



Fink, Francis A.  
Pierce the confusion  
ADP 0932

790364

*Pierce the*  
**Confusion**

and see the

**Child**





# Pierce The Confusion And See The Child

A Discussion Of Federal  
Aid For Education

F. A. Fink

Printed in the U. S. A.  
September 15, 1949

OUR SUNDAY VISITOR PRESS  
HUNTINGTON, INDIANA



Nihil Obstat:

REV. T. E. DILLON

Censor Librorum

Imprimatur:

✠ JOHN FRANCIS NOLL, D.D.

Bishop of Fort Wayne

# Catholics Do Not Ask Support For Schools

IT took a long time to convince editors, radio news commentators, and, it seems, even members of Congress, that Catholics are not asking for "support" of their schools through any Federal Aid Bill. This is probably due to the fact that organized enemies of the Catholic Church had had their attention first.

Since the Catholic Press news agency serves only the Catholic Press, its explanation did not reach the 100,000,000 and more non-Catholics who, through other media, were told a different story, wholly unfounded.

## Those Who Understand, Approve

George E. Sokolsky is one of the few columnists who took the trouble to ascertain just what Catholics of the United States were asking for. Even such widely circulated magazines as *Time* and *Newsweek*, not to speak of releases sent out by the Associated Press, misrepresented the Catholic position. Instead of seeing danger of an encroachment on the field of the State by the Church, Sokolsky sees danger in the reverse, namely, that of the State supporting measures discriminatory to its own citizens if they happen to use their constitutional right to send their children to schools of their choice.

Referring to traditions, Sokolsky notes:

The expansion of the power of the State over the influence of religion first expresses itself in the field of education. In many countries, the only available education has been church schools, of one kind or another, and that was true during the first two centuries of the territory which is now the United States.

Most of our best universities were founded

as church schools, Harvard by the Congregationalists, Columbia by the Episcopalians, Princeton by the Presbyterians, and so on. And that goes as well for the better preparatory schools. The best schools and colleges in such a country as China or Syria were founded by Christian missionaries. All the great universities of Europe were established by clerics. The secularization of education is historically novel in our civilization and has not yet proved itself, except functionally . . .

I have never heard of such schools requesting State subventions either from the states or Federal Government. What they have said is that when social, extra-curricular benefits are given to American children, like bus rides to school, or a glass of milk or orange juice, or medical or dental supervision, such should be given to all children.

## So Does Dorothy Thompson

Mrs. Dorothy Thompson expressed her belief that Cardinal Spellman's argument is morally and constitutionally correct. In her column "On the Record" (August 3, 1949) Mrs. Thompson wrote:

In the opinion of this columnist, Mrs. Roosevelt did confuse the issue, and Cardinal Spellman's argument is morally and constitutionally correct.

As a result of Mrs. Roosevelt's interpretations, many think she is opposing a determined effort to secure Federal funds for the support of parochial schools. But public support of parochial schools is not involved in the Barden Bill at all.

A school is an institution for the education and guidance of children and youth. The American Constitution has been interpreted as prohibiting religious instruction or denominational control of public schools.

Thousands of Catholic parents wish their children to have a religiously-guided education and therefore send them to parochial schools, which, as far as secular education is concerned, conform to the standards set for all schools by state boards of education.

Parochial schools—their buildings and their

teaching staffs—are supported by the church. They receive no State or Federal funds, nor are they asking for any. That is the first thing every reader must get clear. It is precisely this that Mrs. Roosevelt confused by saying these and other private schools “should receive no tax funds whatsoever” and that “the separation of church and state is extremely important to any of us who hold to the original traditions of our nation.”

The Federal aid involved which Mr. Barden and Mrs. Roosevelt would prohibit to all except public school children, has nothing to do with education. It has to do with child welfare; free bus transportation to secure safety and punctuality; free non-religious text books; health checkups; free lunches and milk.

A bus is neither Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, nor atheist. Neither are geometry, nor inflamed tonsils, nor a glass of milk. The services are given to school children and the parents of school children. The schools, in which the children are gathered, are merely used as a convenient means of distributing those services.

Furthermore, they are paid for by all parents—whether they send their children to public, parochial or private school. And if these services, primarily concerned with safety and health, are refused some children on the grounds of the separation of church and state, then in all conscience the parents of such children should be exempt from taxation to pay for them.

Catholic parents already help pay for the public schools, though many prefer religiously guided education. That is an act of free choice. But access to public schools is not denied to them.

They naturally wish their children to receive the material benefits afforded other children via schools. The Barden Bill denies them. It says, in effect: “You have a constitutional right to give your child a religiously-guided education, but if you exercise it, you’ll get no free milk or health check-ups.” And in this sense it is anti-Catholic in effect if not intention.



## So Does The New York 'Times'

Commenting editorially on the dispute between Cardinal Spellman and Mrs. Franklin Roosevelt, the *New York Times* (August 15, 1949) wrote:

The majority (of the Supreme Court, *Everson vs. Board of Education*, February 10, 1947) held that New Jersey did not breach the First Amendment when it provided "a general program to help parents get their children, regardless of their religion, safely and expeditiously to and from accredited schools"—among which sectarian schools meeting the "secular educational requirements" were included . . . A law appropriating Federal funds to be used for the general purposes of private schools would not, on the record, be sustained by the Supreme Court. On the other hand, a law allowing such funds to be used for the direct benefit of school children's health or safety, no matter what kind of school each attends, seems both reasonable and proper . . . It is the *child* we must care for, protect and cherish . . . It is the *child* who must be treated *everywhere on a fair and equal basis* with all other children.

## So Does The A. F. Of L.

The American Federation of Labor announced that its "official policy" was the advocacy for children attending all schools of "such services and such privileges as will protect their very health and safety," and it released its official policy in these words:

It is an empty right to allow the existence of parochial schools for the use of those children whose parents, in good faith, believe they should send their children to such schools, if our government, while recognizing this right, at the same time denies the children who attend these schools such services and such privileges as will protect their very health and safety.

## So Does A Southern Journalist

The editor of the Jackson (Miss.) *Daily News* on August 4, 1949, expressed the belief that there is



## CATHOLICS DO NOT ASK SUPPORT FOR SCHOOLS 7

no cause for alarm in the Catholic position relating to Federal Aid, but that there is in the "activities of the groups which have dubbed themselves as 'Protestants and Other Americans United for the Separation of Church and State.'"

The editor notes that schools in the United States were all religious schools for a longer time than they have not been, and observes that while other religious bodies gave them up "Catholic schools still stand in every state in the Union as a remarkable tribute to the Catholics of the United States." He continues: "The best citizen of the United States is a religious citizen. Catholics believe that their schools are serving not only their God but also their country. The results are recognized by the fair-minded citizens of the United States."

He believes that "Protestants and Other Americans United" are aiming at an objective under a camouflage, and asks them to define what they mean by "separation of Church and State." This point should be well taken, because if the State may not cooperate with the Church in any possible manner, then there should be no chaplain in the Congress; then President Truman last January should not have had any prayers uttered at his Inauguration; then the Supreme Court Justice, who was one of several who expressed the belief that a "wall of separation should exist between Church and State," should have refused to use the Bible in administering an oath to the President.

The exclusion of religion by law from education is tantamount to a legal endorsement of atheism and irreligion. If positive religion cannot be taught in the public schools because the children are not all of one faith, then the least the government could do would be to actually *encourage* schools which *do teach it* in addition to the curriculum prescribed by the State.

The Supreme Court, back in 1925, did, by *an unanimous decision*, give encouragement to such schools by declaring that they held the same status as

the public schools, and that parents have a constitutional right to send their children to them.

This Jackson, Miss. editor, along with many others who have commented on the subject, believes that Joseph Stalin and his Communists are delighted to see an organized effort in the United States to effect the very thing he is doing, namely, to eliminate religion from education.

### **So Does Member Of 'Southern Churchmen's' Staff**

Mrs. Evelyn Cummins, member of the staff of the *Southern Churchman*, denounced the editorial published in that periodical, date of August 13, 1949, in these words:

Mrs. Roosevelt herself has said that Cardinal Spellman's position on the bill is very fair. He does not, nor does the Roman Catholic Church, ask or want help for education, per se, in parochial schools. He asks merely for assistance in providing transportation, text books, and health services, such as would be provided for other children, to the end that all of us may help build a stronger and better nation through all American children of whatever race or creed.

There is no question of doctrine or of "separation of Church and State" involved here and any such implication is misleading. On the contrary, it is for the separation of Church and State that the Roman Catholic Church is fighting its war against Communism all over the world.

Mrs. Cummins also denounces Bishop Gilbert, of the Protestant Episcopal Diocese of New York, for accusing Cardinal Spellman of "bigotry and intolerance," reminding him that in 1947 Cardinal Spellman donated the use of the Gould Home for Children, owned by the Archdiocese of New York, to house children for whom the Episcopal Church could find no other living quarters during the dismantling and re-erecting of St. Barnabas House.

## **So Does A Senator From Barden's State**

Senator Frank P. Graham, of North Carolina, questioned on a radio program emanating from Washington, is reported to have said:

The people of America want all the children to be healthy, regardless of whether they're in private or public schools. So the State, if it chooses, can provide out of public money, including the Federal money, for health services to children as children and bus services to children as children.

One of his interrogators objected that bus service was really a service to the school. But Senator Graham supported the idea that using a school bus is almost the same as using a publicly-built sidewalk.

The child can go to school, using the public facility of the sidewalk. The sidewalk is paid for by the taxes of all the people. There is no policeman there to say, as you use the sidewalk: "What school are you going to?" That's a child, using a public facility to get to school.

