

8-1944

Religious Education and the Public Schools

John Zornan

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarship.richmond.edu/masters-theses>



Part of the [Social and Philosophical Foundations of Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Zornan, John, "Religious Education and the Public Schools" (1944). *Master's Theses*. 1254.
<http://scholarship.richmond.edu/masters-theses/1254>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Research at UR Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of UR Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact scholarshiprepository@richmond.edu.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION
AND
THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

BY

JOHN ZORNAN

A THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF RICHMOND
IN CANDIDACY
FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF SCIENCE IN EDUCATION

AUGUST, 1944

DEDICATION

To My Son

Concerning whom I cherish the fond hope
that he will grow up to be a Christian
and a gentleman.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author is indebted especially to Professor W. L. Prince and to Mr. W. D. Ellis for reading the first draft of this thesis and making corrections and suggestions. He is particularly grateful to them for permitting him to hold his views and present them, even though in certain instances they may have disagreed with him.

MOTTO

The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom.

Psalm 111, 10.

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this monograph is to survey and evaluate the relationship between religious education and the public schools from the early colonial times to the present. Special attention will be paid to the widespread agitation that formal religious courses be introduced into the public school curriculum. This necessitates a thorough investigation of the Weekday Church School which is to be the chief agency of such courses. The last chapters will be devoted to comments and conclusions based on the facts as presented.

The author's viewpoint throughout, especially in points of value and judgment, is that of traditional orthodoxy. For that he makes no apology, even though he does not particularly like the designation. In modern usage the word "traditional" is all too often associated with obscurantism, defined by Mr. Webster as opposition to the diffusion of knowledge and enlightenment. Now nothing could be farther from the author's mind than that. All he asks is that the said knowledge and enlightenment be true and tried and not just an opinion, not just an unproved theory that happens to be in vogue.

Perhaps a better term for the author's position is classical Christianity. The word "classic" in the eyes of Mr. Webster denotes a thing of the highest rank, the best possible, in art, literature, music and allied fields. Should the author prefer the writings of Charles Dickens to those of Sinclair Lewis; should he rather listen to the three great "B's" - Bach, Brahms and Beethoven - than to the modern "boogie-woogie"; should he enjoy artistically rendered operatic songs more than the sentimental songs of some modern crooner; should he declare Raphael, da Vinci, and Michelangelo greater than some exponent of dadaism - would he be, could he be, considered an intellectual dodo by any right minded person? Then why should it be any different in the field of religion? All claims to the contrary notwithstanding, "the old time religion" is not dead. It is as alive as it ever was. Millions of people still believe the old Christian truths which have been handed down from generation to generation. The Bible is still in greater demand than any other book in the world. People of all races and nations in over a thousand tongues still confess Jesus to be their Lord and God even as Thomas did of old.

The author is perfectly aware that there are two and often more sides to the questions herein discussed. All too often the nursery rhyme is particularly applicable that:

Some fly east and some fly west
And some fly over the cuckoo's nest.

In such a situation the easiest way out would be to straddle the issue, to present each side without making a choice. That may be the best procedure in things that do not matter, but it can hardly be recommended in an issue as vital as religious education and the public schools. A choice seems inevitable. Either the status quo is to be preserved, or some new provisions are to be made in order to supply the spiritual needs of the younger generation. Whatever the choice, the consensus of opinion will probably be the same as that concerning the boy referred to by Beattie:

The neighbors stared and sighed and blessed the lad;
Some deemed him wondrous wise, and some believed him mad.
(The Minstrel)

