

The Sentinel

OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

VOL. XVIII

NEW YORK, SEPTEMBER 24, 1903

NO. 39



The religious training of the young is a religious, not a civic, obligation.

Neither church nor state can be benefited by an attempt to teach religion in state schools; the true interests of both forbid such an attempt.

Those churchmen who contend that the state should undertake the teaching of religion should tell us what the church exists for. If it is the business of the state to look after the religious interests of society, then the church has no reason for existence.

The fact that secular education alone is not complete education, and that religious training is necessary for the full development of mind and character, does not prove that the state should teach religion. It shows that the giving of a complete education and the work of fully developing mind and character exceed the functions of the state.

"The prerogative of religious instruction is in the church, and it must remain in the church; in the nature of things it cannot be farmed out to the secular school without degenerating into a mere deism without a living Providence, or else changing the public school into a parochial school and destroying the efficiency of secular instruction."

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO., 11 West 20th St., New York City
OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI

Entered January 2, 1903, at New York, N. Y., as second-class matter, under Act of Congress of March 3, 1879

The Sentinel

OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

VOL. XVIII

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 24, 1903

No. 39

Educators Favor Religion in the Public Schools

As stated last week there is developing in the educational world itself a sentiment or conviction favorable to the idea of making religious instruction a part of the public educational system. More and more the truth is being emphasized that a secular education is not a complete education; that religious training is essential for a proper and all-round development of mind and character. And it is assumed that it is the business of the public educational system, or should be its aim, to produce an all-round development of mind and character. And so the matter of religious instruction and its introduction in the public schools is coming up and being discussed at the annual meetings of the National Educational Association. At the meeting in Boston in July one session was devoted to a discussion of the matter. The chief feature, or at least it became the chief feature, was a paper by United States Commissioner of Education William T. Harris on "The Separation of the Church from the School Supported by Public Taxes," a portion of which we print elsewhere. Preceding this paper were read by Prof. George A. Coe of Northwestern University, Chicago, and "the Very Rev. E. A. Pace, Ph.D., S.T.D., of the Catholic University of America," the topic of the latter being "The Influence of Religious Education on the Motives of Conduct." "There was no dissent of importance from the convictions presented" in these two

papers, but it is very significant that the sound, able, American, yes, and Christian, position of Dr. Harris "aroused immediate antagonism." We are told, though not from an impartial source, that "most of the educators present felt that the speaker was twenty-five years behind the times." Dr. N. C. Schaffer, State Superintendent of Schools of Pennsylvania, "insisted on the need of some religious instruction in the schools," and "protested against the common idea that Bible reading in the schools means the sum and substance of religious education." Others "cordially endorsed his utterances." Rev. William S. Chase, of New York, "charged denominationalism with the exclusion of religious teaching," and made the very significant point that "*with religious unity there would be no trouble about religious teaching.*" "Religious unity" is coming, and there can be little doubt as to what it will mean in this matter. We are told that the discussion "revealed a majority in favor of some sort of religious instruction in the public schools," and that "noting which gratifying circumstance, the Rev. Dr. Pace said: 'It is a great problem which is not insuperable, and the fact that open discussion of it has begun shows that it will be settled in America.'" So the drift of affairs in the educational world itself already assures Catholicism that the obstacles to what it aims at in this matter are not insuperable, and that the question of religion in the schools, for which it is chiefly responsible, "will be

settled in America" as it is demanding that it shall be settled.

✦

The Schools not yet
Completely Secular

We did not mean to imply by what was said last week as to

the growing menace to the principle and practise of separation of church and state as regards public instruction that that principle is fully adhered to in the public schools, for such is not and has never been the case. In the main the principle has been carried into practise, but not entirely. From the beginning it seems that Bible reading and other religious exercises have been common, and such seems to be the case still. But of course this has not been required by the state; it has simply been permitted. But though teachers and school boards may have at their discretion disregarded it to some extent, the principle of separation of church and state has always been law for the schools as much as for the legislatures and courts. So it is true that this question of religion in the schools is a live one to-day not only because of a reaction against the practise of the principle in the schools, but also because of action being taken to have it carried fully into practise. Not only is there a demand that religious instruction shall be legally established as a part of the system of public instruction, but also there are strong objections being entered here and there to the religious features which prevail in spite of the principle of separation of church and state. It is demanded that this principle be adhered to and such features discontinued. This very proper demand arouses intense opposition in some quarters, and though it is not the most important phase of the matter, this has much to do with making the question of religion in the schools a live one at present. That the custom of Bible reading in the schools, which as a religious exercise is certainly out of harmony with the principle of separation of church and state,

is to-day pretty well entrenched in this country would appear from these facts vouched for by Rev. R. C. Wylie, secretary of the "National Reform" Association:

There are nine States in which the reading of the Bible in schools rests securely on a legal basis, plainly written either in the State constitution or in the school law; twelve States in which, while there is no specific mention of the Bible in the constitution or law, there are decisions of courts and State school superintendents of an authoritative character which give to the custom of Bible reading quite a secure legal status; sixteen States and a Territory in which there are none of the legal safeguards mentioned above, but in which the custom of reading the Bible prevails, supported by long-established usage and public sentiment; three States and a Territory in which the Bible is not read, although there are no legal provisions for or against the custom; and five States and a Territory in which the decisions of courts, attorneys-general, and school superintendents are adverse to the reading of the Bible.