The Senator was asked this question: "Where, then, is the separation of Church and State if it's permissible for the State to pay for textbooks, buses, milk, health services? Where do you draw the line?"

He replied that no public money should be used for the building or maintenance of a private or church school, and was immediately asked: "Are textbooks part of the maintenance?" His answer was: "Not of the school. That's service to the child."

## **Unknowingly Upholds Catholic Position**

Dr. Behnken, President of the Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod, speaking in the name of his Synod, released to the press a criticism of the Catholic plea, but that he was commenting on something that he did not quite understand is clear from this paragraph in his statement, which actually upholds the Catholic position:

The principle of separation of Church and State, in the sense that one does not dominate

## 10 PIERCE THE CONFUSION AND SEE THE CHILD

the other, can possibly be supported and even strengthened by Federal aid to public and private schools for certain specific welfare purposes: School lunches, health services, transportation. In the event that the Federal Government offers such assistance to parochial schools, there must be a clear understanding that no government assistance can be given to support the instructional program of church schools.

A few days later (August 17, 1949) speaking at St. Paul, Minnesota, Dr. Behnken declared that his Synod "is not against public health services to parochial school children, and has no objection to free lunches for school children which the community otherwise would serve."

At the same meeting Dr. Carl S. Mundinger, President of St. John Lutheran College, Winfield, Kansas, observed:

I see no religion in a glass of milk or a bus ride for parochial school children. Free medical examinations and dental care for parochial school children are other areas in which the Church and State may well cooperate for the public welfare.

### **The Unpoisoned Favor Justice**

A Gallup Poll of Public Opinion was taken among voters throughout the nation on the subject of the grant of Federal funds even for parochial school maintenance. Voters were asked this question: "If the Bill in Congress is passed which would give \$300,000,000.00 in aid to schools in the poorer states, should this money go entirely to public schools—or should part of it go to parochial schools?" The result was that 41% of all voters favored the distribution of the \$300,000,000.00 proportionately among public and parochial schools despite the fact that 10% of the voters had no opinion. Had they been equally divided it would have disclosed that nearly half the population believes in the government support of both schools that do the same work for the State.

Young voters, between 21 and 29 years of age,

## CATHOLICS DO NOT ASK SUPPORT FOR SCHOOLS 11

who are less prejudiced, voted 49% in favor of assistance to both systems of schools, and only 42% in favor of assistance to public schools only. Had the 9%, which had "no opinion" been equally divided it would have meant that 54% of the voters favored assistance to all schools.

In the Gallup Poll voters were not asked about the few auxiliary services only asked by Catholics.

The result of this poll shows that more non-Catholics than Catholics favor justice to all schools meeting the State requirements for a good secular education on the elementary and high school levels.

### **An Un-American Bill**

Most Rev. Michael J. Ready, Bishop of Columbus, points out the injustice contained in the Barden Bill in these words:

The Cardinal decried the effort to pass legislation which would count in citizens of religious schools for purposes of taxation while counting them out in the services and benefits provided by tax funds. Every citizen will recognize the injustice of that scheme and will hold such a policy as indefensible according to our Constitution and national tradition.

The question of Federal aid for religious or parochial schools is not involved. The only question involved is whether citizens, pupils in religious schools, are to share in Federal funds appropriated for services to children. The constitutionality of including pupils in religious schools among those benefiting from services provided by public funds has been well established.

Pupils in religious schools are already sharing such funds by an Act of Congress in the Federal school luncheon program. The Federal Government has consistently maintained a non-discrimination policy in the field of education as well as in other social services. It is well to recall that fair policy as maintained by Congress in the G.I. Bill of Rights, the R.O.T.C., the

N.Y.A., and the School Lunch Act. Congress has not only refused to discriminate among citizens, but it has guarded against imposing a discriminatory policy in the use of Federal funds.

I am certain that the citizens of our nation would not wish Congress to change such a just and fair policy to one of discrimination against certain citizens because of religion.

Congress consistently has treated all students in all schools as citizens of the United States and has not allowed States to discriminate against them in benefits appropriated by Federal funds. Certainly if health, safety-transportation, and welfare funds are made available to children by Congress they should be made accessible to all children. There should be no religious test against children sharing in health and welfare funds. We pray that Congress will forever maintain such a just policy towards all the citizens of our country.

Secondly, the constitutionality of including pupils in religious schools among those benefiting from services provided by public funds has been well established. The Louisiana textbook case was upheld by the United States Supreme Court. The New Jersey bus transportation aid to children in religious schools was sustained by the same Supreme Court. In these decisions the court reviewed every conceivable objection from the viewpoint of Church and State relations. It ruled that a state may lawfully expend public funds for welfare services in behalf of all children who attend schools which meet the standard of public education.

The separation of Church and State is not a valid issue in the present question.

We simply propose that the Congress follow the wise and just course which it has set in providing benefits to all citizens without discrimination. The Constitution is just as strong and the tradition of separation of Church and State is just as hallowed now as they were before the G.I. Bill of Rights, and R.O.T.C., the Lunch Act, etc., became part of our national policy.

## Are They 'Private' Schools?

A system of schools that covers the entire country and educates about twelve per cent of the entire elementary and high school enrollment in the nation, which teaches the public school curriculum as efficiently and thoroughly as do the public schools themselves, which is only carrying on the tradition which obtained in this country from the time of its birth until the year 1840, which was given the same status as the public school system by an unanimous Supreme Court decision in 1925, hardly deserves to be called "private."

In the President's Report on "Higher Education for American Democracy" we read:

The responsibility for providing a strong system of public education does not, however, deny in any way to any individual or group of individuals the right to attend, or to establish and support in addition to public schools, a private or denominational institution for the purpose of providing, within limits prescribed by law, a kind of education which such individuals or groups deem more suitable to their particular needs and beliefs. It is just as undemocratic for the government to restrict in any way this fundamental right, as it is for government to fail to meet its prime responsibility for a strong system of public education. Nevertheless, any diversion by government of public funds to the general support of nonpublicly controlled educational institutions tends to deny the acceptance of the fundamental responsibility and to weaken the program of public education.

If the above language means anything it means that the Catholic school system of the United States enjoys a status equal to that of the public schools.

About the "diversion by the government of public funds" the last sentence does not militate against what Catholics have asked from the Congress through a Federal Aid Bill, because it refers to "the diversion by the government of public funds to the *general*

*support* of nonpublicly controlled educational institutions.”

This viewpoint was sustained by the National Education Association in a statement issued in the year 1924 which reads as follows:

The National Education Association, while recognizing the American public school as the great nursery of broad and tolerant citizenship and of a democratic brotherhood, acknowledges also the contributions made to education by private institutions and enterprises, and recognizes that citizens have the right to educate their children in either public or private schools when the educational standards of both are approved by the State educational authorities.

### **‘Support’ From Public Funds?**

Catholics have never asked for the “support” of their schools from public funds, even though justice would dictate that support. Justice would not dictate that the State allow \$1.00 for *religious instruction* in the schools, but it does dictate that if other schools, whether Catholic or Lutheran or Seventh Day Adventist, meet the requirements of the State in relation to the efficient teaching of *its* school curriculum, they be paid for that service. Such schools are paid for that service in Canada, and long received similar state support in nearly every nation in Europe. In most countries the policy obtained of allowing parents to determine whether they would have their school tax allocated to a Catholic, or an Episcopalian, or Methodist, or Lutheran, or other denominational school, or to the State school.

If Catholics have never asked for that support here in the United States it does not mean that a Federal Education Bill, or even a State Bill, is not discriminatory when it disallows such support.

It may not be known to you, the reader, that besides using all school tax money for the support of the public schools, most States impose special taxes on all children attending parochial schools, and use that



## CATHOLICS DO NOT ASK SUPPORT FOR SCHOOLS 15

revenue also for the public schools only, just as the Barden Bill would add all parochial school children to the public school enrollment for the purpose of getting a bigger grant from the Federal Government, and then immediately deduct these children when it comes to the distribution.

In California the State goes farther and taxes all non-public schools, even if some of its cities would go bankrupt should these schools be closed.

Last March the Archbishop of Los Angeles conducted a drive for \$3,500,000.00 with which to erect fifteen more Catholic schools, and obtained it. This will bring a great deal of relief to the School City of Los Angeles, for it needs a great many more schools to take care of its growing population. Yet instead of allowing anything towards the support of these schools *it even taxes them.*

Efforts have been made in the past to make attendance at the public school compulsory, but only by anti-Catholic and irreligious organizations. For instance, the *New Age*, official organ of the Southern Jurisdiction, Scottish Rite Freemasonry, 33<sup>o</sup>, takes credit for having tried this thing in the States of Oregon, California and Michigan. It has also admitted that it was supported in this action by the Ku Klux Klan and other anti-Catholic organizations, just as it was forced to admit that it sponsored the *Fellowship Forum*, a Klan paper in Washington, D. C., some years ago. That paper carried this sub-head: "Freemasonry's Representative at the National Capital," and removed it only after some of Masonry's prominent members objected.

No religious-minded American could be adverse to religion in education, because when religion is officially banned from the curriculum atheism is automatically encouraged.

Many years ago Daniel Webster, speaking on the Girard Will case, made this pronouncement:

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 in its tendency.

## Religion In The Public Schools

Do we advocate that religion be added to the curriculum of the public schools? No, we do not, because it would not be possible under the conditions which obtain in this country. In nearly every community a dozen religions are represented in every classroom and no textbook nor teacher could satisfy the parents of all the children.

