

The Sentinel

OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

VOL. XVIII

WASHINGTON, D. C., NOVEMBER 26, 1903

NO. 47



"If the public schools, because of being secular, are vicious, then must our whole theory of government, being secular, be vicious also."

It does not follow that because religious training for the children and youth is good for the welfare of society that religious training for the children and youth by the state is good for the welfare of society.

The religion which benefits the state is the religion which lives and propagates itself without the aid of the state, and which aims at something much higher than the welfare of the state. That religion which seeks the aid and support of the state is not worth its aid and support. State supported and propagated religion is not the sort of religion that benefits society.

If the fact that the inculcation of religious principles is good for society affords ground for state support of the teaching of religion to boys and girls, it also affords ground for state support of the preaching of religion to boys and girls and men and women. If the state begins to support religion it cannot logically stop with schools and the payment of teachers; it will have to go on to the maintenance of churches and the payment of preachers. If it supports public or denominational religious instruction, how can it refuse to support public or denominational worship?

PUBLICATION OFFICE : 222 NORTH CAPITOL STREET, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Entered as second class matter October 12, 1903, at the post-office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

The Sentinel

OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

A weekly publication devoted to the maintenance and defense of liberty of conscience, and therefore opposed to any violation or compromise of the principle of separation of church and state. Non-sectarian and non-partisan in the application of principles.

JOHN D. BRADLEY, Editor.

Published by
REVIEW AND HERALD PUBLISHING ASSN.,
222 N. Capitol St., Washington, D. C.

To whom all communications of a business nature should be addressed.

We believe in the religion taught and lived by Jesus Christ.

We believe in temperance, and regard the liquor traffic as a curse to society.

We believe in supporting civil government and submitting to its authority.

We believe that human rights are sacred, and that they indissolubly inhere in the moral nature of the individual.

We deny the right of any human authority to invade and violate these inalienable rights in any individual.

Therefore we deny the right of any civil government to legislate on matters of religion and conscience.

We believe it is the right, and should be the privilege, of every individual to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, free from all dictation, interference, or control on the part of civil government or any other external authority; or not to worship at all if he so chooses.

We also believe it to be our duty, and no less the duty of all others, to oppose religious legislation and all movements tending toward the same, to the end that all the people may freely enjoy the inestimable blessing of liberty, which is theirs by virtue of the unbounded wisdom and beneficence of the Author of their being.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION

Single copy, per year.....	\$1.00
" six months.....	.50
" three months.....	.25
To foreign countries in Postal Union, one year.....	1.50

CLUBBING RATE.

5 or more copies to one address, one year.....	per copy. .70
Club rate for three and six months in proportion.	
Special terms to agents. Sample copies gratis. Correspondence solicited.	

Any one receiving THE SENTINEL OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY without having ordered it, may know that it is sent by some friend. Those who have not ordered the magazine need have no fears that they will be asked to pay for it.

Special Holiday Edition of the Signs of the Times

on the Subject of



24 PAGES INCLUDING COVER

Beautifully Illustrated

NOW READY FOR DELIVERY

The relation of Capital and Labor is acknowledged to be one of the most perplexing problems of the Twentieth Century

The whole subject will be treated in a fair and impartial manner in this special number of the Signs. The following are some of the articles which will appear in this issue:

1. *The Fundamental Difference between Capital and Labor. What is necessary in order to a permanent settlement and peace.*
Capital's Side — Some Representative of Capital.
Labor's Side — Some Representative of Labor.
2. *Individualism — The Human Unit.*
3. *Christian Union versus Trade Union.*
4. *The Great Strife for Power.*
5. *The Oppression of Wealth.*
6. *Dangers and Warnings.*
7. *How Came this Great Conflict?*
8. *Utterances from Eminent Men.*
9. *Statistical and Biographical Data.*

The retail price of this special number will be five cents per copy.

5 to 20 copies.....4c each
25 or more to one address.....3c each
Single copies will be mailed direct from the office of publication to lists of names furnished at these rates:

1 to 20 copies.....5 cents
25 to 99 copies.....4 cents
100 or more copies.....3½ cents
This price includes addressing, wrapping, and postage. Address

Signs of the Times, Oakland, Cal.

The Sentinel

OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

VOL. XVIII

WASHINGTON, D. C., THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 26, 1903.

No. 47

Many Questions Raised

To treat the growing issue concerning religion and education in this country as though it were an issue merely over the principle and practise of separation of church and state would be to give it very partial treatment indeed. It does present an issue, and an important issue, over the principle and practise of separation of church and state, and of course that is the phase of the matter with which *The Sentinel* is concerned. But this cannot be dealt with properly and justly if other and deeper phases of the matter are ignored. As is plain from the report of the recent vigorous public discussion of the matter that we have given, it raises a number of questions aside from that directly affecting the principle of separation of church and state, most of which are by no means as plain and easy of solution, and some of which are among the deepest to which the mind can be directed, being fundamental and basic to both religion and education. It will be well to state the questions that have been raised, which we do in the following hastily prepared list of questions that in many cases shade into one another: Is the secular educational system responsible for the prevailing and apparently increasing corruption, lawlessness, and religious unbelief and skepticism? Does the absence of religious teaching in the public schools entail moral, social and political evils that its presence would prevent? Is it indispensable to the