✦

Some Expressions from
Catholic Sources

As stated last week Catholic speakers and writers, in furtherance of the aim of that church to overthrow the practise and principle of separation of church and state in the public educational system, are on every possible occasion decrying the system as now constituted and advocating such a change in it as will make it include definite religious instruction. It will be pertinent to give a few recent utterances of this sort, though we shall be obliged to omit comment that we should like to make. Although expressions just like it are constantly being made by Catholic ecclesiastics, an utterance recently made in New York by Bishop McFaul has stirred up some comment and criticism, as is not usually the case. It was made at St. Patrick's Cathedral at one of those frequent Catholic demonstrations which are so fully and prominently described in the press. The occasion was "the consecration of the Rev. Charles H. Colton

as Bishop of Buffalo," and bishops and prelates from all parts of the country were present. Bishop McFaul delivered the sermon of the occasion, and in speaking of the duties of a bishop made the utterance referred to:

There are many live questions in our country wherein the gift of leadership is required of the bishop. The educational problem must be solved. The public schools as at present constituted are detrimental to church and state. Eminent non-Catholic educators are gradually perceiving that "intellectual cultivation has no effect in arresting the sources of evil in the human heart; it alters the direction of crime, but not its amount." Teaching religion in the church and the home is not sufficient. The absence of such teaching in the school is rapidly leading youth into indifference and dechristianizing America. The bishop must proclaim "in season and out of season" the danger of education without religion and morality. Thus he will serve both church and state; for the welfare of the republic depends upon the virtue of its citizens.

This is the utterance resented by the *New York Journal* in the editorial quoted elsewhere. At a meeting held in Boston on June 26 "to further the cause of Catholic federation," and which was attended by "representatives from sixty-nine [Catholic] societies," "Rev. W. G. Read Mullan, S. J., president of Boston College," made this utterance, which, though the only portion of his speech quoted in a report in a Catholic periodical, was placed in bold type:

There can be no education without religion. Our public school system, though great and grand as it may be, is defective, inasmuch as it does not include *Catholic, Christian, religious education*. The Federation insists that there must be religion in education, for without religion there is no education. Education without religion leads to anything but true and good and sincere citizenship.

About the same time a convention of the German Catholic Societies of New York State was held at Albany. The president of the organization, Joseph Mielich, in his annual address declared:

It is the most sacred duty of parents to give their children a Christian education, and it is the duty of the State to assist them in doing so. We demand a share in the public school funds because we have been taxed to create this fund. The State guarantees us religious freedom, and the right to educate our children in our religion is inherent in this privilege. We enter a solemn protest against the order of the Government compelling Indian children to attend godless schools. We protest against the unjust manner with which the Government has treated the Catholic people in the Philippines.

Mr. Mielich must have been reading the State Sunday law. This idea that "the right to educate our children in our religion" *at State expense* is necessary in order to enjoy the religious freedom guaranteed by the State is on a par with the idea that unless Sunday observance is enforced upon everybody the observers of Sunday are not protected in their religious liberty. But this is a piece of sophistry that is being used against the principle and practice of separation of church and state in the schools as well as in the matter of Sunday enforcement. Thus, in a statement issued a year or so ago Bishop McFaul said:

Here we have a system of **public schools** wherein all religious teaching is eliminated. Catholics consider the system dangerous to free institutions. Still, if our fellow-citizens, regardless of results, must have this system, we can only appeal to them—for we also are American citizens—not to tax us for the support of schools which our conscientious convictions will not permit us to patronize. It is no answer to say to us: "There are the schools ready for you or anybody else; if you do not desire to send your children to them, it is no fault of ours." Non-Catholic citizens select a system of schools which is obnoxious to their Catholic fellow-citizens, and then they have the hardihood to say to them: "You shall be taxed for their support; whether they are suitable to your or not does not concern us." Must not the freedom of conscience to which an American citizen is entitled be held inviolable, and should not his fellow-citizens, by virtue of the Constitution, protect him in the exercise thereof? Shall not our country

supply our Catholic children with a system of education acceptable to the Catholic conscience?

One of the chief objects, if not the chief object, for which the American Federation of Catholic Societies, at the head of which is Bishop McFaul, has been organized and is being strengthened is to have "*our country supply our Catholic children with a system of education acceptable to the Catholic conscience.*" This is one of the dangers of that religious-political organization. It has already proposed "a solution of the educational problem, so far as we are concerned." But we shall have to leave that for later consideration. Many more such utterances as have been given here might be given if space permitted. The Catholic press abounds with expressions of the same ideas.