Well, wise or foolish, sane or mad, the author's preferences are evident in the following pages. Should any agree with him, he will be most grateful. Those that might disagree he directs to the famous words of Voltaire; "I do not believe in a word that you say, but I will defend with my life, if need be, your right to say it."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION.....	iv
CHAPTER 1 - SCANNING THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND.....	2
Religious Liberty in the Colonial Period; Later Developments; Religious Education and the Early American Schools; The Secularization of American Education; The Religious Position of Horace Mann; Summary.	
CHAPTER 2 - THE NEED FOR RELIGIOUS EDUCATION TODAY.....	17
Education Today; General Criticisms; Moral Criticisms; Anti-Christian Ten- dencies; Summary.	
CHAPTER 3 - CHRISTIAN AGENCIES FOR RELIGIOUS EDUCATION.....	29
Parochial Schools; Sunday Schools; Part Time Schools and Agencies; What about the Public Schools; Objections; The Voice of John Dewey; Summary.	
CHAPTER 4 - THE WEEKDAY CHURCH SCHOOL.....	44
Definitions; Early History; Recent Growth and Expansion; Organization; Types; Time Allowed; Place of Sessions; Courses; Teachers; Finances; Legality; Characteris- tic Religious Philosophy; Summary.	
CHAPTER 5 - COMMENTS AND CONCLUSIONS.....	61
What the Churches Can Do; What the Home Can Do; What the Public Schools Can Do; Summary.	
RECAPITULATION.....	68
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	70
VITA.....	75

Chapter 1

SCANNING THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Inquire, I pray thee, of the former age,
and prepare thyself to the search of their fathers...
Shall not they teach thee, and tell thee, and
utter words out of their hearts? Job. 8, 8.

Chapter 1

SCANNING THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

In order to understand the present, one must comprehend the past, for the present is rooted in the past. Many false standards of today are a direct result of a misinterpretation of history, or rather of that which is thought to be history. In order to obviate that, this first chapter will be mainly historical.

Religious Liberty in the Colonial Period

Contrary to many Fourth of July orations, and newspaper editorials, religious freedom was not one of the ideals of the Founding Fathers. As a matter of fact intolerance and bigotry were not only proclaimed but practiced. The Pilgrims came to these shores seeking religious liberty - and almost immediately proscribed it for every one else. Governor Winthrop in his "Considerations" put it thus: "If the place of our co-habitation (sic) be our own, then no man hath the right to come unto us... without our consent...A family is a little commonwealth and a commonwealth a great family. As a family is not bound to receive all comers, no more is a commonwealth."¹

¹ Verkuyl, Gerrit, Christ in American Education, p. 31 (Fleming H. Revell Co., New York, N. Y., 1934).

Accordingly when Roger Williams proclaimed opinions that were contrary to those accepted in the "family," he was tried, convicted and sentenced to be banished to England. Many others were fined and imprisoned for transgressing the religious restrictions. "At least four Quakers suffered martyrdom," says Verkuyl.²

Things were no different in other early colonies. Throughout New England the Congregational Church held sway. In Virginia and the Carolinas the Church of England was established from the beginning. In New York and New Jersey the Dutch settlers naturally established the Reformed Church. All the colonies, "without exception, had laws minutely regulating what could or could not be done on Sunday and usually laws compelling church attendance."³

But what about the adoption of the first Amendment to the Constitution of the United States? Does that not prove that the leaders of the colonists wanted religious toleration and separation of church and state? It does not. The Amendment indeed states, among other things, that: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," but the reason for its adoption was not so much the very noble cause of religious liberty, as often supposed, but rather pure expediency. It would have been impossible to

² Op. cit., p. 32.

³ Myers, Gustavus, History of Bigotry in the United States, p. 12 (Random House, New York, N. Y., 1943).

select a church acceptable to all concerned. Five of the states had established churches of their own. An attempt to make a choice would certainly have resulted in endless bickering which might have ruined the whole project of a Federal Union. Furthermore, the Amendment puts a restriction on the Federal Government only. The States were left to do as they pleased in this matter. The Federal restriction, moreover, prevents only the establishment of a national church and nothing more. It does not prohibit the support of a church or a religious organization. In fact the very Congress which adopted the first Amendment, stipulated that in the Ohio territory "two designated sections of each township...were to be given perpetually for the purpose of religion and education."⁴

A much better indication of the trend toward greater religious freedom was the passage of the Northwest Ordinance in July, 1787. According to its provisions all "peaceable and orderly" persons were to have complete freedom of conscience within the territory. The same can be said of Article 6, par. 3 of the United States Constitution which abolishes religious tests as qualifications for Federal offices.

⁴ Zollmann, Carl, American Church Law, p. 70. Cf. Gen. Laws U.S., 573; Land Laws of Ohio, 1825, p. 17. State ex rel. Owens v. Trustees of Section 29, Delhi Tp. (1841) 11 Ohio, 24. Article 6, par. 1, of the Ohio Constitution, speaks of property intrusted to the state "for educational and religious purposes."