moral and religious welfare of the young and of society that secular and religious training be combined? Does the non-religious training of the public school system hinder and distort moral and religious development? Is instruction without religion antagonistic to religion? Do parochial and religious schools, "as a matter of fact, turn out more exemplary and more valuable members of society than are those who get their education in the public schools?" Are the children educated in such schools better morally, either before or after graduation, than the average of those trained in the public schools? Does the training of such schools insure piety and security against religious infidelity? Is the religious training that is desired by those who are demanding a modification of the public school system in the interests of religious teaching really religious training, or is it only perfunctory instruction in religious theories, and no more potent for forming character than other intellectual exercise? Is public education the function of the state or is it the function of the church? Which is better adapted for the work and can secure the best results for society? Is the church especially really qualified to attend to and control education in general? Would it be wise and safe to leave this work to the church, and would the condition of society be any better if the church controlled education instead of the state? To what extent should the state educate? Is it

outside of its proper sphere when it goes beyond "providing the simplest, most elementary kind of education for those children who would otherwise be neglected"? Should the system of education supported by public taxation "go further than the merely elementary instruction necessary to save the state from the perils of an ignorant and illiterate electorate"? Which is best for free institutions, the public educational system as now constituted, or as it would be constituted when remodeled in the interests of religious teaching? Is the present public school system a menace to or safeguard of the republic? Are the home and the church insufficient for the work of the religious training of the young—is it impossible for them to do this work without assistance? Should those who do not care to, or refuse to, make use of the public educational system in educating their children be exempt from the general tax levied to support the system, or should they be allowed to divert or assign their proportion of such tax to schools of their own selection apart from the public system? Is religion the only true and safe basis for education for both society and the individual? Is religion really an essential or even a legitimate part of education? Is religion really essential to or any legitimate part of morality? Is religion essential to social welfare? Is not religion, so far as it implies supernatural authority through Divine revelation, an outgrown superstition? What authority is there in reason for the religious dogmas which constitute the basis and substance of the religious teaching desired? etc., etc. We shall not undertake to answer these questions now, or perhaps at any other time, but next week we shall call attention to something that is fundamental to this whole matter that will answer most of them.

"Thanksgiving" by "Thanksgiving day"
Official Direction is here again, and **Again** once again the President and the governors of States have performed the annual religious office which, in spite of the fundamental American doctrine of complete separation of church and state, seems to be a fixed and practically unquestioned function of the Presidential and gubernatorial offices. At the opening of his proclamation this year the President states that "according to the custom of our people, it falls upon the President to appoint a day of prayer and thanksgiving to God," and in conclusion, in official form, he designates "as a day of general thanksgiving Thursday, the 26th of November," and recommends "that throughout the land the people cease from their wonted occupations, and in their several homes and places of worship render thanks unto Almighty God for His manifold mercies." In his capacity as President he informs the people that "during the last year the Lord has dealt bountifully with" them, and tells them that it behooves them "not only to rejoice greatly because of what has been given" them, "but to accept it with a solemn sense of responsibility, realizing that under Heaven," etc. One paragraph is a sort of formula for "thanksgiving God" and prayer to Him on this occasion. However, if such documents are to be issued by Presidents, it is well that they should be given the tone which the individuality of President Roosevelt has imparted to this one. It is well that the duty of worthy living and the need of having "our hearts roused to war steadfastly against all the forces of evil, public and private," should be impressed. And in view of unmistakable tendencies that are at work in the national life, and that have manifested themselves strikingly in re-

cent years, it is well that the attention of the people of the United States should be directed to the high responsibility and obligation resting upon them which these statements were designed to impress, and which many leading Americans, in the eagerness to have their country "like all the nations," seem to have forgotten or ceased to respect:

In no other place and at no other time has the experiment of government of the people, by the people, for the people, been tried on so vast a scale as here in our own country. Failure would not only be a dreadful thing for us, but a dreadful thing for all mankind, because it would mean loss of hope for all who believe in the power and the righteousness of liberty.

The governor of New York told the people of that State this year that "the nation of which our commonwealth is an integral part has been the pacific agent for the extension of Christianity and civilization," that "in all we have been singularly blessed by the evidences of divine favor," and that "it is therefore not only our duty, but we should also welcome the opportunity for expressing our gratitude to the Ruler of the universe." "In accordance with time-honored custom," he therefore, as governor, in a document bearing "the private seal of the State," proclaimed to them: "Let us put aside secular employment and repair to our various places of worship and there offer up praise and thanksgiving to God." And, "in order that we may discharge this duty, and in pursuance of the power vested in me," he "set aside" and designated November 26 "as a day of thanksgiving and prayer." Of course the governor had no power vested in him to issue a document of this character. Such use of the authority of the office of governor or of President may be in harmony with "time-