A Subsidiary Question

In connection with the question of religion in the public schools, or public support of religious teaching, a number of other questions are raised, which, while important and having a certain bearing on the main issue, really do not affect the principle involved, and however they are decided cannot be allowed to determine the main question. One of these is "the question of the practical and comparative results of education in the public schools and in schools of which the basis of the instruction is religion." The New York *Sun* thinks this "is certainly a very important question," and "a practical question," and one that "ought to be answerable, if not completely, at least partly by facts," and in harmony with the suggestion of a correspondent who is of the opinion that "a statistical comparison of the practical results of the public school and of the parochial school education would not exhibit the moral advantages of religious instruction," has asked for, and promised to print "as valuable contributions to an important

social study," communications giving "well-authenticated facts bearing on this particular question." "Are our children actually suffering moral deterioration because of the purely secular education they receive in the public schools, and are pupils turned out by the parochial schools of a better moral tone and less likely to fall into habits deleterious to themselves and the community?" pertinently asks the *Sun*. Its correspondent suggests a definite plan for getting at the facts and reaching a conclusion:

Instead of arguing the school question on mere theory, why not get facts on which to proceed? They are obtainable. Find out what was the schooling, parochial or public, of the actual majority (1) of those who are in the pauper class in the dispensaries and hospitals; (2) of those who are daily brought up before magistrates for "drunk and disorderly" conduct; (3) of those who are serving time in jails. It is easy to go through the wards, the courts, the corridors, and get answers to these questions in actual statistics, and until these statistics are at hand there is no basis for any argument on the subject worthy of consideration.

It is safe to say that the ecclesiastical system which is making the most fuss over "godless" education has nothing to gain by such an investigation, and that its position in the matter will not be strengthened thereby. The *Sun* intimates as much by virtually advising it not to press matters to a point where such an investigation "is sure to be made" and to be used in determining legislative action. The safest policy for "the Church" in this matter is that which an exchange says she is now pursuing—"to claim everything and prove nothing."



In a paper read at the "Quaker Hill Conference" on August 14, on the topic, "The Education Which a Self-Governing State may Properly Provide," Prof. Chas. H. Smith of Yale University "took strong ground as to the necessity of including both morals and religion in

primary education," but he qualified this by saying that it should be done "only so far as is necessary to form good citizens of an earthly state." There need be little fear but that when religious teaching is established in the public educational system it will be done on the ground that it is in the interests of good citizenship here, and not because of any interests it may promote over yonder. The danger of this idea of religious instruction by the state lies in this very fact that it is coming to be regarded as in the interests of and necessary for good citizenship. It is this that will enable it to be carried into effect.



The *Catholic Transcript* says:

It is a noteworthy fact that Lutherans and Jews retain their adherents longer than do other non-Catholic denominations. And singularly enough they join hands with Catholics in demanding religious education for their children. The sects that are lamenting empty pews are those that raise the shrillest cry whenever an attempt is made to engraft religion upon our school system.

This is a truly Catholic statement. The Lutherans and Jews do not, as the writer of this knew full well, join hands with Catholics in the attempt to engraft religion upon the public school system. On the contrary, there are no two classes more opposed to that Catholic scheme. The Jews and Lutherans care enough for their religion, for fundamental American principles, and have enough self-respect not to expect and demand that the state shall attend to the matter of the religious education of their children.



"That conception of the state which seeks to banish the Bible from the school and to silence therein the voice of prayer and all instruction in Christian truth, is at war with any acknowledgment of God in any State constitution, with all our thanksgiving proclamations, with the universal custom of prayer in Congress and in our State legislatures," protests the

Christian Statesman. This is the truth, and it proves that that conception of the state is a consistent conception, and one that accords with the fundamental principles of the American government. The "acknowledgment" of God in constitutions, thanksgiving proclamations by civil officials, and the prayer custom in legislative bodies are relics of church-and-state union that have never been proper in the American Republic.



According to the *Christian Endeavor World*, "no more important topic was discussed" at the late International Christian Endeavor Convention at Denver "than that of 'The Bible in the Public Schools,' which was ably treated by the Rev. T. H. Acheson, of Denver." He "gave an interesting résumé of the legal status of the Bible in the public schools of the various States," and said "that all Christians ought to take the position of the National Educational Association, at its meeting in Chicago: 'The Bible that made the public schools ought also to be taught in them.'" The great Christian Endeavor organization is evidently one of the forces that stand for state support of religious teaching.



The Catholic Church has four thousand parochial schools in the United States, with an attendance of about one million students. The claim is put forth that "the superiority of the parochial schools over the public schools is becoming more apparent every day." The public schools have an attendance of about thirteen millions.



A misprint occurred last week as to the date of the day appointed to be observed "as a day for prayer for public schools and for sermons on education." It should have been given as September 13 instead of September 10.