But that does not mean that God Himself should be barred from the classroom; it does not mean that His moral law, accepted by both Jews and Christians, should not be interpreted; it does not mean that the parents have no rights in relation to what their own children should be taught. The decision of the present Supreme Court forbidding even indirect cooperation between the State and religion went counter to an unanimous decision of the Supreme Court in 1925, which held that the children belong not to the State, but to their parents, and that these have the right to have their children educated in schools of their choice. By inference parents would also have the right to demand that the school authorities permit their children to go out from school once or twice a week for religious instruction to be conducted under the auspices of the religion in which they hold affiliation. We are only commenting on a *principle* here, because Protestants have more to lose than Catholics through the discontinuance of released time instruction, since the children of very few of the former receive any religious instruction whatsoever, while one-half of the entire Catholic body is enrolled in religious schools.

## Compare Efficiency Of The Schools

Are you one of those who antecedently assumes that no independent system could successfully compete with the State system? If you are, we would only

ask you to visit a Catholic school and then to visit the same grade or grades in the public schools to ascertain which school is doing the better job. Public school teachers come and go, change occupations whenever they believe that it pays them financially to do so; and few of them ever dream of remaining school teachers for life.

In the Catholic school system the reverse situation obtains. Every Catholic religious teacher is consecrated for life to do that work; and since he (she) is home every night he (she) is able better to prepare lessons, to examine school papers, etc.

## **Right Understanding Of Backgrounds Is Necessary**

The controversy over Federal Aid "for certain services to all children" was first precipitated by enemies of all religion.

For instance, Mrs. McCollum, the professed atheist of Urbana, Illinois, was used as a tool by the organization known as the American Society of Free-thinkers, of which her father is President.

A short time previously a Mr. Everson, of New Jersey, was used as a tool to appeal to the Supreme Court of New Jersey to determine the constitutionality of a "Bus Transportation" law enacted by the New Jersey Legislature, which permitted the picking up of non-public school children on the highway. After the New Jersey Supreme Court found against Everson, his sponsors carried his case to the Supreme Court of the United States.

You need not be told that the employment of lawyers to prepare Briefs to be submitted to the Supreme Court, and to be argued and defended by these attorneys before the Court, costs a great deal of money, the burden of which no individual is likely to assume himself. It was discovered that several vehemently anti-Catholic organizations prepared Briefs to support Everson's appeal, as they later did to support Mrs. McCollum's appeal.

## How POAU Influenced Congressmen

When the POAU (Protestants and Other Americans United) was formed in January, 1948, it announced that it would press every member of Congress and every member of State Legislatures, as they convened, to keep out of any Federal Aid Bill a provision which would permit bus transportation to non-public school children. It was thinking, of course, only of children attending *Catholic* parochial schools.

Every member of Congress received a copy of a pamphlet from that organization entitled "Shadows over Our Schools," in which the Catholic Hierarchy of the United States was libeled.

This same organization admitted that it had induced 100,000 people over the nation to write to their members of Congress to support the Barden Bill. It was this anti-Catholic animosity which led to the flood of letters from Catholics to the same Congressmen—something unusual for Catholics to do.

## Why?

But why should "Protestants and Other Americans United" join hands with professed Freethinkers and Atheists? The reason is that the churchmen who formed this organization have all had anti-Catholic, and some of them extremely left-wing records. But there are backgrounds behind this latest offensive. We refer to the anti-Catholic and anti-American organizations which prevailed in this country twenty-five years ago. There was a tie-up, for instance, between the *New Age*, the official organ of the 33<sup>o</sup> Scottish Rite Freemasonry, Southern Jurisdiction, and the Ku Klux Klan, in a campaign to make attendance at public schools compulsory in the States of Oregon, California and Michigan.

If you were to go over the files of the *New Age* from the latest number through these twenty-five years and longer, you would find unfounded criticism of the Catholic schools in practically every issue.

## CATHOLICS DO NOT ASK SUPPORT FOR SCHOOLS 19

Besides this organization has been sending out a *News Bulletin* and *Slip Sheet* to editors of the daily and sectarian press every two weeks for the past twenty-six years—and most of these releases are anti-Catholic.

The cause of Protestantism has been greatly injured by the anti-Catholic campaign waged by some of its leading churchmen.

### **Our Non-Catholic Friends Know Better**

The 70,000,000 of our countrymen who are not affiliated with any of the churches live chiefly in the large cities, where Catholics constitute from thirty-one to more than seventy per cent of the entire population. They are driven farther away from religion by these anti-Catholic crusades, because they know Catholics by personal contacts, and they observe that the only clerical political activity, of which they are aware, is conducted by non-Catholic clergymen.

They observe that the only ones who seem not to know of any *plan* inaugurated by the Catholic Hierarchy to get hold of public funds for Catholic schools, or even to get some control of the public schools themselves, are Catholics—which makes it clear to them that there is no such plan.

Older non-Catholics know that even when Al Smith ran for President of the United States neither the Catholic Hierarchy, nor a single Bishop within the Hierarchy, raised his voice in espousal of Smith's candidacy, despite the fact that Protestant clergymen by the thousands, and some of their Bishops, openly opposed his election.

Most non-Catholics know that the Catholic schools are rendering a greater service to our nation than the public schools in which subversive textbooks have been used, in which Communist-minded teachers have taught, and from whose classrooms Christ and even God Himself are barred. According to a statement issued in a report of an Illinois Legislative Investigating Committee in August, 1949, "schools provide a

## 20 PIERCE THE CONFUSION AND SEE THE CHILD

most fertile field for effective activities for Communists and other subversive factors."

They know that the Catholic Church has done more than all other organizations in this country taken together, more than all other organizations in the world combined to stem the tide of Communism; that there are no subversive textbooks used in parochial schools; no Communist-minded teachers employed. They know that religion in education is not harmful, but immensely helpful to our nation's well-being. They know that the double taxation which Catholics willingly assume saves others from excessive taxation for the support of public schools.

### **Closing Our Schools Could Bankrupt Cities**

If in Chicago, Detroit, Cleveland, Buffalo, and other large cities, Catholics were to use their constitutional right to send their children to the public schools, local taxation would jump sky high.

They know that their cities would be thrown into bankruptcy if they had to provide the new school room needed for the admission of all Catholics. In the city of Chicago there are 76 Catholic high schools and 315 elementary schools, attended by 215,000 children. If the parochial schools were closed the school city would have to erect 215 more schools, each with the capacity of 1,000 children, and then take on the burden of their support. Similar crises would be precipitated if Catholics in other large cities were "disposed to get even."

### **Campaign Hurts Protestantism**

Verily anti-Catholicism is only helping the Catholic Church, while it is dealing a death blow to Protestantism. Presently there are only 7,000,000 affiliated Protestants in the fifty largest cities in the United States where 20,000,000 Catholics live, and, according to a survey reported in the latest Yearbook of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America,

less than one-third of the Protestant affiliation attends services with any regularity. The figures report that "only 30% of those on church rolls attend a service on any Sunday except Easter."

That is the reason why many Protestant clergymen are more bitter towards the promoters of the POAU than Catholics are. They believe that more should be done to preserve Protestantism than to destroy Catholicism, and to that end forty-two denominations have pledged support of "a united Evangelistic Advance" beginning on October 2, this year, and continuing throughout the year 1950."

Among the "other Americans" cooperating with the POAU are the Atheistic and Freethinker Organizations, and other bodies opposed to all religion, and, strangely, the "American Civil Liberties Union," whose national head, for a long time, was a professed atheist, and which belies its name by opposing the "civil liberties" of Catholics, Lutherans and a few other sects, who operate their own schools.

## **Settle It The American Way**

His Eminence, Edward Cardinal Mooney, Archbishop of Detroit, was questioned in Rome about the controversy over the proposed Federal Aid Bill, and his reply was as follows:

I think that no religious body in the United States wants to dominate education for itself and to the disadvantage of others. But we do not want to make religion handicapped. Nobody wants anybody else to pay for the religious instruction of his children, but everybody ought to want all American children to get a square deal. That principle would dictate a sane and sound solution of the question as we look at it.

We do not want a solution which is definitely contrary to the principles of American fairness and solidarity, therefore, we ask only that which the federal government can do in accordance with explicit decisions of the Supreme Court and we want that for all children of the United States.

Traditionally, religion has been recognized

in America as a help to citizenship. Every great American has appealed to religion in support of good citizenship and in the U.S.A. the ideal has always been co-operation in the face of real differences.

The American way is not to let these differences divide us in our devotion to our country and in the prosecution of the common good. In concrete situations which tempt people to indulge in bitterness the American sense of fairness and solidarity should come to the fore.

The entire problem is epitomized, the Cardinal declared, in a cartoon he would like to see posted on every bill-board in the U. S. for two weeks. The cartoon shows two little friends standing by a roadside about five miles from town on a winter day with the snow a couple of feet high. A school bus paid for by the fathers of both comes along and takes one of the little chums but refuses to take the other because he is going to St. Matthew's instead of the public school.

That is not America, he concluded.

## Summary Of What Catholics Ask

(1) Catholics have never sought and do not now seek Federal Aid for the "support" of their schools.

(2) It is very true that Catholics have written about the "injustice" of double taxation, of unfair discrimination contained in the American policy of requiring their schools to follow the same curriculum imposed on State schools without offering to pay anything for the efficient teaching of that curriculum. The defense of a theory is not tantamount to action for a contrary practice.