honored custom," but it exceeds the delegated and constitutional power of the incumbents of those offices. It is a well-established principle in this country, notwithstanding it is not fully observed, that civil officials have "no authority touching matters of faith and worship." The official "thanksgiving" proclamation, with its directions and recommendations, is distinctly and unmistakably an assumption of authority touching matters of faith and worship. It is true that these proclamations are not now very authoritative, but the inevitable tendency is for them to become more authoritative and at last imperative. The "duty" which is now officially affirmed and its performance officially recommended merely, will in the natural course of things come to be officially enforced under penalty. The statement as to the "extension of Christianity" probably means nothing, but it serves to give a sort of official recognition to that religion, to make it appear as if it were the recognized and established religion of the State and nation. It will therefore please all those who are pleased to believe that "this is a Christian nation" and that Christianity is legally established in this country. It is most certainly an excellent thing to give thanks unto the Lord and to recount his blessings, but whether or not it is an excellent thing for the President of the United States and the governors of States to recommend and direct that this be done depends upon whether or not it is an excellent thing to consistently adhere to the great principle which requires a clear and distinct separation between the functions of the church and the state — upon whether or not it is an excellent thing to disregard that principle sometimes. If the principle is indeed a right principle it cannot safely be disregarded, no matter how

harmless or even how good may be the purpose in behalf of which it is disregarded. The evil of the "thanksgiving" proclaimed custom is in the precedent that it affords for things that are exceedingly harmful and dangerous, for the principle of such things is in it.

✱

The following is from a report rendered by the "committee on non-sectarian education" at last year's annual meeting of the American Unitarian Association:

The movement toward the secularization of our public schools of all grades has been rapid during the past thirty years. The formal reading of the Bible and the perfunctory chapel exercise have disappeared from the common schools in many places. But much remains to be done. In some places large sums of money, raised by public taxation, are paid to support what are essentially Catholic schools; while in one of our largest cities the public school teachers are even now prohibited from making any reference to the Reformation in teaching modern history. In many parts of our country an unorthodox belief in religion is treated as a disqualification for educational positions, and men and women of finest character and largest ability find themselves discriminated against on this account. This is true not only in the common-school grades, but also in institutions of higher education. It may confidently be asserted that there are State institutions where a Universalist or a Unitarian, however well qualified or even superior to other candidates, could not be elected to the presidency.

Such discriminations partake of the nature of intolerance, and show one way in which the principle of separation of church and state is violated in public educational affairs. The statement that in one of the largest of American cities public school teachers are prohibited from making any reference to the Reformation in teaching

history is one that should not be forgotten and that should cause serious thought. It comes from a source where there is no inclination to exaggerate the influence of Romanism, and what it affirms is very instructive as to what the ascendancy of that influence in this country will bring and is bringing.

✱

That which is sure to come with any attempt of the state to give or support religious instruction is foreshadowed by the declaration of a Catholic correspondent of *The Sun*, "We Roman Catholics will not accept Protestant doctrine for our children," and the prompt response of a Protestant correspondent, "We will not accept Roman Catholic doctrine for our children." The inevitable fruit of religious teaching, or support of religious teaching, by the state will be sectarian strife and antagonism.

✱

Referring to Cardinal Gibbons' utterance and to the "indications of a revival in this country of the school controversy" by the Roman Catholic Church, *The Outlook* says: "There are some indications that the inspiration of this movement against a public school system under the control of the state comes from the Vatican. One would like to know whether the new Pope himself gives to it encouragement and support, and perhaps direction."

✱

"The church has not received the mission to make known the human sciences; she has not been established for the progress of the nations in the arts and sciences, no more than to render them powerful and wealthy."

✱

The inside date line of the last issue of *The Sentinel* was left unchanged by the printers. It should have been November 19 instead of November 12.

The Religion and Public Education Issue

The Recent Discussion

II

THE expression from Cardinal Gibbons to which we referred last week as one of the two which have recently brought into prominence the issue commonly described as that of religion and the public schools, and excited a vigorous public discussion of the same, came about a week later than that by the Rev. Mr. Geer, in the form of an interview published in the Newark (N. J.) *News*. And as we stated last week the expression (which was evidently designed by the Cardinal as a public announcement and declaration of the attitude of the ecclesiastical organization in this country of which he is the chief figure) followed closely upon his return from Rome, and shows that the Roman Catholic Church is determined to overthrow the public educational system as it now exists, and feels that the time has about arrived when she may safely press the matter to an issue. The Cardinal said:

The system of public education in this country is imperfect and vicious, and undermines the religion of our youth. We want our children to receive an education that will not only make them learned, but pious, men and women. We want them to be not only polished members of society, but also conscientious Christians. We desire for them a training that will form their hearts as well as their minds. We wish them to be not only men of the world, but above all, men of God. The religious and secular education of our children cannot be divorced from each other without inflicting a fatal wound upon the soul. The usual consequence of such a separation is to paralyze the moral faculty and to foment a spirit of indifference in matters of faith. Education is to the soul what food is to the body. The milk with which the infant is nourished at its mother's breast not only feeds its head, but per-

meates at the same time its heart and other organs of the body. In like manner the intellectual and moral growth of our children should go hand-in-hand; otherwise their education is shallow and fragmentary, and often proves a curse instead of a blessing. . . . I am not unmindful of the blessed influence of a home education, and especially of a mother's tutelage. But of what avail is a mother's toil if the seeds of faith which she has planted attain a sickly growth in the cheerless atmosphere of a school-room from which the sun of religion is rigidly excluded? The remedy for these defects would be supplied if the denominational system which now obtains in Canada were applied in our public schools.