Religion Cannot be Taught in Secular Schools

An Eminent Educator Shows Why¹

THE principle of religious instruction is authority; that of secular instruction is demonstration and verification. It is obvious that these two principles should not be brought into the same school, but separated as widely as possible. Religious truth is revealed in allegoric and symbolic form, and is to be apprehended not merely by the intellect but by the imagination and the heart. The analytic understanding is necessarily hostile and skeptical in its attitude toward religious truth. The pupil is taught in mathematics to love demonstration and logical proof, and he is taught in history to verify the sources and to submit all tradition to probabilities of common experience. The facts of common experience dealing with the ordinary operations of causality are not sufficient to serve as symbols of what is spiritual. They are opaque facts and do not serve for symbols; symbols are facts which serve as lenses with which to see divine things. On themes so elevated as religious faith deals with, the habit of thinking cultivated in secular instruction is out of place. Even the attitude of mind cultivated in secular instruction is unfitted for the approach to religious truth. Religious instruction should be surrounded with solemnity. It should be approached with ceremonial preparations so as to lift up the mind to the dignity of the lesson received. Christianity is indeed the religion of the

revealed God, but there is no revelation possible to the mind immersed in trivialities and self-conceit. In religious lessons, wherein the divine is taught as revealed to the human race, it is right that the raw, immature intellect of youth shall not be called upon to exercise a critical judgment, for at his best he cannot grasp the rationality of the dogmas which contain the deepest insights of the religious consciousness of the race.

The advocate of the parochial school often urges by way of rejoinder his view that the secular branches ought to be taught in the same manner as the catechism, which teaches the dogmas of the church by authority; and it is a fact in parochial schools that the influence of the dogmatic tone sometimes creeps into the secular recitations, and too much authority in secular studies prevents the pupil from getting at the vital points. He cultivates memory at the expense of thought and insight, for the best teaching of the secular branches requires the utmost exercise of alertness and critical acuteness of the intellect. The spirit of authority loves dogmatic assertion and the memorizing of the exact words of the text-book. It represses the investigating spirit and stifles independent thinking. Arithmetic, algebra and geometry cannot be learned by authority. It is, in fact, a nearer approach to the divine to have an insight into the necessity of mathematical proof than it is to take results of demonstration on authority.

In view of the differences between religious instruction and secular instruction, and in view of the contrast between the spirit of the school and the spirit of the church, it is clear that the school cannot successfully undertake religious instruc-

¹ This very able pointing out of the distinction between the method proper for religious instruction and that proper for secular instruction, and the impossibility of giving religious instruction in the public schools to the advantage of either church or state, is by United States Commissioner of Education, William T. Harris. The substance of the paper read by him at the American Educational Association convention in Boston in July was afterwards presented in an article in *The Independent*, and what is given here is reprinted from that article.—EDITOR.

tion; in fact, experience goes to show that the school fails to achieve success when intrusted with religious instruction.

Even the bare enumeration of Christian doctrines in language partly secular is sufficient to show the impossibility of their introduction into the curriculum of schools supported by public taxes. Even the doctrine of the existence of God implies a specific conception of Him, and the conception of the divine varies from that of the finite deities of animism to the infinite deity of East Indian pantheism and the Holy Bible. It varies from the pantheistic Brahm, whose concept is that of negation of all attributes, to the Jehovah of the Bible who is self-determined and personal, but elevated entirely above nature. Mere deism is opposed to all of the creeds of Christendom. When we come to teaching a live religion in the schools we see that it must take a denominational form, and moreover it must take on the form of authority and address itself to the religious sense and not to the mere intellect.

The church has through long ages learned the proper method of religious instruction. It elevates sense perception through solemn music addressed to the ear, and works of art which represent to the eye the divine self-sacrifice for the salvation of man. It clothes its doctrine

in the language of the Bible, a book sacredly kept apart from other literature, and held in such exceptional reverence that it is taken entirely out of the natural order of experience. The symbolic language of the psalms, the prophets and the gospels has come to possess a maximum power of suggestiveness, powerful to induce what is called the religious frame of mind. The highest wisdom of the race is expounded before the people of the congregation in such language and such significant acts of worship as to touch the hearts of young and old with like effect.

We must conclude, therefore, that the prerogative of religious instruction is in the church, and that it must remain in the church, and that in the nature of things it cannot be farmed out to the secular school without degenerating into mere deism without a living Providence, or else changing the school into a parochial school and destroying the efficiency of secular instruction. . . . The church management must not rest in security on the belief that the time is coming when it may safely rely on an unsectarian instruction in the elementary schools for the spread of true religion, nor rely upon the re-establishment of parochial schools in place of free schools under government control and supported by public taxes.

If we are to train up a God-fearing people to inhabit this land of ours, and stamp upon its civic life an indelible Christian character, the only way in the world to accomplish it is to insist on Christian church schools of highest character and grade, not to supplant the public schools, but to supplement their work in the sphere which they cannot occupy, and give to the rising generation a thorough knowledge of the essentials of religion and the foundations of faith.—*The Lutheran*.