If State aid were actually granted it would be granted not to the school, but to the child. Education taxes are computed on the basis of the cost per child in the kindergarten, elementary and high school. Since that is true, even "support" of a private school would actually be an allotment to the child.

(3) In nearly all other countries the State per-



mits Episcopalians, Catholics, Presbyterians, Lutherans, to erect their own schools, and if they do a good job in teaching the State curriculum, the schools are maintained by the State. In many of these countries the parent is permitted to declare to which school he would have his school tax money applied. Over here, of course, that practice which seems to be eminently just, does not obtain. Yet Catholics are not trying, "according to a plan," as charged by the POAU, to have the American policy altered.

(4) While, under the Barden Bill, Catholics, who would pay \$60,000,000 of the \$300,000,000, would not be entitled to any services whatsoever, even if all their children, attending non-public schools, would be *counted* in order to procure a large Federal grant, and then immediately *deducted* in order that the per capita allowance per *public school* child might be greater.

In practically every State a similar injustice obtains, since the local *public schools* receive a per capita allowance from the State for every child enrolled in *both* the public and parochial schools.

In the State of California the parochial schools themselves are taxed, even though they bring great relief to the public in every city of that State. Isn't that unjustly penalizing a school to which the Supreme Court of the United States gave official status?

(5) The government owes health services *to every child*, no matter what school he may attend. Wasn't an effort made by our President even this year to have enacted into law a Bill which would provide health services, such as free medicine and a physician's care, to every one in the land, rich or poor, and regardless, of course, of the religion or race to which he (she) might belong?

Bus transportation for all school children has been made legal by the legislatures of sixteen states. But whether allowed by a special law or not every

child is entitled to it from the viewpoint of *safety* on the highway.

If the State would have children attending Catholic, Lutheran and other schools, use certain textbooks, then evidently, if it supplies these books to the children in public schools, it should furnish them to the others as well. This is again a service *to the child*, and not to the school.

Hence any opposition to the minimum demands of Catholics through a Federal Aid Bill is unfair, and must be motivated either by religious prejudice or by a misunderstanding of the situation.

Every child in the nation has civil rights, among them the right to attend any school which meets the requirements of the State, to health services, to protection on the highway, and to textbooks prescribed by the State itself.

# What They Thought A Generation Ago

**A**FTER the Public School system had functioned for exactly a half century, the press was filled with observations on its non-success, as reported, in part, in this pamphlet. You will note that all the criticisms were written by *Protestant* churchmen and editors of or contributors to the daily press.

*The Age of Steel*, October, 1896:

A boy may be kept at school for several years, . . . but if his heart is not educated with his head, his conscience with his memory, a knowledge of the date of the battle of Bunker Hill and the number of gallons of water in Lake Michigan are no guarantee that he will not use his acquired knowledge in putting the finishing touches to as consummate a scoundrel as ever entered a prison cell. So far as education goes, there are rascals who understand geometry, and can give you the distance of the sun, moon and stars as easily as a railway conductor can punch a mileage book.  
Fred Woodrow.

---

President Hyde of Bowdoin College, before the Massachusetts Teachers' Association of Boston, November, 1896:

The public school must do more than it has been doing if it is to be a real conductor of youth and an effective supporter of the State. It puts the key of knowledge in the child's hand, but fails to open the treasure of wisdom to his heart and mind. Of what use is it to teach a child how to read if he cares to read nothing but the sensational accounts of crime? These people who know how to read and write and cipher and know little else—these are the people who furnish fuel for A. P. A. fanaticism—who substitute theosophy for religion, passion for morality, impulse for reason, crazes and caprice for conscience and the Constitution.

From *The Educational Review*, February, 1898:

A little less than 50 per cent of all the children of our country frequent any Sunday school. The meaning of these figures is simply overwhelming. More than one-half of the children of this land now receive no religious education . . . Even this feature does not show all the truth. It seems to admit that those who attend Sunday school are receiving proper religious instruction; but everyone knows this cannot be granted.

Dr. Levi Seeley,

Of the State Normal School, Trenton, N. J.

---

## Shall We 'Disunite God'?

Rev. Henry C. Minton, of California (Presbyterian), Moderator of the General Assembly:

Is our educational machinery subsidiary to its only worthy end—viz., the fashioning of character? Have we, so morbidly afraid of uniting Church and State, gone so far as to disunite God from the State? This is a most serious question. The faith of our sons and daughters is involved, and the Kingdom of God in this country is involved. Our school system is not an organized skepticism, but a God-forgotten secularism.—Philadelphia, May 19, 1901.

---

Rev. Dr. David H. Greer (Episcopal), before the General Episcopal Convention:

Education needs something more than mental training and culture to make men pure and keep them so. It needs that culture and training inspired by religion. The Episcopal Church is not satisfied with the present system of public schools, because religion is not taught in them. These schools should not only turn out well-equipped young men and women, but Christians as well.—Washington D. C., Oct. 22, 1898.

The same Episcopal convention decreed:

That the bishops and clergy remind the people of their duty to support and build up our own schools and colleges, and to make education

under the auspices of the Protestant Episcopal Church superior in all respects to that afforded in other institutions.

Bishop Johnston (Episcopal), of Western Texas:

Gladstone said that a man educated intellectually but not morally may become more dangerous than before; and that is precisely the case with the colored people. In the public schools they receive no moral instruction, and while their wits are being sharpened there is scarcely any moral strengthening. This inability of the public schools of our land to teach any system of morals is going to lead, within a few years, to a struggle the like of which this country has never seen, and it will be with a generation that believes nothing at all.—Sermon preached in New York, June 10, 1901.

Dr. Wallace Radcliffe (Presbyterian):

In our church life we recognize the trinity—home, school and church—a triple cord not easily broken. The home is a school, the school is a home. It is an unintelligible Christianity which loses sight of this important factor (the school) in our church. \* \* \* It is something that your children go to school; it is more that they go to a school of your own religious belief. Therefore, we summon you to bring up your children in your own faith. Let us establish schools \* \* \* and teach our religious convictions.—Washington, D. C., Oct. 7, 1900.

## Moral Training Cast Out

Rev. Dr. E. T. Wolf, professor at Gettysburg Theological Seminary, before the Evangelical Alliance:

Moral training has for the most part been cast out of our public schools. Every faculty, except the highest and noblest, is exercised and invigorated; but the crowning faculty—that which is designed to animate and govern all others—is contemptuously ignored; and, unless its education can be secured, our young men and women will be graduated from our schools as moral imbeciles. This country is facing a grave

## 28 PIERCE THE CONFUSION AND SEE THE CHILD

social problem.—The Philadelphia *Press*, Dec. 4, 1901.

Rev. Dr. Washington Gladden, Columbus, Ohio, in an address at Yale University, April, 1902:

All that saves the public school from ruin in many cities is the self-sacrificing work of the teachers. There is a marked tendency in these schools to lower the standard of education by eliminating God and making us a sordid, money-making race.

---

### Morals Must Be Taught

Brooklyn (N. Y.) *Eagle*, June 1, 1902:

Right and wrong in the affairs of conduct are not matters of instinct: they have to be learned, just as really in fact, as history or handicrafts. Is this knowledge being imparted to our children in any efficient way and by any efficient teachers? Is the public school doing it? Is the Church doing it? Are fathers and mothers doing it? We are compelled to say "No" to all these queries. \* \* \* The truth is we are taking for granted a moral intelligence which does not exist. We are leaning upon it, depending upon it, trusting to it, and it is not there.

Our whole machinery of education, from the kindergarten up to the university, is perilously weak at this point. We have multitudes of youths and grown men and women who have no more intelligent sense of what is right and wrong than had so many Greeks of the time of Alcibiades. \* \* \* The great Roman Catholic Church \* \* \* is unquestionably right in the contention that the whole system as it now exists is morally a negation.

The great company of educators and the whole American community need to be sternly warned that if morality cannot be specifically taught in the public schools without admitting religious dogma, then religious dogma may have to be taught in them. For righteousness is essential to a people's very existence. And righteousness does not come by nature any more than

reading or writing does. \* \* \* We are within measurable distance of the time when society may for its own sake go on its knees to any factor which can be warranted to make education compatible with and inseparable from morality, letting that factor do it on its own terms and teach therewith whatsoever it lists.

This argument is often heard in favor of secularized schools. "Let religion be taught in the home and in the Sunday school." Archbishop Ryan's answer to this specious plea is worth remembering:

If you subtract from the great mass of Christian parents the number who have not the necessary time to teach their children at home, and also a second class who have not the necessary knowledge, and still a third class without the necessary disposition, you will probably sweep away two-thirds of the teachers of the home school. And when you reflect on how little can be done in an hour's Sunday school work, and how this little is half dissipated before the next school day, you will understand how essential is the daily education in religious truth.—(Quoted by Sacred Heart Review.)

## Prof. Gates

Prof. Gates, of the Chicago Theological Seminary, writes in the *Biblical World*, September, 1902, as follows:

The great problem of life is education. The mind of the race is growing all the while, and it is for the educator to see that these mental powers are developed in the right direction. But no man's education is complete if religious instruction be omitted. One may know all the mysteries of science and literature; he may sweep the heavens with the telescope, or peer into the secrets of nature with the microscope; but if in all this he see not God he is but poorly educated, after all. Now where do we find ourselves, as we confront this phase of the national problem? We have a system of public education to be proud of. Never have the various questions that meet the teacher been so well understood

as today. But what is this great system doing for the religious instruction of our children? Practically nothing.