Later Developments

As more and more states were formed and added to the Federal Union, religious restrictions became less rigorous both in the older and the newer states. Following the Civil War there was a distinct trend toward a complete separation of church and state. But only the Utah Constitution is explicit on the point. Nevertheless the unwritten law of the land seems to be that the church and state must ever be and remain separate, especially in regard to finances. To most of our people the arrangement is ideal and there is no imminent threat to violate it. But we dare not become complacent. Religious intolerance and bigotry are ever ready to rear their ugly heads. Eternal vigilance is indeed the price of liberty, be it political or religious.

Religious Education and the Early American Schools

The history of American Education is inseparably interwoven with the American concept of religious freedom. Although we have people who like to believe that our present educational system was fathered and fostered by the Colonists, the plain truth is that it was not so. The first American schools were usually church schools. Education was generally under the domination of the ministers. Not only that, but in many instances state and church, town and parish, secular and sacred matters were mixed and even identified. Witness the order of the Massachusetts General Court given to the town's Selectmen in 1642, that they were to ascertain of parents and masters if they were training their children or apprentices "to read and understand the principles of

religion and the capital laws of the country." When the same Court later sought to establish schools, chief among the reasons for it was that, "the knowledge of the Scriptures" and "learning may not be buried in the graves of our fathers, in church and commonwealth, the Lord assisting our endeavors..."⁵ The same sentiment was usually reflected in the school books which were in use.

In fact, to many, the thought of a free, non-religious school, would have been unthinkable and heretical. Here is what Governor Berkeley of Virginia said about that in 1671: "I thank God there are no free schools nor printing presses, and I hope we shall not have them these hundred years; for learning has brought disobedience and heresy and sects into the world, and printing has developed them, and libels against the Government. God keep us from both!"²

It is a far cry from that sentiment to the one expressed by the then United States Commissioner of Education, July 4, 1907: "The public school is and of right ought to be godless."⁷

Not only were the elementary schools in the hands of the various churches, but the colleges and universities also. Harvard, Princeton, Rutgers, William and Mary, were founded like Yale to fit young men for the public employment in church and state.

⁵ Quoted in Verkuyl, op. cit., pp. 27-28.

⁶ Quoted in Verkuyl, op. cit., p. 27.

⁷ Quoted in Verkuyl, op. cit., p. 51.

The Secularization of American Education

As was pointed out, the church stood first in the minds of early educators. That is no longer true. Today the major part of education is in secular hands, its chief aim is to prepare for a successful life, it concerns itself little with religion and things spiritual, much less with Christianity. The transformation started with the elementary schools which gradually passed into the hands of the state, spread to the various private and church academies, and finally even the erstwhile church colleges lost their religious character. With this metamorphosis came the demand for a secularized curriculum which is deemed both ideal and necessary by most modern educators.

Such a momentous change, of course, did not just happen, nor could it happen over night. The causes were many and the struggle long. One of the chief causes was immigration. As long as the various colonial communities were of one language and of one faith, there were no demands for a separation of church and state. But when people of other persuasions settled in the community; when various Protestants, Catholics, Jews, and even atheists began to dwell together, frictions became numerous. Protestants could not be satisfied with Catholic doctrine, nor Catholics with the Protestant. The Jews rejected both. The agnostics and atheists were against all three. Under such circumstances a possible solution was the elimination of religion from the curriculum. In time this was accomplished to a large extent.

To the difficulties brought on by immigration there was added the Babel of Protestant sects. As the various denominations split into rival factions, each group became jealous of the other and wanted to introduce its own tenets into the schoolroom - or nothing at all! Thus there developed the rule of the belligerent minority. Their motto was: If you can't get in yourself, keep the others out!