Bishop James A. McFaul of Trenton, in an address the other day, remarked, anent the subject of religion in the public schools, that "intellectual cultivation has no effect in arresting the sources of evil in the human heart; it alters the direction of the crime, but not its amount." This is true, and because it is, our Roman Catholic friends should see the necessity for providing for the religious education of their own people without looking to other sectarians for assistance.—*Christian Work and Evangelist*.

Two Newspapers on the Question of Religion and the Public Schools

UNDER the heading, "An Attack on the American Public School Is an Attack on the National Welfare," the *New York Evening Journal* of August 29 published this editorial:

On Tuesday, August 25, in New York City, a distinguished clergyman, preaching to a large congregation, dealt with certain aspects of present social conditions. His emphasis of the importance of morality throughout life was admirable and truthful. His denunciation of the divorce evil was powerful and in the interest of the home and of the future. But his attack on the American public school, one of a regular series of such attacks daily becoming more numerous, we feel bound to resent and oppose.

The public school of America does not need any defender. It underlies the country's progress, it is the ONE hope of the country's future. . . . But any clergyman or any religion that attacks the public school does need a defender, for such a clergyman or such a religion, if it speak with authority, confesses fear of knowledge, which means fear of truth.

In the attack on the public school it is stated that the public school, in which education in FACTS is separated from the inculcation of religious BELIEF, accounts for the lack of morality in the people. Crimes of one kind or another are pointed out as the result of the public school, in which spelling, arithmetic, geometry and other departments of fact are kept distinct from the religious training, which includes miracles and belief. We shall show how unjust and foolish is the attempt to connect individual crime with the splendid, beneficent, national public school system.

The newspaper which contained the attack mentioned on the public school told also of a young army officer, named Murtaugh. This young man had disgraced himself through fraud, and had been accused of conduct unbecoming an officer, and also of being a common thief. It happens that this young man got his education in a religious school, a school in which religion is taught with geography, etc. Would it not be stupidly unjust to hold that RELIGIOUS school responsible for this unfortunate young man's predicament?

That same newspaper contained an account of a young woman confined in the Tombs Prison, accused of forgery and other crimes.

That young woman's education was received in a RELIGIOUS institution. Would it not be unjust to hold the good, earnest women who taught her responsible for her moral shortcomings?

Czolgosz, the anarchist who murdered President McKinley, was educated in a religious school; he never attended an American public school. Would it not be a stupid crime to hold the RELIGIOUS school responsible for the murder?

The public school, in which all the children of the nation may meet on equal terms, is the nation's glory and greatest hope.

There are religious schools of all kinds, Baptist, Methodist, Presbyterian, Roman Catholic and others, in which children are well educated and in which, in accordance with their parents' desire, religious teaching is added to the other branches of instruction.

These schools are well managed, they do great good, they should be treated with respect. They should be paid for by those who want them.

But the public schools also should be treated with respect, and especially by ministers of religion.

The Constitution of the United States forbids the recognition of any religion by the government, which means that all religions should be treated alike justly and impartially.

Common sense and common justice demand that when all the people are taxed for the education of childhood, religion should be left out of the school course, that no faith may be offended.

Wherever Protestantism, however indirectly, is made a feature of the public school, justice and right are violated.

The Protestant, the Catholic, the Jew, the atheist—all forms of religions, all forms of belief, and of unbelief—should find in the public schools the most intelligent inculcation of established FACTS.

Those who wish their children to receive an education in which facts and religion are mingled have the right to do as they please, but they should do it at their own expense.

The man who attacks the American public school, be he clergyman or layman, attacks the welfare of this country, although he may not realize it, and he attacks also the standing of his own religion in the estimation of the great majority of American citizens.

This is in the *Journal's* vigorous and characteristic editorial style, and in this instance its vigor is well-directed, though it is inclined to exaggerate somewhat the value of the public school. But, if by attacks upon the American public school is meant such attacks as that resented in this instance—attacks for the purpose of having religious teaching introduced in them—there is no exaggeration on any of the other points made. The "distinguished clergyman" referred to was Roman Catholic Bishop McFaul, head of the American Federation of Catholic Societies. His utterance and the circumstances of its deliverance are given elsewhere. The religious schools which Murtaugh and Czolgosz attended were Roman Catholic religious schools; the religious institution in which the young woman spoken of received her education was a Roman Catholic religious institution. These examples should give Mr. McFaul and others like him something to think about, for in the light of them certain big assumptions of theirs need considerable toning down.

No newspaper in the country takes more interest in and gives more attention to matters of public interest in which religion figures than the *New York Sun*, and the *Sun* is especially interested in this question of religion and the public schools. From editorials bearing on this question which it has published in the last few months, and which relate especially to conditions in New York, we select the following:

The question of religious education for the public schools is interesting many of our correspondents. Whenever this question is raised in our columns there at once pours in on us a flood of correspondence on the subject. Mr. Green, a teacher, argues that some sort of religious training is necessary for the full development of a child's character; but what sort shall it be, asks another correspondent, in a community of Christians and Jews, Catholics, Protestants and infidels? Still another ques-

tions if the actual results of the religious teaching in the Catholic parochial schools are as good as those in the public schools.