Answering the proposition that religion should be taught at the Sunday school alone or in the family, the *Biblical World*, in an editorial, October, 1902, says:

It has been so assumed, but each passing year shows more clearly that this is not the case, (that religion can be taught in the Sunday school and in the family). The home feels no longer the necessary responsibility, and the Sunday school has neither the time nor the instrumentalities for adequate instruction. And, in addition, the divorcement of religious from secular education destroys the vital relation between the two. Therefore, it seems certain that the ideal of education, as well as the only adequate method of education, is to establish religious and moral instruction in the common schools. And we shall then find ourselves once more in accord with the status of instruction in England and Germany.

### **Amasa Thornton**

On this same question Mr. Amasa Thornton, in the *North American Review* of January, 1898, says:

The questions which we have to solve then are these: How can the present decline in religious teaching and influence be checked; and how can such teaching and influence be increased to such a point as will preserve the great cities of the next century from depravity, degradation and destruction? What can be expected of the family? If the adults of the present age are not as religious as the needs of the hour and of the future require, will the children receive the proper religious training if they receive none except in the home circle?

After pointing out that thousands of children do not even learn a short prayer at home, the writer then declares that one of the greatest blunders that has been made in this country is the failure of teaching religion in the public schools. He then pays the following tribute to the Catholic Church:



The Catholic Church has insisted that it is the duty to educate the children of parents of the Catholic faith in such a way as to fix religious truths in the youthful mind. For this it has been assailed by the non-Catholic population, and Catholics have been charged with being enemies of the liberties of the people and the flag. Any careful observer in the city of New York can see that the only people, as a class, who are teaching the children in the way that will secure the future for the best civilization, are the Catholics; and although a Protestant of the firmest kind, I believe the time has come to recognize this fact, and for all to lay aside religious prejudices and patriotically meet this question.—(*North American Review*, January, 1898, pp. 126-128.—See also the *Biblical World*, November, 1902, p. 323.)

### **Prof. Coe**

Prof. Coe, of the Northwestern University, recently said in a lecture delivered at Chicago, reproduced in the New York *Freeman's Journal* of January 24, 1903, as follows:

The position of Roman Catholics in regard to religion and education, and their policy in the establishment of parochial schools, are absolutely correct. For corroboration of this opinion I refer you to the work "Philosophy of Education," by Dr. Arnold Tompkins, principal of the Chicago Normal School, in which he says religious character is the proper end of all education.

### **Points Out Weak Points In Public Schools**

Back in October, 1903 the Rev. W. Montague Geer, vicar of St. Paul's Chapel, Trinity Cathedral, New York, wrote to the New York *Sun* a striking letter in which he reiterates and reinforces the arguments for religious education which in a former letter produced such a storm of discussion. "This question," he says, "has ceased to be a point at issue between Protestantism and Roman Catholicism, and has become one between Agnosticism, established and en-

dowed, and Christianity, disestablished and disendowed."

Dr. Geer goes on to say that there can be but one point of view for the Church and all Christians in this matter of religious education, the point of view of the children of the poor.

My opinions on this subject were at one time strenuously opposed by a man now high in the counsels of the nation. Today he sends two of his sons to a Church school of the highest order, and his daughter to another, both schools well known for aggressive Christian nurture. And I have acted, as far as I could, on the same principle. Yet neither he nor I thinks, for a moment, that our children are one whit better in the sight of God than those of the poorest hodcarrier; or one whit better entitled to daily Christian nurture. We send our children to Christian schools because we rightly value Christian education and can afford to pay for it. The hodcarrier sends his children to the public school, since he has not the money to do better for them; because the state has made it impossible for him to secure Christian education for his children. That condition of affairs is most repugnant to my sense of justice, as I do not doubt it is, on reflection, to his. There can be no Christian propriety or American fair play in such cruel discrimination against the poor, in essentials.

Dr. Geer makes a very good and apt exposition of the reasons why irreligious education is bad for the state and helpless in the solution of national problems. He groups them under nine heads:

I. State education touches the negro problem for harm.

\* \* \* No nation was ever guilty of wilder folly than we are now guilty of in attacking this discouraging problem with an almost completely secularized and Godless education. Burke argued against total abolition, and said: "I confess I trust infinitely more (according to the sound principles of those who ever have at any time ameliorated the state of mankind) to the effect and influence of religion than to all the rest of the regulations put together."

II. State education touches the divorce problem for harm. It does little in itself to strengthen the moral fibre of our children, and it deprives the Church of one of her best opportunities to do that kind of work so effectively as to reduce the divorce evil to the lowest possible point. The public school system comes between the Church and her children for harm. The Gospel, as a result, has not free course in this country; and until it has, the divorce evil will increase, and Church life and home life will continue to deteriorate, and innocent children will continue to suffer (Oh, the pity of it!), and in increasing numbers; all, admittedly, to the peril of our existence as a nation.

III. State education touches the industrial problem for harm.

The less religion a people have the more quarrelsome, unreasonable, discontented and suspicious of each other they become; more and more watchful for self-interest, without regard to the public good. Religion binds the classes and the masses together, and makes them more considerate of each other's feelings. No seeming exceptions to this rule can disprove it. \* \* \* When labor threatens a general strike in all departments of work throughout the entire land, and when capital threatens to reduce labor to subjection by a process of slow starvation, verily the splendid dimensions of our great country shrink to those of a small and quarrelsome Verona.

IV. State education touches on political problems for harm, by multiplying the number of those whose votes go to the highest bidder, because they have not had principles of honesty instilled into their hearts and consciences in any effective way.

V. State education over-educates and over-stimulates countless numbers of people whose after lives give no adequate play for their enlightenment and unhappily acquired ambition. Hence, deserted farms, over-crowded cities, widespread and ever increasing discontent.

Attention is called a second time to this over-education indictment, because, in common with nearly all the other specific indictments in

my first letter, it has received no notice in the discussion which has followed, although in your editorial you speak especially of this question as being "well worth debate."

VI. State education touches for harm the problem involved in the marked falling off in the number of candidates for the Christian ministry.

VII. State education touches for harm the problem involved in the falling off in church attendance, largely for the same reason. I do not find that the Roman Catholic Church, which provides parochial schools for its children as far as it can, has complained of any falling off, either in the number of candidates for the priesthood or in the attendance of people in divine worship. That Church is, therefore, surely wise, yes, and patriotic, in putting her children under the highest spiritual obligations to her as their Divine Mother.

IX. State education is going to touch for harm our problems in Porto Rico and the Philippines, for the same reason that it has been a source of injury to us in the home country.

Nor is there a single ethical or spiritual problem that we have in common with other countries which state education does not touch for harm.

Can there be any surprise, that one burdened with this belief is not to be silenced by fear lest the Roman Catholic Church should profit by a modification of our system of education?

There can be no effective teaching of morality without personality. We cannot teach patriotism without George Washington and Abraham Lincoln. No more can Christian ethics be effectively taught independently of Christ and His Church.

Nor is it enough to say that the Church and the home must attend to the religious instruction of the young; because, in their influence over children, both Church and home are being weakened and slowly undermined by our "madly-perverted" system of secularized education.

## Sir Joshu Fitch

Sir Joshua Fitch tells us (Fitch, Thomas and Matthew Arnold, pp. 95-96) that he dreaded any theory which would tend to view the life of the scholar as a thing apart from the life of a Christian; he protested most earnestly against any attempt to divorce religious from secular instruction, or to treat them as distinct parts of an educational scheme. In the last named work Sir Joshua Fitch says:

The device sometimes advocated in later times for solving the religious difficulty in our common and municipal schools by confining the functions of the school teacher to secular instruction, and calling in the aid of the clergy or other specialists to give lessons on religion at separate hours, would have seemed to him wholly indefensible, and, indeed, fatal to any true conception of the relation of religious knowledge to other knowledge."

In one of his sermons he said:

It is clear that neither is the Bible alone sufficient to give a complete religious education, nor is it possible to teach history, and moral and political philosophy, with no reference to the Bible, without giving an education that shall be anti-religious. For, in the one case, the rule is given without the application, and in the other the application derived from a wrong rule.

## Prof. Harper

The *Literary Digest* of December 27, 1902, expressed the same views, said to have been inspired by the then editor, the late President Harper, of the University of Chicago, taken from the *Chicago Biblical World* of November, 1902. In this article we find the following most appropriate statements:

It is a serious phase of the present situation that the religious and moral instruction of the young is isolated from their instruction in other departments of knowledge. The correlation of the different elements of education is incomplete, because the religious and moral instruction is received in entire separation from the general

instruction of the public schools. The facts and truths of religion are the foundation and the imperative of morality. Present civilization rests upon the religious and ethical ideas of the past, and the civilization of the future depends upon a due recognition of religion and morality as essential factors in the growing welfare of humanity. The knowledge and experience of religious and moral truth must underlie and penetrate all knowledge and experience. The events and the ideas of the past, as of the present, must be viewed in the light of a divine hand as the creator of the universe, a divine power sustaining it, a divine wisdom guiding it, and a divine purpose accomplished in it. The physical world about us, our fellow-men, and our own selves must all be interpreted by religion truly conceived and morality properly understood. It is, therefore, impossible to accomplish the ideal education of the individual when the religious and moral element is isolated from the other elements; still worse, when it is not received at all by the majority of the children. All the elements of education must be woven together into an organic unity to produce a perfect result.

## No Religious Training

A remarkable address was delivered at a public school commencement in Toronto, Ohio, on Aug. 7, 1902. It was by Judge John M. Cook, a non-Catholic, in a Methodist church.