Thus the head of the Roman Catholic Church in this country, who, *The Outlook* says, "has heretofore been regarded as a friend of our public school system," openly and plainly declares for the substitution of the "denominational system"—that is, a system where the state levies a general tax for public education and turns the money thus raised over to the various denominations to be used in support of denominational schools. This expression, "coming from so eminent an authority" and containing "so serious an imputation upon the public school system of the country," has attracted keen attention and excited no little comment. Among the newspapers which promptly gave it attention was the *New York Times* which, in an editorial headed, "Is Our School System Vicious?" declared that "if the views expressed by this distinguished and broad-minded prelate are just, then this is incomparably the most important public question before the American people." After stating that "the discussion of educational theories in this country proceeds for

the most part in two channels," "the great body of practical educators concerning themselves with utility as the chief aim in education, and seeking to devise methods of instruction which will impart a sound training in those branches of which a knowledge is required in the affairs of life" while "insisting that the home is the true place for spiritual teaching," while, "on the other hand, there are earnest and convinced men, almost wholly within the Roman Catholic Church, we believe, who exalt spiritual things as an end to be sought in school teaching and insist upon the necessity of religious instruction in the public schools," the *Times* declared that the views of the latter "have nowhere been more clearly and frankly expressed than by Cardinal Gibbons," and continued:

The objection that the organic law stands in the way is not a satisfactory answer to the argument of Cardinal Gibbons, if his assumption is sound that the public school system is vicious. The Constitution of the United States leaves to the several States the control over the subject of religion. In the exercise of that power of control the people of the State of New York declare in their constitution that "neither the State nor any sub-division thereof shall use its property or credit, or any public money, or authorize or permit either to be used, directly or indirectly, in aid or maintenance, other than for examination or inspection, of any school or institution of learning wholly or in part under the control or direction of any religious denomination, or in which any denominational tenet or doctrine is taught." But even the constitution should not be made the buttress of a vicious system, if the school system is vicious. If it saps the foundation of morality we must change the constitution.

In a matter of this gravity full and candid inquiry would necessarily precede any change in the constitution and in our American school system. Cardinal Gibbons incidentally points out the proper field of inquiry. . . .

A candid examination of the working of the public school system in Canada would illuminate the discussion. In the Dominion a Roman Catholic taxpayer may require that his school tax be devoted to the use of the separate schools of his own church, and funds for these schools are also provided from other sources. In the Province of Quebec the school system is almost entirely in the hands of the church. An examination of the Canadian system might also embrace the working of the parochial schools in this country. The advocates of a division of the school fund would very greatly reinforce their argument if they were able to show that the results of religious instruction in the parochial schools did, in fact, demonstrate their superiority over the secular system. If they send out into the world a greater portion of "polished members of society and conscientious Christians," that is manifestly an important point in their favor. If their hearts as well as their minds are made better, if it appear that they are more secure against the temptations of the world or better citizens, better men and women, the argument for a reorganization of the school system would be immensely strengthened. The inquiry, of course, should take account of the records of the courts and of institutions for correction and punishment. No source of information should be neglected which would promise to disclose the actual truth as to the respective merits and demerits of the two systems. Until such inquiry has been made in good faith it seems to us that the discussion is profitless. The American people appear to be deeply convinced that the system they have adopted and maintained from the foundation of the government is sound. The proof that it is vicious is not furnished by mere assertion.

As is to be expected from the great newspapers, the *Times* deals quite differentially and diplomatically with the Cardinal's utterance. But nevertheless it makes it plain that it does not agree with him as to the character of the public school system, and regards his state-

ment on that point as pretty well all assertion and very little fact. The *Times'* discussion of the matter evoked communications from a number of correspondents who heartily seconded its attitude. We quote from two of these communications:

The "denominational school" idea is an old one, and there are arguments in its favor, but what a division of energy would result from the adoption of its methods! In all justice, our Hebrew brethren would be entitled to Hebrew schools; then we would have Catholic schools, Baptist schools, Congregational schools, Christian Science schools, Spiritualistic schools, and other institutions of learning of all shades of belief and unbelief, supported from the public treasury and owing a divided allegiance to the various boards of education on the one hand and to "bishops and other ministers" on the other. Many of the schools would, of necessity, be very small and more or less select. Others would be large and imposing. There would be more principals and teachers, and less opportunity to grade such principals and teachers according to ability, than there is at present. Personally the writer was but recently informed by a person who for years attended church schools that the public schools of the city are decidedly preferable, from an educational viewpoint. The denominational system would become more difficult as it was extended to high schools and public academic institutions.

As a matter of fact the cause of religion suffers most among the young because neither parents nor churches do their duty. Among our "Bedford gangs" and other conglomerations of young disorderlies we have boys who were educated in church schools and private schools, as well as in public schools. The school can never usurp the domain of a worthy father and mother. The churches can never, by denouncing the schools, rid themselves of the duty of "going out into the highways and byways" and attracting the young to the houses of worship.

Viciousness is a word associated most

distinctly in the minds of the community in general with the kind of depravity that has its natural sequences in degraded living among the lowest resorts of our social life, and its final consequences in the criminal courts, the prison and the gallows. That the vast machinery of the public schools of this country systematically works — or threatens to work — this final ruin in the lives of those who are trained by it is a statement that should rouse every citizen of our great republic into an interest and a concern more active than if an invasion of the combined forces of the world threatened our national welfare.