The question of Bible reading in the public schools, once a cause of bitter controversy between Catholics and Protestants, has now been succeeded by the beginning of what may be a considerable controversy over the schools between Christians and Jews.

The Charter of the City of New York provides for the reading of the Bible in the public schools, but to whom the selection of the version of the Bible to be used is to be intrusted does not appear. Obviously some English version must be used in the schools. Nor is there any definition of the "Holy Scriptures," though there are differences of canon which sharply divide the religious world. The Jewish canon, of course, excludes the New Testament. The Roman Catholic canon differs from the Protestant. The Bible as it exists in the King James translation is received as canonically complete by Protestants generally, but not by the majority of Christendom and by the majority of Christian believers in New York.

Accordingly, in times past, opposition to the reading of the Bible in the King James version has come from Roman Catholics, but of late years we have heard little of it, probably because that church welcomes any sort of recognition of religion in the schools, and its canon of the Scriptures includes all those in that version, although the form of the translation does not receive its approval. The State Superintendent of Public Instruction avers, moreover, that during the seventeen years of his connection with that department he has "never known of an appeal or protest from any inhabitant of the city of New York with reference to reading the Bible in the public schools of that city, although it has been daily read in every one therein during all that period."

We observe, however, that the Jewish inhabitants of New York, increased rapidly from a comparatively small number to five or six hundred thousand, or about one quarter of the total population of the Manhattan borough, where they live almost wholly, are now beginning to make protests. A writer from the Ghetto, in a recent number of the *American Hebrew*, complains bitterly of the "missionary campaign" for the propagation of Christianity among the Jews which, he alleges, is carried on by "some of the public school principals." He instances a school on the East Side, with

an attendance from 90 to 95 per cent. Jewish, where, according to his allegation, the principal "has persisted for years in reading from the New Testament at the morning exercises." This practise of "dealing out Christianity to Jewish children" he resents as a violation of the constitutional rights of conscience, on the ground that it is using the schools for religious purposes which conflict with the faith and conviction of a large part of the people. It seems to him, and not unreasonably, that "there is too much discretion in the hands of the principals," under the section of the Charter we have mentioned.

It will be seen, therefore, that the question of Bible reading in the schools has taken on a new phase, and more particularly in New York, now the seat of the greatest Jewish community in the world. This Jewish population, too, is growing so rapidly by immigration and by an especially large natural increase that it is likely to be one million at the end of the present decade. Moreover, the Jews of New York are distinguished by their interest in the public schools, the cleverest pupils of which are frequently if not usually of Jewish birth. Until recently we have heard little from them on the subject of Bible reading as a school exercise, but it looks now as if, with their great increase in numbers and influence, they would be likely to insist on making their influence felt in deciding this question. They have become a part of the population so great that they are of a political importance which they are not slow to appreciate at its full value and to use for the benefit of their race and religion. Accordingly, the Jews have demanded and secured the arrangement of examinations and of school sessions so that these shall not interfere with the religious duties of the Jewish pupils.

The need of religious training for the young generation is now engaging special attention among the Jews. We made a quotation the other day from a paper by a Jew of the orthodox school, the school in which are the great majority of the Jews who have come to this country from eastern Europe during the last twenty years—the Jews who inhabit the East Side Ghetto, the most numerous community of that race in the world. This Jew laments that the American Jews, even those of the strictest orthodox inheritance, are falling away from Judaism as a religion. Another Jew writes to us confirming his observation of that tendency, but glorying in it. Both these writers seem to look on the education the chil-

dren are receiving as responsible for this "new Jewish thought." The first finds a "great danger" "in the complete secularizing of the education of Jewish children." Even where there is a "homœopathic dose of religion," however sufficient it may be for the non-Jewish child, it is not enough for "the Jewish boy or girl, who needs Jewish knowledge, if not faith," else the "sapping of Jewish strength" will go on. "The task of the religionists must be to capture the younger generation," he declares; and the same sentiment influences Christians who are demanding religious teaching in the public schools, on the theory that the school should be primarily a training ground, a nursery, for the church.

We are glad to observe, however, that this orthodox Jew does not make any demand for the introduction of Judaism into the public schools and does not find fault with them because it is not there. He calls on the orthodox Jews themselves to provide the religious teaching. . . . The Jews, instead of looking askance at the public schools because they are assisting so powerfully in bringing about this "gradual decay," are eager to have their children enjoy the advantages of the public school education, in the primary and grammar schools, and in the colleges.

The Roman Catholic Church, which looks on religious training of the young as a primary religious obligation, is staggering under a tremendous burden of expense in order to maintain its parochial schools, and among Protestants there has always been a demand that the Bible should be read in the public schools. But nobody has been able to solve the problem of a scheme of public religious instruction which shall be equitable and consistent with our principle of government. Even if the Jews are not now the most numerous of all the races here, they soon will be. The Roman Catholic population is at least a third of the whole. If we are guided at all by the church attendance as indicative of religious belief, the majority of the people of New York are infidels or indifferent to religion. Actually, too, the public schools, without the religious instruction demanded, are crowded and therefore are satisfactory to parents, apparently. So great is the steady increase in the demand for school accommodations that the city is taxed to the utmost to meet it, though the parochial schools of the Roman Catholic Church are numerous.