Mr. Cook said:

In one study your curriculum has been deficient. Your diploma is no guaranty of your religious training. Man, a fighting animal that he is, has a three-fold nature, physical, mental and moral. The two first have been trained; the third, I am sorry to say, entirely neglected, so far as your schools are concerned. Such condition is supposed to be necessary in republics. You may succeed; you may accomplish all that you have pictured to yourself you will accomplish, and all that your friends hope for you, and yet, without religion, your life will be a failure. Your moral nature should recognize that there is a great con-

trolling influence in the world that man cannot escape. A great first cause, which we call God, to whom we are responsible and whose teachings, come in what manner they may, we must observe and obey. A controlling power to whom we can look for assistance and against whom we can lean. Away with agnosticism that knows nothing; without faith, without hope, I would sooner have the belief of a heathen savage, carrying in my vest pocket a little idol, looking to it as God, than have a faith or rather no faith, whose only teaching is that you cannot tell whether there is a God or not. There will come a time when you will need a God, a real God, an actual God. Succeed as you may, you will meet with many reverses and defeats. There will come a time—many of us have reached it already—when the broken fragments of your ambitions will lie all around you as so many skeletons, haunting and taunting you. Day by day you will inquire, is this all? No, not all. If, in this life only we have hope, then we are of all created things most pitiable.

When a mere youth I went to a parish school that required, whenever the clock struck the hour, the whole school should rise and repeat in concert the Apostle's Creed. Blessed is the memory of that school. I still hear the striking of that clock and the words of that creed still linger with me, conveying my mind and satisfying my soul. "I believe in God, the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth; and in Jesus Christ, His only Son, our Lord, who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was dead and buried. He descended in hell. The third day he again arose from the dead and ascended into heaven and sitteth on the right hand of God, the Father Almighty, from thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead. I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Holy Catholic Church; the forgiveness of sins; the Communion of Saints; the resurrection of the body and life everlasting."

My young friends, may you ever remember that in all your getting you get wisdom and understanding, which is a firm belief in, and the practice of the Christian virtues.

# The People's Wish vs. Organized Opposition

## *The Voice Of America*

Judges, financiers, doctors, psychologists, editors, farmers, laborers, teachers, lawyers, penitentiary officials, detectives, traveling men, government officials, politicians, plain folks—Catholic, Jewish and Protestant 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.

The letters received sound like the voice of America.

Several granite-like facts stand out from this mass of opinion:

1—Americans of all creeds or no creeds can talk religion outside of the church.

2—America is going to do something, in a national way, about training its children spiritually as well as mentally and physically. The facts are convincing. We are shocked at the



crimes of our own grade school and high school boys, who are criminals because they don't know how to be anything else. That ghastly line of 10,000 human beings who die by homicide in America every year is a parade that must be stopped. We are getting tired of having our young daughters live mental and physical lives that we cannot comprehend—and no spiritual lives at all. Business men are getting tired of having over a billion dollars a year stolen by fraud. America is on the point of doing something that will serve to set our children straight.

3—Children do have souls, and their souls must be trained in schools as well as in homes; if they are not trained in homes, then school training is all the more necessary. America, these letters indicate, is coming to recognize that fact; it is getting ready to act on it.

It is not common for the daily press to editorialize and sermonize on articles which appear in current magazines, but *Collier's* received praise, congratulations, and encouragement from editors in every state. We reproduce a few herewith:

"This piece of news (the *Collier's* announcement of an effort to prepare a school-room code of right living) should be heralded with satisfaction," says the *Passaic (N. J.) News*.

"It exactly expresses a growing feeling . . . There is no reason why good men and women of all religious faiths cannot agree upon a simple course of such instruction," says the *Savannah News*.

"Moral philosophy is taught in the universities," points out the *Indianapolis Star*—"why not in our grade schools? Almost any good work on moral philosophy could be reduced to a simple code that could be taught in the public schools, without advantage either to or against any religion," it comments.

The *El Paso Times* says: "The necessity for the teaching of either morals or ethics to the rising generation has become decidedly felt within the last few years. A moral man with little education is apt to be regarded as a better citizen than an unmoral man with a good deal."

"It is to be hoped that the movement will be successful in solving one of the greatest if not the greatest problem confronting the nation today, says the *Winston-Salem (N. C.) Journal*.

"The fallacy of training children mentally and not morally is everywhere becoming alarmingly apparent," says the *Glendale News, of California*.

"Where are our children trained and brought up?" asks the *News Reporter, of Whiteville, N. C.* "If in the home and school, then it is incumbent upon the school to carry out the injunction."

"Mother's knee"—and the schoolroom—the *Santa Ana (Cal.) Reporter* sees them both as sources of power. "The schools should help the mother by following the proposal of *Collier's* that 'natural religion' should be taught in the public schools by means of a moral code."

"Read what *Collier's* says about the lack of moral training in our public schools," advises the *Wichita (Kansas) Beacon*. "Isn't it about time for the church to accept this layman's challenge, for a long time inarticulate and half-formed and now given direct expression by *Collier's*?"

The *White Plains (N. Y.) Reporter*: "It is apparent that the people of the United States are in favor, or at least a great mass of them are, regardless of their religious beliefs, of training the mind morally as well as intellectually.

"Suggestions for a code divide themselves into two classes. Some writers want religion introduced into the public schools. Others say that morals or ethics is enough.

"What is to be done with the Ten Commandments? Scores of writers suggest that nothing could be better for our schoolrooms."

The editor of *Collier's* explained his reason for the polling of public opinion in these words:

Because of our differing beliefs, religious teaching has been barred from many of our public schools.

This has resulted—quite unwisely and unnecessarily, as it seems to us—in there being

little or no training for our children in those schools.

Concerning supernatural religion, men differ and divide; but natural religion lives in every human being. It is evidenced in that moral guide which we call conscience—which may be crude or cultivated, but which is the essence of every system of morals because it is a part of the mind of every man.

No sane person will deny the necessity for all—regardless of creed—to aid in the development of that fundamental force. An education solely in the material things of life is surely incomplete. The young mind must be impressed at the same time with the fundamentals of what constitutes right and wrong.

This general approval of a change of policy in the public school system of the United States was not surprising in the light of a report issued about that time by the International Sunday School Council of Religious Education, which revealed the astounding and shocking fact that:

There are 27,000,000 Americans below the age of 25 years, normally Protestants, who receive absolutely no systematic religious instruction. Two out of every three Protestant children under 25 years of age are not being touched in any way by the educational program of any church.

In 1941 the number of American children "with no religious background or instruction" had reached 30,000,000, according to George Wieland, religious statistician.

Dr. L. W. Irwin, writing in the *Christian Observer* (Presbyterian) in April, 1926, noted that:

The United States stands before the world as a Christian nation. If there be any truth in the claim that the nation is Christian its system of education should be placed on a Christian basis, and that teaching should be done from a Christian point of view, not atheistic or agnostic.

## The Voice Of Britain

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.

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 citizenship 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* wrote of the work done by religious bodies in evacuation areas and continues:

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.

## Brought Wide Approval

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 cost.

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.

A letter from Lilian M. Faithfull contained this passage:

If a united front had been presented to the undenominational movement of sixty years ago and a determined corporate effort on the part of the various religious bodies to retain their hold over the school children, if not over the schools, much might have been done . . . It is almost incredible, but it is a fact, that there are children of school age who do not know what happened on Good Friday.

Athelstan Riley, of Jersey, wrote:

Churches and denominations should be encouraged by the State to give religious instruction in all schools, and all that pay rates (taxes) should share in them equally. At present the scales are heavily weighted against definite religious teaching, and the Roman Catholics in particular, who take the greatest interest in the education of their children, and will not entrust them to unknown teachers in provided schools, are cruelly treated.

## 46 PIERCE THE CONFUSION AND SEE THE CHILD

J. Scott Lidgett, Bermondsey Settlement, Farncombe-street, Jamaica Road, sent this comment:

I write to urge that those—a rapidly growing number—who are concerned with the gravity of the situation should exert their influence upon all education authorities, national or local, to take wisely considered but vigorous action in regard to this momentous subject. If the Christian values of our civilization are to be maintained we cannot afford to live on the capital of the past, but must take all available means for strengthening the convictions of faith by adequate instruction in its Christian foundations.

Action followed quickly in England. Representatives of the Established Church, of the Catholic and "Free" Churches (which includes all other denominations) drafted a five-point post-war Peace Program, the first point of which called for "compulsory religious instruction in every school of the nation."

In August, 1941, the proposal was submitted to Winston Churchill and to the President of the Board of Education by 224 members of the British Parliament. The government was asked to have text-books prepared for religious instruction, to require a religious service to be held each day in every school and to authorize state inspectors to see that religion would be taught in accordance with the wishes of parents.

At the end of December, 1941 (See *Time*, Jan. 5, 1942) it was reported in the press that "Parliament will soon make religious instruction and daily worship a statutory requirement for every school in the United Kingdom. The churches and Britain's Board of Education are now collaborating to draft an act making worship and religious instruction compulsory."

Britain has, for many years, permitted religious organizations to erect their own schools and then to receive public funds for their support, provided only that the secular branches of the curriculum be properly taught. The benefit of religious instruction as a part of every school curriculum has not only been



recognized, but defended by the leading statesmen and newspapers of England.

Mr. Balfour, leader of the Conservative Party in England, declared:

I have always cherished the hope that our elementary State schools eventually would be so conducted as to secure to every child the kind of religious instruction his parents desire him to receive. This is the sole solution that appeals to me as strictly compatible with our ideals of religious liberty, of parental responsibility, and of the primordial necessity of religious training in children's education. I hold it to be an evil, aye, the greatest of all evils, to permit children to be brought up in schools in which no provision is made for religious formation. And I solemnly express today my hope that England will never accept the responsibility of public instruction without religion.