The crucial point of the controversy in this matter lies in the right answering of the question: Does secular education exclude the development of the moral sense as well as the religious sense? Does the training of the mental faculties alone play no part in the development of the conscience? The lack of conscience or the perversion of it is the first condition in the course of a life of viciousness. Is it not within the jurisdiction of the authorities to prove whether or not the largest number of vicious lives coming under their cognizance is on the side of secular education as organized in our public school system? It would surely be worth an immense amount of trouble and research if actual results could be got at by statistics in answering these momentous questions.

The results of such an investigation would support "the secular school system" and not "the attack on it by Cardinal Gibbons," according to another correspondent, who desired "to have the mooted question investigated and the comparative merits of the two systems—the secular and the religious—authoritatively determined and set at rest":

No advocate of the secular system of education need have anything to fear as to the results of such an investigation. It was a reaction from the evils of church schools and government by the church that led our forefathers

to revolt against them in the educational polity of the New World and to favor the establishment of the secular system, this course being more consistent with their ideas of civil and religious liberty.

Another Protestant Clergyman Advocates Religious Teaching in the Schools

Several Protestant clergymen in New York made the Cardinal's utterance and the *Times'* comment a text for expression on the subject in their sermons on October 11. Dr. George G. Lorimer, of the Madison Avenue Baptist Church, declared that while he knew that "if a man like me challenges a cardinal, it is called bigotry," that he did "not hesitate to say that our public school system is the promise of the future," and that "to attack our schools as vicious is an affront to our teachers, men and women as pure as any priest who ever said a mass or nuns who go forth from house to house upon their errands." But the position of the Cardinal found an ardent supporter in another clergyman, Rev. Reese F. Alsop, rector of a Brooklyn Protestant Episcopal church, who was decidedly convinced of "the necessity of religious instruction in the public schools":

Cardinal Gibbons says that the public school education is Godless, that in being exclusively secular it undermines the religion of the youth. How does our system of education undermine the religion of our youth? The answer is: It does not form their hearts; it seeks to make them men and women of the world, but not men and women of God — in a word, it divorces their religious education from their secular. In commenting upon this indictment the editor says, "There are earnest and convinced men (almost wholly within the Roman Catholic Church, we believe), who insist upon the necessity of religious instruction in the public schools." He is greatly mistaken in thinking that it is only Roman Catholics who insist upon that necessity. There are thousands not of

that communion who insist upon the same thing. A man as wide-minded as Lyman Abbott insists. It is time that the company was greatly increased.

Little by little, religion, the reading of the Bible, the teaching of the Commandments, and the enforcement of moral precepts as of divine authority, have been pushed out, been made to give place to pure secularism. Lest some denominational tenet should be buttressed, lest offense should be taken by some class in the community, large or small, schools must ignore the moral and spiritual part of our nature and train up the child only to know and get on. They must say nothing as to the great "should" under which we all stand. They must say never a word on the great subject of duty to God. Such is the goal toward which we have been tending. Alas! that it must be admitted that the very body of which Cardinal Gibbons is an honored leader helped to push our schools into that path. It called the King James version of Scripture a Protestant Bible, and protested against Roman Catholic children being forced to hear it read. Then the Jew protested against the New Testament. The unbeliever and the agnostic protested against the idea of God being put into their children's minds. And so it has come to pass that in a Christian land, in a Christian century, the great majority have yielded to the few and allowed the process to be completed.

Why might not the Ten Commandments be a part of the course taught and commented upon? Who would object? Certainly neither Romanist nor Jew. Why might not the fundamental data of Christian morality be taught and enforced? Why might not carefully selected portions of Scripture be read?

Roman Catholic Defense of the Public Schools

In connection with this utterance from a Protestant source it is gratifying to note the following from a Roman Catholic of prominence—Jeremiah Quin, president of the school board of Milwaukee, Wis. In the course of an

address before the Milwaukee Teachers' Association on October 17 he said:

Cardinal Gibbons, in an interview broadly published in the press, pronounces the American public schools vicious. How any man can assert that our public schools, directed and controlled and conducted by a body of Christian men and women of unstained character and high standing, are vicious is incomprehensible. If the public schools, because of being secular, are vicious, then must our whole theory of government, being secular, be vicious also. I very much regret this attack upon the one institution on which, in the minds of all Americans, the future welfare of the republic rests. What would our vast heterogeneous nation be without our public schools? It would be a nation of sectarianism, in acrimonious conflict, each sect fighting for a share of the school tax. Every true American will forever oppose such a movement.

