

"The emphasis on the secular in education at the expense, and sometimes to the exclusion, of the religious is largely the outcome of this tendency today. In so far as we in our generation omit to emphasize what is vital in education and to regard Godliness as an indispensable part of good learning we shall fail to hand on to our children that legacy to which we owe a debt, incalculable but only too easily forgotten."

Charles Exon, Anglican Bishop of Exeter, responded:

"Is it impossible that a brief period for opening worship should be enjoined by statute for every school?"

"School worship fosters in the child the corporate loyalty to the school for which the teachers are rightly jealous. The constant repetition of psalm, hymn, collect, versicle, and response, can hardly fail to leave in the memory of the child seeds of truth which will develop later. When the child leaves school he will more easily feel at home in the worshipping community of church or chapel."

Where Is The Christian Voice?

WE HAVE never confronted a greater anomaly than that which was created by the recent decision of the Supreme Court forbidding the use of school time for religious instruction, and the clear demands for such instruction emanating from every corner of the country.

Addressing the "World Council of Christian Education" Eddie Rickenbacher, President of the Eastern Air Lines recently urged his countrymen "to rededicate ourselves, individually and collectively to the faith of our forefathers, which proved such a bulwark to our great country," and noted that "spiritual wisdom is indispensable in this atomic age. Religious education can inspire our generation of young people to serve for that maturity which will manifest itself in the qualities of tenacity, dependability, cooperation, and the drive to work for and strive for the continuation of the American way of life."

He continued:

"If ever a time existed in the affairs of man when Christianity had to resume its militant spirit to build faith, fortitude, and spiritual strength that time is now . . .

"Some would have us leave that job to the clergy. I do not believe we should place the whole burden of this task on the church or on the clergy. Too many of us are Christians by proxy, and, as any business man knows, you cannot run a business—not even God's business—by proxy . . . If farmers were as indifferent towards tilling the land as people are towards working in the field of Christian faith, our food supply would quickly dwindle to the famine point. When it comes to spreading and perpetuating Christian faith and deeds, we are all in the position of the farmer. If we plant good clean seeds we reap a good harvest. If our seed is poor we reap a worthless crop. If we plant nothing we get nothing?"

Mr. Rickenbacher believes that if we exhibited only 50% of the missionary spirit which inspires the Communist the whole world could be won to Christ within a few years. He believes that "whole nations have been turned into slave markets by conquerors," who were filled with the spirit of anti-Christ; and "they can be liberated only by the Christian law of love, matching the doctrine of hate on which the Communist movement rests. But if more than one-half of our fellow Americans lack a knowledge of the

ABC's of religion, if their children are not enrolled in Sunday schools, and, in addition, do not receive weekday instruction, our citizenry will not have the foundation on which to build the kind of world which Eddie Rickenbacher envisions.

Says Protestants Will Continue

DESPITE the Supreme Court decision banning religious education in the Champaign, Ill., public schools, most released-time programs will be continued throughout the United States.

That was the prediction made by Dr. Frank M. McKibben, chairman of the committee on week-day religious education for the International Council of Religious Education.

Speaking at the council's third annual workshop for Christian Education leaders, Dr. McKibben said the programs would be continued because most of them are conducted in churches and not in public school buildings.

He termed the Supreme Court ruling "confusing," and added that the committee on week-day religious education was convinced that the high court had not settled the question of released-time.

"At least five of the nine justices went on record, in one way or another, saying that the Champaign decision did not outlaw the forms of released-time," Dr. McKibben declared.

He said that because religious classes in Champaign were held in public school buildings, the situation there was not "typical" of most communities conducting released-time programs.

Speaking of religious education in general, Dr. McKibben said Protestant churches have "an utterly inadequate" program to offer.

"Protestantism must develop a new strategy in Christian education," he declared. "A crisis lies before us to train boys and girls through Christian education in world citizenship.

"Our Catholic and Lutheran friends have parochial schools. Our program is utterly inadequate."

He said parents had an "inescapable responsibility" to train their children along religious lines, and advised them to sit in on planning committees and help in Sunday school home-assignment work. Teachers should check with parents on behavior problems, he added.

About 100 religious education leaders from 25 states and Canada were on hand for the sessions.