Moreover, the denial by one of our correspondents that the children coming from the schools are showing a practical moral declen-

sion because of the absence of public religious instruction is deserving of serious consideration. The question as to the effect of the purely secular training of the public schools on the moral character of their pupils is now raised. It is contended, on the one side, that the secular education to which they are confined leaves the moral development of their pupils woefully incomplete; in other words, that education without religion is a snare and a delusion. But how, asks the other side, are you to give religious instruction under the authority of the State to a body of children of parents of many different religious beliefs? One of our correspondents proposes a compromise. He would teach the Ten Commandments as moral laws which are of universal acceptance by all religions; but that would not satisfy those who are demanding religious instruction, for, *at the bottom, what they demand is instruction in a particular religion. They want more than morals; they want religion.* How is it possible to satisfy them without stirring up controversy and rebellion, division and recrimination, which would lead inevitably to the break-up of the whole school system?

It is contended that because of the absence of religious teaching in the schools the children from them are retrograding morally. Where is the evidence that such is the case? Side by side with the secular public schools, with half a million pupils, are the Catholic parochial schools, of whose instruction religion is the foundation. Which produce the better results in character? If the superiority of the religious education is as great as some of our correspondents represent, the fact must have been

Our school authorities should not cater to race or religion. If any sect desires to have its children taught its peculiar tenets, let the members of that sect pay for the schools in which they are taught. Institutions supported by general taxation should be exclusively American and completely secular. Only in this way can the schools be maintained without fighting between the sects for their control. Catholics, Protestants, and Jews do not agree. The Agnostic differs from them all, and his rights in the matter are as sacred as any or all of them. Religion should never be alluded to in the public schools. It is just as fair for a teacher

demonstrated practically in the public experience. That is, if boys and girls whose training has been religious turn out so much better than those from the public schools, there must be a flood of precise evidence to prove it. The specific criticisms of the public schools which we receive from parents and others relate to the character of the secular instruction given and do not complain of the absence of religious teaching.

The vast majority of the children of New York are taught in the public schools, and they have been taught there for a generation past under substantially the same conditions as now. Is any moral decline observable among them? It may be that many of those whose religious training outside of the schools is neglected by their parents are less faithful in their church allegiance than children in the distinctively religious schools are taught to be; but practically is their moral tone lower? Are they not showing a tendency which is observable even among the religiously trained?

Until these questions are answered with convincing facts it seems to us there will be no substantial basis for any profitable discussion of the question in which our correspondents are taking so much interest. Moreover, religious instruction of the kind wanted by the advocates of it is prohibited by the constitution of the State and can only be made possible by the amendment of that fundamental law. The census of church attendance taken last autumn seems to indicate that no agitation for such an amendment would have any hope of a successful result.

in the schools to antagonize religion as it is to teach it. Neither should be done; and until this view of the matter is taken there will be confusion, injustice, and bad blood all around.—*The Truth Seeker.*



For the sake of justice, in England as well as in France, we hope that an end will before long be put to the power of any particular church in those lands over the public schools. The steadily increasing value to the state of the non-sectarian public schools of America as developers of loyal and intelligent citizens should be an object-lesson to all other countries.—*The Outlook.*

SUNDAY ENFORCEMENT

This department is designed to record what is being done throughout the United States and elsewhere in the way of Sunday enforcement. Necessarily the items in most instances must be a bare recital of the facts. The principles involved are discussed elsewhere in the paper.

"Eight small boys of New Richmond were fined \$1.50 each for playing ball on the streets Sunday," reported the Attica (Ind.) *Ledger* of August 27.

A. Billet and Oscar Bresner, grocers of New Orleans, were arrested on August 23 "for violating the Sunday law." "They were brought to the police station and paroled."

On August 28 it was reported from Llano, Texas, that the city marshal had "served notice on all business men in the city that they would be expected to observe the Sunday law to the letter." "Drug stores can be kept open, but nothing except medicines can be sold." "The enforcement of the law meets with the approval of the people."

A dispatch from Huntington, Ind., under date of August 29 said:

Church and temperance people have urged that officers to stop violators of law at Brebaugh's park, west of this city, on Sundays be furnished. Last Sunday the Van Buren and Columbia City baseball teams were arrested. Friday the Columbia City team pleaded guilty and paid fines. The others will have a hearing. To avoid the law, the management of the park has advertised a free game Sunday.

Among the resolutions adopted at the "third district W. C. T. U. convention" in session at Hartford, S. Dak., on September 1 and 2 was one on "Sabbath observance," which read as follows:

We are much alarmed at the rapidly increasing desecration of the holy Sabbath, and we want all white ribboners throughout our district to work with untiring effort for the enforcement of law against Sunday ball games, excursions or any other form of

amusement that may make this day one of business or pleasure instead of rest and worship.