The third great cause was the rise of the public schools. These had been tried in several places before but without much success. Then came the Revolution with great havoc to various educational enterprises of the churches. Verkuyl describes the situation thus: "Buildings had been destroyed and their equipment ruined; teachers and students drafted for service. The resources of the people were exhausted. Most citizens felt primarily the need of restoration on the farm and in business. The Church had much to engage her interest for the revival of spiritual life among the people; support of schools would be an added burden from which she was willing to be relieved. There were Christian Colleges that lay forsaken, whose Boards freely offered them to the state or to nonchurch agencies. Abruptly, in every part of the land, transition took place from church control to public control over the country's schools."⁸ As these public schools grew in number and influence, a demand was made for centralization of curriculum and control. With the appointment of State Boards of Education and the adoption of official textbooks, the teaching of religion became all the more difficult and in many cases impossible.

⁸ Verkuyl, op. cit., p. 35.

But the secularization process was not yet complete. The zenith of the controversy was reached only after the Civil War. While many parochial schools had merged into the public school system, some never did. This was particularly true of Catholic schools. Where these parochial schools remained, they were usually granted partial compensation by the State for the secular education they were giving the pupils. When objections were raised against this practice, the Catholic press rushed to its defense. Soon the issue became a political one. President Grant in his annual message of 1875 recommended an amendment to the Constitution which was to prohibit the teaching of religion in the public schools and also to prohibit the use of any public funds for religious purposes. Such an amendment was introduced a week later by James G. Blaine, who was the leader of the House at the time. The vote came on 14 August 1876. The proposed amendment was defeated when it failed to receive the necessary two-thirds majority in the Senate.

But in its very failure the proposal seems to have gained the victory. While agitation for an amendment ceased, the general drift of public opinion was toward a completely secularized education under the control of the state. Along with this drift there came various changes in State Constitutions which forbade the use of public funds for sectarian schools. Such laws are now in force practically in every state of the Union.

The Religious Position of Horace Mann

No historical discussion of the public schools can omit the name of Horace Mann, since he is called the father of our present educational system.

He is, furthermore, just as often held responsible for secularization of the public schools of Massachusetts and by the way of example also the rest of the country.

Prior to his appointment as Secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education, Mr. Mann had been active chiefly as a lawyer and politician. He advocated legislation for better schools and was an active leader in the temperance reform. At the time of his appointment to the Board in 1837, he was the President of the Massachusetts Senate.

Almost immediately upon taking office Mr. Mann gained notoriety, chiefly because of his strict adherence to the School Law of 1827. This law contained the explicit provision that no school books were to be used "which are calculated to favor any particular religious sect or tenet." The generally accepted interpretation of this law was that it forbade the introduction of sectarian books into the public schools and sought to keep the religious controversies then raging in Massachusetts out of them. But no one really knows just what led to its passage, since all available sources are silent on the point. About the only thing that is certain, is the fact that there was no opposition to the law when it was passed. Horace Mann and his followers made much of this point. But hardly anything can be proved from silence. Besides, legislators pass many a law which turns out to be a boomerang. So it was with this legislation. The law meant well, but nevertheless it outlawed practically every book on religion and morals extant at the time! For ten years no one seemed to realize it. Only when Horace Mann began to adhere to his strict interpre-

tation did the full implications of the law dawn upon some of the religious leaders of Massachusetts. The debate was as bitter as any in the educational field.

Mr. Mann made his religious position clear. He rejected all the fundamental tenets of orthodox Calvinism and wanted a "natural religion," one based on the evidences of God's existence supplied by the physical universe and not by the Bible. These evidences he considered even superior to the revelations of the Scriptures. And yet he urged that the Bible be read, without comment, of course, in all the public schools. In the Normal Schools founded by him, one of the subjects of instruction was: "The principles of Piety and Morality, common to all sects of Christians." One of the rules for the same Normal School was: "A portion of the Scriptures shall be read daily."⁹

As for religious instruction in the public schools, he made these emphatic statements: "In regard to all affirmations, that I have ever attempted to exclude religious instruction from school, or to exclude the Bible from the school, or to impair the force of that volume, arising out of itself, that they are now, and always have been, without substance or semblance of truth."¹⁰ When the Rev. Matthew Hale Smith accused him of being opposed to the religion in the schools, he answered: "I regard hostility to religion in our schools, as the greatest crime which I could commit against man or against God. Had I the power, I would sooner repeat the massacre of Herod, than I would keep back religion from the young."¹¹

⁹ Culver, Raymond B., Horace Mann and Religion in the Massachusetts Public Schools, p. 124 (Yale University Press, New Haven, Conn. 1929).