The same Mr. Balfour, in his book entitled *Theism and Humanism*, in which he defends the need of religious education, wrote:

That debt will not long be paid if morality comes to be generally regarded as the casual effect of petty causes; comparable in its lowest manifestations with the appetites and terrors which rule, for their good, the animal creation; in its highest phases no more than a personal accomplishment, to be acquired or neglected at the bidding of individual caprice. More than this is needful if the noblest ideals are not to lose all power of appeal. Ethics must have its roots in the divine; and in the divine it must find its consummation.

Commenting on this, the editor of the *Tablet* (February 24, 1940), wrote:

Religious illiteracy is the worst of all forms of illiteracy, and the greatest injury which can be done to the young. Yet we have been rearing in our great towns this godless proletariat. Those who know the practical difficulties, in an atmosphere in which authority is not valued as a source of life, but resented as an affront to democratic dignity and the pretense that the major-

ity impression, however ignorant and handicapped by its environment that majority may be, must be allowed to set the tone, will not hastily blame the Church of England for this ignorance, as so many Church of England spokesmen have been fond of blaming the Church of Spain, a body with not half the resources or income, for unbelief in Spain.

But they will look rather to the whole development of the English educational system, and particularly to the capture of Oxford and Cambridge in the last century by the forces of unbelief, largely led by German idealist philosophy, which formed the mind of Whitehall through two critical generations.

Today a very high proportion of the teachers whom the State schools entrust with the next generation are aggressively anti-Christian, and their own religion is not the Christian faith, but a humanitarianism which, even when it professes agnosticism, treats all the great questions of the purpose and meaning of human life as if the Christian revelation was certainly untrue. *The Times'* leading article, since reprinted, on 'Religion and the National Life' brought out very clearly how the doctrinal bases upon which our national life and institutions claim to repose, have been eaten away.

If comment were needed on the above thesis, we would let it be made by John Ruskin, the noted English author, who writes (see *Precious Thoughts*) in part:

Anything which makes religion the second object, makes religion no object. God will put up with a great many things in the human heart, but there is one thing He will not put up with in it—a second place. He who offers God a second place, offers Him no place . . .

All human government is nothing else than the executive expression of Divine authority. The moment government ceases to be the practical enforcement of Divine Law, it is tyranny; and the meaning I attach to the words 'paternal government' is, in more extended terms, simply this—'the existence fulfillment, by formal methods, of

the will of the Father of Mankind respecting His children.'

On July 15, 1941, declaring that actual ignorance of what the Christian religion teaches is wide-spread, the then Anglican Archbishop of York, Dr. Temple, now the Archbishop of Canterbury, moved the following important resolution on education at the final meeting of the summer session of the Church Assembly:

That this Assembly, convinced of the need of a true Christian education *in all the schools of the country*, and gratefully recognizing the work of teachers in all classes of schools, gives general approval to the statement recently issued by the Archbishop of Canterbury, York and Wales, and earnestly hopes that with the co-operation of the various Christian communions, of education authorities, of the teachers, and of Christian citizens generally, speedy effect may be given to the following five point resolution:

(1) In all schools a Christian education should be given (except where parents wish to withdraw their children from it) by teachers willing and competent to give it.

(2) Religious knowledge and the imparting of it should be an 'optional subject,' not merely an 'additional option.'

(3) Where only one or few of the teachers are qualified to give Christian teaching it should be made permissible to give this teaching at any period within school hours so that the same teacher may teach several classes at different periods.

(4) Religious teaching should be inspected with regard to its methods by His Majesty's inspectors or some other duly authorized person.

(5) In all schools there should be an act of worship at the beginning of the school day.

## Canada

In the two Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, Canada, religion is taught in the schools and the State supports Catholic, Methodist, Presbyterian and Ang-

## 50 PIERCE THE CONFUSION AND SEE THE CHILD

lican schools. The policy was stated in May, 1898, by the editor of the *Canadian Churchman* (Prot.):

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.

The government of Ontario made the following concessions 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.

### **Holland**

In this country the law recognizes private schools and grants them subsidies. As in Sweden, Norway and Denmark, Holland had a State Protestant Church for years, and only "Members of the Protestant Church in good standing" were permitted to teach. But under a new law, inacted in 1920, private schools were given the same status as public schools and, today, are patronized by three times as many students.

### **Germany**

The traditional policy of the German Government was based on the parental right to educate his child, although education, for many years, was compulsory under a curriculum in which religion was taught. But after World War I changes were made even in the Provinces where Catholics constituted a majority, because Socialism, which had grown to great proportions, demanded the secularization of education. Socialism had millions of followers in Germany after World War I and it was as anti-Christian as is Communism today.

In 1920 the Supreme Court of the Commonwealth handed down a decision to the effect that the Revolutionary School Law of Saxony, which prohibited religious instruction in schools, was un-Constitutional.

### **Austria**

Religion was taught in all the schools in Austria until its invasion by Hitler. In 1924 when Socialists had control of the government there was an effort to have religious instruction discontinued, but without success.

Dr. Hans Karl Zessner, a member of the *Department of Constitutional Law* of the Office of the Austrian Chancellor, held it to be:

A great mistake to rely upon the State completely for elementary teaching. It is true that it devolves upon the state to see that elementary education be general and free and that a minimum of educational standards be generally accepted. Complete control, however, of education is not a function of the state. Schools must be maintained in keeping with the intention and the spirit of the parents and of the religion of the children who attend the same. The rights of parents and the rights of children must be considered first of all in education. It is an unjustifiable act of violence to suppress them.

### **Australia**

Samuel Pearson, a Protestant New Zealander, sent a letter to one thousand Protestant Ministers' Associations and Protestant Church Courts in the United States, urging that they unite for the introduction of some religious instruction into the public schools if it covered no more than the Ten Commandments and the main precepts of the Bible. He noted that:

In democratic Australia, which has no State Church, Catholic priests, Jewish rabbis, and Protestant ministers have, for sixty years, been allowed to enter the public schools for half an hour once a week to give special religious in-

struction to the children of their own faith in a separate room.

### **In Pagan Lands**

When Protestant missionaries enter China, Japan, India, the first thing they do is found schools to impart religious instruction to pagans. They follow the same practice when they establish themselves in Latin America, whether it be Mexico, Central or South America. These institutions are directed and supported by mission funds collected here in the United States. The Protestant clergy are well aware that evangelistic work will not succeed if there be no foundation on which to rear the structure of Christianity. Religious knowledge evidently must be the basis of religious practice.

### **Why Not In The United States?**

For those who wonder why Protestants in the United States do not found their own religious schools, the probable answer was given in its April 25, 1925 issue by *The Nation*. This magazine is Socialist, unfriendly to Christianity and especially to Catholicism. In substance the article to which we refer declared that the public schools of the United States are already in the hands of Protestants.

The answer is given by the *Nation* (April 29, 1925) a Socialist Magazine very unfriendly to Christianity and especially to the Catholic Church. In substance the article reports that the public schools of the United States are already in the hands of Protestants. The reader will, we are sure, be interested in this reproduction of the result of the survey taken by the *Nation* 24 years ago, under the caption "Many Catholics Teach Schools," by David Henry Pierce.

Are the public schools of the United States a Protestant and Caucasian institution supported by public funds? There is considerable evidence to permit of an affirmative response. In connection with a proposed book, the writer inquired of leading teachers' agencies, the extent of discrimination by school

officials against Catholics, Jews, atheists, and members of other than the white race.

In so far as the answers dealt with religious discrimination they prove that the alleged non-sectarianism of the American public school is a fiction. Discrimination against Catholics and Jews is high in nearly every section of the country. The dean of the department of education of the Toledo Municipal University frankly urges Jewish students to refrain from specializing in education because of the difficulty in securing positions. The most brilliant Jewish students in Ohio State University, who have majored in education, cannot secure places in the public schools. In an Ohio village the woman in charge of a school house refused to deliver the keys of the building to a young principal, recently appointed, because he was a Catholic.

Negroes are employed in colored schools and also in some Northern and Western cities where a liberal policy was begun early and has been steadfastly maintained. Cleveland, Detroit, and Chicago have found no horrible evils resulting from permitting colored girls to instruct white children. Foreigners are not wanted in the American public schools, nor are Asiatics permitted to prove to receptive white children that the "inferior" races possess human traits.

With reference to Jews and Catholics conditions vary slightly in different sections of the country, but discrimination is the rule rather than the exception. One California agency writes that "Jews are considered individually, by personality largely." In answer to a request for his opinion concerning present tendencies, the manager declares that discrimination in his section is decreasing. He adds: "It is a curious and interesting item that in this section the denomination most aggressive in insisting that its adherents be hired is the Methodist." He concludes that the Klan has increased anti-Catholicism and that where a Catholic community is vigorously pressing a parochial school program there is less opportunity for teachers of that faith to secure public-school appointments.

The Middle West shows a high degree of intolerance in regard to teachers of other than conventional, well-known Protestant faiths. "Ninety-six to 98 per cent of our calls are for Protestants," writes a Missouri agency. "Anything 'queer' is objected to." "At least 95 per cent of our calls ask or require Protestants" is a response from Iowa. "I consider," writes an agency manager from the home State of James Whitcomb Riley, "that the religious line is more emphatically drawn now than at any time in my experience . . .