All honor to Mr. Quin for this utterance. And he is not the only Roman Catholic who has opposed the position of that church in this discussion, although but very few have done so. One of the communication published by *The Sun* was "A Remarkable Defense of the Public Schools by a Catholic Priest" of Brooklyn, who signed himself "Fair Play." In response to "letters from able and distinguished Catholics who repudiated with contempt the position taken" by the writer of this communication, *The Sun* declared editorially that it was admitted to its columns "because it came, undoubtedly, from a Catholic priest," and that because of its tone and attitude toward "the parochial school education" would not have been heeded "if it had come from any other source." From this communication we quote the following:

Archbishop Corrigan frankly admitted that the Bible was forced out

of the public schools through the agitation of the Roman Catholic clergy. That left nothing but secular things to be taught. Now the Catholics are clamoring for religious training and condemning the public schools because they don't have it. Why didn't they let it alone in the first place? The reason was that the Scripture reading was from a Bible not accepted by them. It was not a Catholic Bible, and they didn't want Catholic children to listen to such a Bible. Now, what do they offer better in the matter of religious training than a simple reading of Scripture and a prayer at the opening of the day's school work? They claim that spending from a quarter to a half of the time of the children in drilling them upon the catechism and similar things, so the child can repeat it, answers their idea of religious training. A child may be efficient in his ability to repeat these things, yet not be a religious child. He comes to look upon those things as he would on the multiplication table, and they mean no more to him. This constant drilling of a child upon catechisms and similar matters, verses and recitals, is time wasted. The child that is properly taught in a school from a religious point of view is one that knows what it is to be a good boy or girl when out of school the same as in. It is not one who swears and fights as soon as he is out of school. The latter is the parochial school child. You will see much less of it in the child of the public schools. This latter has some idea of the principle of right and wrong; the parochial child has very little of it. He's bigoted and selfish.

Then, the Catholics wish to force upon the public teachers of their faith and order and compel the Protestant children to have thrust before them all day a garb representing some Roman Catholic order. That's much worse than reading a Protestant Bible to a Catholic; for the reading is wholesome and lasts but a few minutes; the garb is a constant reminder of Romanism, and is repulsive to Protestants. The idea is to get the garb into the schools, and with that as an entering wedge more will follow. . . .

The public tolerates this matter, but this screaming for public moneys for parochial schools, and this scheme to force upon the public schools this garb, is a thing that won't do and must be shut out. All praise to our Superintendent of Public Instruction, who is fair enough to see that this garb business is but a dodge to get a hold upon public schools. Let us all preserve them. They are for the people, and are the greatest institution of this free country of ours.

The proof of the pudding is in the eating. The Catholics of the United States to-day do not begin to average as well in education or morals as do the Protestants and non-religionists. Visit our prisons and see the great preponderance of Catholic criminals — 90 per cent at least, though if the ratio to population were carried out there would be only about 14 per cent. That proves that the much lauded religious training of the Catholics is no good. It does not teach men moral responsibility. It does not lessen crime and criminal tendencies as Protestantism does.

Then, all this teaching of the super-human power of the priest is not fit for the twentieth century. Spain is on the verge of a revolution from it. This school question is one of rule and politics of that [the Roman Catholic] church. It belongs to the parents to decide what they want for their children, and not for the priest to intrude himself into the home and order what the children shall be taught.

This discussion seems to have been welcomed by some Catholic priests as an opportunity to express publicly (but prudently, by withholding their names from publication) their opinions and disapproval of some of the "infallible" ideas and methods which prevail in the Catholic Church. One or two other communications of this sort not bearing directly upon the question of religion and the schools have appeared in *The Sun* during the course of this discussion, and we shall notice them at another time.

The Methodist Attitude

Of course the most decided expressions of opposition on Cardinal Gibbons' utterance were by representatives of religious bodies that are least in sympathy with Roman Catholicism. The most important and striking of these that we have seen appeared as the leading article in the *New York Christian Advocate* of October 15. It was headed, "Jeshurun Waxed Fat and Kicked." The editor explained, as if to add to the force of the other portions of the article, that he did "not mean to speak disrespectfully of the Catholic Church in the title, nor in the use of the phrase 'cloven foot';" that he had "a high respect for the Roman Catholic Church," for reasons which he enumerated, but that that respect did "not reach reverence because of the incongruous mixture [in that church] of things which we respect with things we cannot respect"; that he had "no sympathy with those who declare that the whole Church from top to bottom is corrupt"; and that "we believe in its right to exist in this country, and would enlist to maintain those rights as quickly, but probably not with as much enthusiasm, as we would to maintain the rights of the denomination to which we belong." It was explained that what was symbolized and meant by "waxed fat" and "kicked" was what is stated in the second paragraph of what we now quote from the article:

When the whole world was sympathizing with the late Pope and the Catholic Church; when the publications were sent out from Rome in the most dramatic way; when in their enthusiasm many Protestants began to suggest that the time was not far off when all Christian churches could unite; and archbishop declared that it would not when some Catholic bishops and one

be fifty years before this country would become all Catholic, we wondered how long it would be before the cloven foot would be shown more fully than heretofore by the highest representatives of the Roman Catholic Church in this country. . . .

The Roman Catholic Church, by reason of its prosperity here and the flattery of politicians, thinks it now safe to avow hostility to and begin an attack upon the public schools of this country; it proposes to overturn them as now constructed and to get what the state will not now give it—a portion of the public money raised by general taxation for education; and at the present time in different parts of the country priests, bishops, archbishops, and the only American cardinal are engaged in denouncing the public school system. We have waited until His Eminence, Cardinal Gibbons, spoke, for his speaking is worth the utterance of a thousand priests and ordinary bishops. He is pre-eminent on this continent, noted for suavity of manner, skilled to the highest degree in the use of language, ingratiating in public deportment, and speaking only occasionally, is always sure to be heard by multitudes and widely reported. Usually what he says is diplomatically said and is valuable to indicate the way the Catholic wind blows and the current flows. He seldom speaks so as to excite direct and immediate opposition. But now he comes forth against the public school system of the United States. . . .