¹⁰ Quoted from the Eighth Report by Culver, op. cit., p. 204.

¹¹ Culver, op. cit., p. 208.

But Horace Mann made some very important reservations concerning this religious education for the young. Again and again he stated that such instruction dare not be "sectarian"; that the inculcated principles must be "common to all sects of Christians"; that although he wanted "the religion of heaven" in the schools, he did not want "the creeds of men." These same reservations were the guiding lights when he selected the books for the school libraries. They also led him to the rejection of the library of the American Sunday School Union as well as individual volumes.

What about this position of Horace Mann? Had it been generally adopted, would it have arrested "the tide of secularization that has robbed our schools of religion," as Mr. Culver contends?¹² Or, as others have contended, did Mr. Mann have a hand in that secularization?

In the first place, it must be said that Mr. Mann was completely within the law. He did not invent the legislation. It was there when he was appointed to the Board of Education. Had he used the prohibitions of the law as a shield, he might have averted the controversy. Surely he would have saved himself a great deal of bitterness. But he deemed it necessary not only to state the law but also to propound his philosophy of education and his philosophy of religion. He thereby exposed himself to attack, for not all could accept that philosophy.

In the second place, Mr. Mann had a definite anti-Orthodox complex. He opposed the old Calvinist theology in no uncertain terms. His own religious creed was essentially Unitarian. Thus the adoption of his views

¹² Culver, *op. cit.*, p. 238.

would not have been neutral at all, nor would his principles have been "common to all sects of Christians." It would have been Unitarian and thus sectarian.

In the third place, Mr. Mann himself had to admit that the type of books he wanted for religious instruction were virtually nonexistent. Since the religious books that were available were outlawed, and there were no "approved" volumes, the net result was that no religious instruction could be given, not even in "natural religion." Thus while Mr. Mann was not solely responsible for the secularization of the public schools in Massachusetts, his attitude did help the process. Both he and Henry Barnard of Rhode Island "changed the emphasis from that of training Christian citizens serviceable to God and country, to that of producing patriotic citizens, serviceable to self and country. The shift was so revolutionary that by many the need of Christian teaching for full-fledged citizenship was presently overlooked altogether."¹³

Finally, Mr. Mann, like many other educators, fell into a grave error when he tried to equate morality and religion. Morals are indeed a part of religion, but certainly not the whole of it. This is especially true of Christianity, which involves much more than codes of conduct. Christianity, in its classic essence, is a metaphysical philosophy; morals are its observable outcomes, which in themselves are not unique, but more often similar to those seen among decent people everywhere. What makes Christian conduct different is its motive, namely, faith in Christ Jesus.

¹³ Verkuyl, op. cit., p. 38.

This criticism of Mr. Mann's religious position in no way disparages the good he did for public education in the United States, nor does it detract anything from his personal sacrifices in this field. Verkuyl correctly evaluates his work in these words: "The appointment of Horace Mann as Superintendent of Schools in Massachusetts, 1837, marks an epoch in American education. Previous to his activities, school supervision had been little more than mockery; direction of curriculum, attendance, and teaching had been slipshod. Mr. Mann carefully investigated and broadly reported. He made the people of his State acquainted with conditions and aware of results. He showed the absolute need of financial support through taxation. America was listening in."¹⁴ Though he will give him all due credit; though he will deplore the despicable methods of those who opposed him; the regret of every conservative Christian must be that Mr. Mann rejected "the faith which was once delivered unto the saints."¹⁵

Summary

Education in the United States during the colonial period was in the hands of the various churches and religious instruction was an integral part of the curriculum. In time the schools passed into secular hands and under the control of the state. With this change, for various reasons, the

¹⁴ Op. cit., pp. 37-38.

¹⁵ Jude 3.

secularized curriculum came into favor in all levels of public education. Various efforts were made, particularly in Massachusetts, to stem the tide, but they were of no avail. For the last hundred years public education has been to a large extent divorced from religious instruction. But, as the next chapter will show, a reaction is now setting in. It seems that the secularized curriculum has not been an unmitigated blessing.