The correspondent's assumption that public and Protestant schools are identical is the view of others. A Pennsylvanian, for example, in endeavoring to account for discrimination, asserts: "In the case of the Jews the discrimination arises partly from the fact that they have many holidays, and these different from ours. Of course the main reason is the feeling that American institutions should be kept unsullied. In the case of Catholics there seems to be a feeling that they are not so well fitted by training and forward progressive outlook. However, religious prejudice probably is at the root of the discrimination." He adds that in the district he serves, Western Pennsylvania, discrimination against Jews and Catholics is almost universal.

A New York agency manager declares that discrimination is usually due to social conditions. "Many Catholics and Jews have not had equal opportunity, socially with Protestants and would not therefore be happy in many Protestant communities." Replies from the South did not indicate that this popularly condemned section of the country was subject to any greater degree of intolerance, except for the color line, "which is as fixed as Gibraltar." However, the Klan has made itself felt in the type of teachers desired. A Georgia agency writes: "Religious tests in our opinion are less common within Protestant ranks, but more common by far in this section as between Catholics and Protestants. The discrimination is mainly outside the larger cities; in other words,



in localities having a very small percentage of Jews and Catholics." The writer adds that Jews suffer a degree less discrimination because the Jewish religious organization in no way opposes the institution of the public school.

It is the Middle West, however, which seems to be particularly smitten with an intense prejudice against the non-Protestants. It seems to permeate men who would be expected to possess a reasonable amount of cosmopolitanism. A few years ago an official in the educational department of Western Reserve University, in writing a letter of recommendation for an honor graduate, a Jewess, included the following: "Although she is of the Jewish faith, I am sure she will be a successful teacher." Every metropolitan suburb of Cleveland inquires openly into a teacher's faith, a condition that would hardly be tolerated in the vicinity of New York or Boston. Not only do the non-Protestant elements seem more alert in preventing discrimination in the East, but Ohio differs from New York, Pennsylvania, and Massachusetts in that there is no specific legislation against the open and undisguised use of the religious test. Incidentally, few State departments of education place any obstacle in the way of executives who care to ask a teacher: "What is your religion?" or "What church are you a member of? If not a member, which do you prefer?" An Idaho official wrote that Article IX, Section 6 of the State School Law declared against discrimination, that school executives did not subject their applicants to any religious "test," but they were permitted to print upon application blanks a request for an applicant's statement of religious preference. When asked if such a request did not constitute a religious test the Assistant State Superintendent wrote: "I do not think that a printed form requesting church preference is a religious test, as the teachers are under no obligation whatever to answer the question. Very few of them do fill in the blank. We have no law forbidding the use of this question on printed form."

The foregoing is quoted, not because Idaho is particularly flagrant in the matter of the religious inquisition, but because it represents the attitude of the majority of State educational officials. Regardless of State constitutional provisions that there must be no religious or political discrimination for public office, it seems tacitly assumed that this rule does not extend to teachers. The position of the United States Department of Education in regard to religious tests for teachers in public schools may be gathered from the following letter:

The Bureau of Education exercises no control or supervision over the public-school systems of the several States. It is only a clearing-house of educational information, advice, and assistance, and makes no attempt to interfere with the administration of any State's system of schools. In view of this fact I can make no authoritative ruling on the use of the religious tests in filling teaching positions. Anything that I might have to say on this subject would be of the nature of mere opinion, and I hesitate to give that. It is conceivable that the use of such tests may lead to abuses particularly under some circumstances. On the other hand, there are doubtless those who hold that a school board in employing a teacher should be possessed of information as to whether he or she is religious or non-religious. Those holding this view would doubtless contend that a teacher having no religion whatever could hardly be trusted to develop the highest moral character.

May 6, 1924.

L. A. Kalbach.

Acting Commissioner of Education.

Pennsylvania officials declare the practice of demanding a teacher's declaration of religion is contrary to the Constitution of the United States and also a violation of an express statute of their Commonwealth. Says Albert Lindsay Rowland, director of the Teachers Bureau, Department of Public Instruction:

With regard to the question which you raise, both the Constitution of the United States and the constitution of this State forbid a religious test

for public office, and here is a further provision in the School Code, Section 2891, which reads as follows: "No religious or political test or qualification shall be required of any director, visitor, superintendent, teacher, or other officer, appointee, or employee in the public schools of this commonwealth." Under these circumstances, any teacher who can prove that there was a violation of this statute in connection with her employment could recover damages therefor.

This makes interesting reading, particularly when compared with the assertion of the agency which declared western Pennsylvania demanded "Protestants only."

Chapter 71 of the General Laws, Section 39, of Massachusetts provides that discrimination shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$50. It also makes excellent reading until we include the assertion of a Massachusetts agency manager: "This law is understood to have been mainly promulgated by a combination of Catholics and Jews and in my opinion has worked rather to their own disadvantage." New Jersey has a positive bit of legislation, and a September issue of *America*, the Catholic Weekly, reported a grand-jury investigation of alleged discrimination against Catholic and Jewish teachers. New York will refuse state aid if discrimination is proved. Discrimination nevertheless exists, and opinions vary regarding the effectiveness of the law.

The Catholic Church is making rapid strides in its efforts to educate all children of the faith in parochial institutions . . . On the other hand, the public school is assuming the character of a Protestant parochial institution, destined to be controlled by Methodists, Presbyterians, and Baptists. Although public school children secure valuable contacts they are not permitted to discover that Catholics, Jews, foreigners, and other "queer" folks might be as capable instructors as their Sunday-school teachers.

Such a condition cannot exist indefinitely. The immediate trend of American public education seems to be toward further discrimination. But a whole-

some civilization cannot be predicted upon the basis of Catholic parochialism and Protestant hypocrisy. To develop tolerance, sympathy and understanding, children must be impressed with the unity of mankind. An educational system, devoted conscientiously to furthering social progress, will have no room for sectarianism either in teaching body or student personnel. Standards that will determine a teacher's worth will be far removed from such requirements as church affiliations, facial contour, or color of the skin. The social force will require an intense effort, with decidedly radical changes. But until these changes occur, public education will act merely to preserve the seeds of discord.

# Advice From Our Past Presidents And Others

## **George Washington**

LET us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the 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 principle.—George Washington's "Farewell Address."

## **Theodore Roosevelt**

On January 29, 1905, the late 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, 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 exalteth a nation."

## **Calvin Coolidge**

Calvin Coolidge, in October, 1925, made this statement in a talk delivered in the city of Washington:

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 law, it is because there have been first 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 from 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 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.

On another occasion the same President, speaking at Phillips Academy (May, 1928) observed:

Unless our people are thoroughly instructed in its great truth, 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.

You will note the late President Coolidge's interpretation of the "why" for the separation of Church and State, namely to "emancipate the former from all political influences," and not to discourage its functions.

## **Thomas Marshall**

Speaking at the cornerstone laying of a new Catholic school for St. Mary's Parish, Indianapolis, the Honorable Thomas Marshall, then Governor of Indiana, and later Vice-President of the United States, 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 the 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 Almighty God.

I congratulate this church or any other on erecting such an institution as this 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.

## Rev. James A. Pike

In his inaugural sermon as Chaplain of Columbia University, the Rev. James A. Pike (Protestant Episcopal) declared on August 7, 1949:

In discussion of Federal aid to education I worry about the general naivete which assumes that the neutrality of public schools is not a dogma. Actually schools are teaching that this is all there is—a humanistic ethical-culture basis of life . . . If you teach no religion, you teach a kind of religion, which is secularism.

## The Duke Of Wellington

Another great military and political leader has spoken even more strongly on this subject. Lord Mahon writes of the conversation which he had with the great Duke of Wellington, as follows:

I shall never forget the earnestness and energy of manner with which he (the Duke of Wellington) deprecated mere secular education, adding, "*I doubt if the Devil himself could advise a worse scheme of social destruction.*"

Take care what you are about, he exclaimed on December 23, 1840, when speaking of the new Education Act; "for unless you base all this education on religion, you are only bringing up so many clever devils."

The above is taken from Lord Stanhope's "Conversations with the Duke of Wellington," London, 1888, page 180.

## U. S. Chamber Of Commerce

In July, 1941, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States set up a Committee to cooperate with a similar committee of the American Association of School Administrators designed to bring more religion into the education of the child. This joint committee made this declaration:

There has been too little appreciation that an intelligent belief in God is the greatest obstacle the 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 their 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 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.

Here is a corporate expression of belief that religious schools should be encouraged.

### **Nicholas Murray Butler**

On November 28, 1940, at the rededication ceremonies of Earl Hall, Columbia University, the late President Nicholas Murray Butler deplored the effect of the exclusion of religious education from the public school in these words:

This generation is beginning to forget the place which religious instruction must occupy if 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 re-

ligious 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 serious 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.

The same President of Columbia had the following to say in his annual report to the Trustees of his institution on January 11, 1935:

One need not himself be religious, or indeed have any great concern for religion, to grasp the fact that religion has had a very large, often a preponderant, influence in shaping our contemporary civilization and in laying the foundations of our present-day social, economic and political institutions. Until within a reasonably short time, the process of education itself was dominated by religion . . . During the half century just past, this condition has changed entirely, and religious knowledge, together with religious interest, is passing, all too rapidly, out of the educational process . . .

The school child, however, is entitled to receive, and should receive that particular form of religious instruction and training which his parents and natural guardians hold dear. This cannot be done if the program of the tax-supported schools is arranged on the theory that religion is to be excluded from the educational process or treated merely incidentally as an element in home life. The government's indifference to religion must not be allowed to become opposition to religion.