The public schools must be maintained. The proposition to adopt "the denominational system which now obtains in Canada" is equivalent to uniting church and state, so far as it goes. According to the theory of this government the state has no right to enforce Christian education upon children whose parents are opposed to it. It is a decided infliction when applied to Jews; it is a decided infliction when applied to such as have the idea—mistaken though it be—that they will allow their children to be educated without religion, and then expect them to choose a religion for themselves. . . .

Behold the troubles on this subject that now exist in England and have

existed for ages. A most pitiable condition exists in that country. Thousands of Christians are refusing to pay the taxes that are imposed because of the relation of the plan to denominational education. Only the Church of England people (and not all of them) and the Roman Catholics fully sympathize with the scheme now in force. Others are willing to accept it only because they believe it is better than what previously existed, and is a step in the right direction; but the great majority of all the English people are opposed to it. Catholics and Church of England people sympathize with it, not because they sympathize with each other, but because it gives them public money to use for the education of the children in church schools and in the Catholic religion. If Roman Catholicism in England had a great proportion of the population, if for example it approximated the English Church in numbers, there would be a contention which would rend the nation over the method that exists there now. As for Canada, who does not know that Lower Canada is preponderatingly French and Catholic, and no proper analogy can be drawn between that country and this?

We do not doubt that it would be an excellent thing for the children of the state to be educated, together with their ordinary instruction, in Christianity; but so far as our observations go the children that are educated in the parochial schools of the Catholic church are no better morally than those that are educated in the public schools; their conduct upon the streets, the language they utter, is certainly not superior to that which is heard from the scholars of the public schools; and we fancy it would be easy to show that in the inmates of reformatories and prisons there is no moral superiority manifest by those who have attended the parochial schools of the Catholic Church, and no lack in numbers according to the ratio of population of Catholics and others.

Independent of this, granting that some evils result from the divorcing of religious instruction so called from the public schools, it should not be forgotten that religious contentions have

always been and always will be the most bitter if they grow out of persecution or public denunciation of cherished faiths. This country has a wonderful principle and method for preventing dissension, and in the pursuance of that plan and illustration of that principle it has established the public school system. In order to keep the peace in the communities and make the schools eligible to all classes it removes from them the element of religious contention and the causes of religious contention. It will not allow a teacher to denounce the Catholic Church nor to advocate, disparage, or recommend any form of Protestantism.

As compared with despotism, the general benefit to humanity of such a republic as this is so great that it is desirable to maintain at every point the separation of church and state.

If Catholics are thoroughly convinced that they cannot educate their children as they wish to in the public schools, they are not obliged by law to send them. If the expense is heavy upon them to support the schools and their own parochial schools, it is an incidental disadvantage; but the general freedom allowed here to them, together with others, is more than sufficient to compensate for it. They stand exactly where those do who dislike the public schools because of their equalizing tendency. They may send their children to private schools, but the equalizing tendency for the whole people is so valuable to the country as to justify taxation of all American people, whether they send their children to private schools in Europe, Canada, or the United States. It might as well be understood by the Roman Catholic Church that, if it really raises this issue, the Protestant churches of this country will ally themselves at the polls with Jews and with agnostics — that is, with all classes opposed to denominationalizing the public schools or appropriating public money to the support of denominational schools. Conservative men who have never joined in indiscriminating hue and cry against the Catholic Church, would contend to the last at the polls and elsewhere to preserve the public schools intact. Pol-

iticians who care for the integrity of their parties will do well not to mingle in this discussion, for if the public schools are disturbed a wave which will remand them to obscurity will certainly rise.

This "correctly represents the attitude of the Methodist Episcopal Church on this question," according to the editor of the *Northwestern Christian Advocate*, the next most influential organ of that church in this country, who has himself been writing and speaking vigorously of late against "Romanizing the public schools," and shows that there is ground for *The Sun's* declaration that an attempt to carry into effect the scheme of the Roman Catholic Church as to the public school system at the present time "would be likely to excite one of the bitterest political conflicts in American history." But it is not improbable that the situation may change. The Methodist Church, which is powerful in the nation and not at all loth to employ the political methods which are the natural implements of the Catholic Church, and therefore is ready, to the extent of its power and influence, to make effective in the political field the notice which the editor of the *Advocate* serves on the Catholic Church and the "politicians who care for the integrity of their parties," wants Sunday observance enforced in this country, and there is no telling at what moment circumstances may be such that it will be willing to compromise on the school issue in the interest of the enforcement of the Sunday institution. The Catholic Church is likely to be on the lookout for just such a bargain.

The organ of the Freethinkers, the *Truth Seeker*, was "glad to see so orthodox a sect as the Methodists refuse to join in the demand for a division of the school funds," and to know that "on

the school question the *Advocate* comes over to agnostic ground, the only true American stand." It took advantage of the logic of the *Advocate's* position that "the state has no right to enforce Christian education upon children whose parents are opposed to it," to declare that it would now expect its support "in demanding that the Bible be excluded from the schools."