A clergyman of Covington, Ind., has announced that the local "baseball people have given him their promise that there shall be no more Sunday games." The local paper "sincerely thanks the boys for complying with the law and with the requests of those who are in sympathy with the purposes of the law." When the "purposes of the law" in question are candidly viewed in the light of principle it will be seen that there should be no such law. Sunday observance should not be a matter of civil law.

At a recent convention the New York State Grocers' Association "took advanced ground for Sunday closing," reports the *St. Paul (Minn.) Trade*. It adopted a resolution declaring that it "favors the passage of a uniform Sunday-closing law, including all kinds of business which is not a public necessity, such as drug stores." This is the natural tendency in this matter; those who at first demand that the business in which they are engaged shall be prohibited on Sunday will never be satisfied until every line of business is prohibited.

A number of persons were arraigned in the police court at Springfield, Mass., on September 4, on the charge of having "violated the Sunday law by selling confectionery and soda-water in their places of business on Sunday." James DeMacakos and George Yianacopoulos "were tried and found guilty and fined

\$20 each, while most of the other cases were continued."

In the case of DeMacakos, Officers Marble and Huot testified that they went to the defendant's store on Sunday morning, August 23. Officer Marble invited his friend Huot to have a glass of soda, and they were served by the defendant, who received the pay for it. Officer Marble then cast longing glances at the candy counter, and expressed a desire for five cents worth of chocolate drops, which were quickly

done up and handed to him by the storekeeper. Officer Wade testified that he saw DeMacakos in the store on the Sunday in question. The defendant pleaded not guilty, but he was found guilty and fined \$20.

Similar testimony was given in the other case, the same method having been employed to obtain evidence. A groceryman was also tried and fined \$20 for Sunday selling.

Field Secretary O. R. Miller of the "National Reform" Bureau, Washington, D. C., made two addresses in Springfield, Mass., on September 13. In the morning at Trinity Church he "described the moral victories won under the leadership of the Reform Bureau." A summary of what he said is thus given by the *Republican*:

The primary object of the Reform Bureau is to secure the passage by Congress of important and much-needed reform legislation along the line of temperance, Sabbath observance, stricter divorce laws, anti-gambling measures, etc. The success of the Bureau may be seen from the fact that eight measures which have been passed by Congress were drawn up by the Bureau and introduced at its request, and by it followed up and pushed through to final success. The Bureau has also prevented much bad legislation. The Bureau will work in the next Congress for a better Sabbath law for the District of Columbia, and a bill to suppress liquor selling at old soldiers' homes and an interstate and liquor bill, to stop wholesalers from shipping liquors to no-license towns, and finally an amendment to the United States Constitution prohibiting polygamy.

So there is to be another attempt for "Sabbath" legislation by Congress at the coming session. Mr. Miller "highly commended Congressman Gillett for the assistance he had rendered the Bureau in securing the passage of moral measures," he having "introduced several measures drawn up by the Bureau, which have been passed."

✦

In writing to the *New York Journal* to congratulate it on its "fearless editorial

in reference to the attack by churchmen on the public schools of this country," a "Dr. McGlynn Catholic" says: "You will have the united support of all enlightened and progressive Catholics of these United States in your fearless work in answering these people." It is significant that it is considered a *fearless* thing in these days for a great newspaper to do what the *Journal* has done in this matter. It would not be a fearless thing were it not for the power of Catholicism in this country to-day, which makes newspapers anxious to please and afraid to offend Catholics. It is to be hoped that there are vastly more "enlightened and progressive Catholics" than there appear to be.

✦

A representative of the Long Island Episcopal Diocese has served notice on the tax assessors of Hempstead, L. I., that action is to be taken in the supreme court of the county "to have the assessment on the Cathedral schools of St. Paul and St. Mary set aside on the ground that they are conducted for charitable purposes and are therefore exempt from taxation." The schools are assessed for nearly \$100,000. The taxes for 1901 were paid under protest, the board of supervisors have refused to set them aside. If these schools are for charitable purposes it is proper to exempt them from taxation; but if they are for religious purposes, it is not.

A TWENTY-FIVE CENT EDITION
OF
POWER FOR WITNESSING

Heretofore the 75 cent edition of this remarkable volume on the work of the Holy Spirit has been the only one obtainable; but a new edition in paper covers is now ready, the price of which is 25 cents, postpaid.

We believe the mere announcement of this fact will induce hundreds to secure a sufficient number of copies to supply their Sabbath-school classes and friends who are interested in the subject. It is so filled with incidents resulting from the operation of the Spirit on hearts that it will be eagerly read by all.

AN ILLUSTRATED DESCRIPTION WILL BE SENT ON APPLICATION.

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,

11 West 20th St.,
New York City.

Oakland,
Cal.

18 West 5th St.,
Kansas City, Mo.