An expression representative of the Jewish view of the Cardinal's utterance is this from an editorial writer on the *American Israelite*:

The public school system of education may be imperfect; so, too, is the parochial school system of education; so is every other system. But it is untrue, to use no stronger term, to say that the public schools are "vicious," and to declare that "they undermine the religion of our youth." The public schools have nothing to do with the religion of the youth, so they do not undermine it. It would not be a difficult matter to show that the men and

the women who have received their education in the parochial schools are no better in point of morality and perhaps are far worse than those who have their education at the public schools. When Cardinal Gibbons says, "We want our children to receive an education that not only will make them learned, but pious men and women," the people of this country will tell him that that is all right, but it is not the function of the public schools to make pious men and women. It is the function of the church and the Sabbath schools to make pious men and women. It is the function of the public school to teach the secular branches. When he furthermore says that "the religious and secular education of our children cannot be divorced from each other without inflicting a fatal wound upon the soul," he should be informed that they have been divorced all these years and the wound upon the soul has not been inflicted. A wound would be inflicted which could never be healed up if an alliance were to be contracted between the church and the state such as the Cardinal wants.

"A fallacy underlies this phrase 'teaching religion.' Strictly speaking, religion cannot be taught; it can only be imparted. Religion is 'the life of God in the soul of man,' and life is not inculcated but inspired. The pedagogue can teach the Ten Commandments. But knowing the Ten Commandments is not religion. Reverence for God, respect for one's parents, honesty, chastity, truthfulness, a pure heart—these are religion; and these cannot be taught; they must be imparted. Strictly speaking, morality cannot be taught. Morality is the practise of the duties of man toward his fellow-man. What those duties are can be taught; but morality is not a knowledge of what duty is—that is ethics; morality is a will to fulfil those duties. Teaching instructs the intellect; but both morality and religion have their secret in the will; and

it is only as the will is directed to reverence, purity, temperance, good will, that the child becomes either moral or religious." Genuine religious instruction, therefore, is primarily not a matter of curriculum and catechetical instruction, and may be absent when these are present, as would be the case with "religious instruction" in state schools. "A teacher who is irreverent may teach that 'God is a Spirit, infinite, eternal, and unchangeable in His being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness and truth;'" but an irreverent teacher cannot inspire reverence in his pupils. An unchaste teacher may teach the seventh commandment; but an unchaste teacher cannot inspire the spirit of chastity in his pupils. Religion is a spirit, not to be taught but to be imparted, and only he can impart it who possesses it."

Religion and Education

What is their relation? Some new and most valuable books for all concerned (and everybody should be concerned) with this great and most vital question now foremost in the religious and educational worlds:

EDUCATION

By MRS. E. G. WHITE

"Every human being is endowed with a power akin to that of the Creator—individuality, power to think and to do. It is the work of true education to develop this power; to train the youth to be thinkers, and not merely reflectors of other's thoughts. It has to do with the whole being, and with the whole period of existence possible to man. It is the harmonious development of the physical, the mental, and the spiritual powers." These are statements from the opening chapter of this truly great book on education. It is an invaluable exposition of the foundation, aim, scope, and principles of true education.

Attractively bound in gray cloth, with beautiful three-color cover design. 321 pages. 8 $\frac{1}{4}$ x5 $\frac{3}{4}$ inches. Price, postpaid, \$1.25.

THE PLACE OF THE BIBLE IN EDUCATION

By ALONZO TREVIER JONES

This book deals with a most vital issue in the field of religion and education to-day, and goes to the very basis and foundation of human thinking. Its clear, positive, and convincing setting forth of the way to certain knowledge and absolute truth in the deepest and profoundest questions that can engage the attention of the mind, meets a need than which none is or can be more imperative in this age when doubt is rapidly becoming the method of fundamental human thinking and probability the basis of fundamental human knowledge. The book is written especially for Christians, many of whom are at sea in these days because of the great crisis of thought for which it offers a sure remedy, but it should be read by all who think deeply and are concerned with the fundamentals of education. Among the chapter headings, of which there are twenty-one, are these: "The Essentials of Knowledge," "The Greek or 'Scientific Method' To-day," "The Separation of Christianity and the State in Education."

Bound in cloth and paper. 248 pages. Prices, postpaid: Cloth, 75 cents; paper, 25 cents.

OUTLINES OF MODERN SCIENCE AND MODERN CHRISTIANITY

By GEO. MCCREADY PRICE

"We are passing through to-day perhaps the greatest crisis of thought the world has ever known; and yet the great mass of the people do not take the trouble, any more than Gallio did in the Book of Acts, to understand what is going on," just recently declared one of the foremost thinkers and religious teachers of America. This book and the one just described above will greatly assist you "to understand what is going on" and what this crisis is. All three of the books are needed by those who would be saved from it and out of it. This last book is a rational and logical examination and consideration from the standpoint of genuine Christianity of some of the leading ideas which have brought the great crisis of thought which is now upon the world and which all who think must face. Some of its chapter headings are: "The Divine Immanence," "Scientific World Building," "Some Moral Aspects of the Evolution Theory," "Evolution and the World Problems."

Neatly bound in cloth. 271 pages. Price, postpaid, 75 cents.

REVIEW AND HERALD PUBLISHING ASSN.,
222 N. Capitol St., Washington, D. C.