Chapter 2

THE NEED FOR RELIGIOUS EDUCATION TODAY

Provoke not your children to wrath; but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. Ephesians 6, 4.

Chapter 2

THE NEED FOR RELIGIOUS EDUCATION TODAY

Education Today

The growth of our educational system has been phenomenal. From meager beginnings we now have a vast system of which we certainly can be proud. It is often said to be the best in the world. "Such changes have been wrought and progress made that the American school system has become one of the finest in the world."¹ According to governmental reports we had in 1938, 31,547,000 pupils in our elementary schools, taught by 870,963 teachers, at a cost of \$1,968,898,000. According to reports for 1938 we had 5,610,691 additional pupils in our secondary schools. On top of it all we had in 1936, 1,178,318 students in attendance in our 1,333 universities and colleges. The total educational bill for 1942 was \$3,177,000,000.

These certainly are impressive figures. They show that we are educationally minded. The Second World War has, of course, caused great havoc in this sphere as in many others. But when peace comes we look for bigger

¹ De Blois, Austen Kennedy and Gorham, Donald R., Christian Religious Education Principles and Practice, p. 314 (Fleming H. Revell Co. New York, N. Y., 1939).

and better things in the field of education. A time may even come when we shall spend more for education than for liquor. (The liquor bill for 1942 was \$4,000,000,000 and \$6,000,000,000 for 1943!)

The purpose of all this education has been variously stated. The most popular definition seems to be that the schools are to "prepare the pupils for life." H. C. Link² puts it this way: "The purpose of this widespread education is to develop the individual and to prepare him for life."³ A more scholarly definition reads like this: "The major functions of schools are to serve as agencies of society to conserve and transmit the cultural values to succeeding generations; to develop in the youth an understanding of, and an appreciation for, his social order; and to insure social progress, insofar as any institution can assure progress."⁴

Is our system doing this? Can it be improved? How? These are questions that must be considered and answered from time to time by every institution, no matter what its name or function. They should be considered and answered in all sincerity and truthfulness by that institution which plays the dominant role in the lives of our younger generations, especially of that between the years of five and seventeen, our public school system.

² Mr. H. C. Link is director of the Psychological Service Center of New York, and for several years he has directed many nation-wide studies of socio-economic trends made by over a hundred psychologists located at various universities.

³ Link, Henry C., The Return to Religion, p. 134 (The Macmillan Co., New York, N. Y. 1936).

⁴ Rouseck, Joseph S. and Associates, Sociological Foundations of Education, p. 33 (Thomas Y. Crowell Co., New York, N. Y. 1942).

Our schools, of course, have never been without their critics. And that has been a good thing. Without criticism no improvement would ever be possible. But when criticism becomes so vociferous as it is at present, we must consider and weigh it, especially when it comes from educators themselves.

General Criticism

What is wrong with our schools? Listen to Mr. Link: "Experiments made by psychologists during the past five years prove that formal education above the grade school does little or nothing to improve personality or character." And again: "There is no body of evidence in the whole field of psychology that proves any definite growth of character or personality as a result of higher education in its generally accepted forms."⁵ In fact he goes so far as to say: "There is some good evidence that the contrary often occurs, and that the prolongation of formal education results in deterioration of personality."⁶ Once more: "The hours, the discipline, and the pressure of the work done in schools, represent often a vacation from life rather than a preparation for life."⁷

In short, our schools fail to educate. Dr. Link attributes this failure especially to three things: first, the lowering of standards in order to make mass education possible; second, the inbreeding of the teaching staff with the resultant cultural lag; and third, the creation

⁵ Link, op. cit., p. 134.

⁶ Ibid., p. 135.

⁷ Ibid., p. 141.

of the "liberal mind." This last constitutes for Dr. Link "the most damaging single aspect of education" and is called "as mystical and irrational as any dogma of the church ever was." He defines this liberalism thus: "Liberalism...is the result of an indiscriminate releasing of a person from the traditions and restraints of the past without substituting an adequate set of restraints or ideals for the future."⁸ This liberalism "often manifests itself in a lack of conviction on matters of basic right and wrong, sometimes described as tolerance."⁹

Any educational system which can be characterized by statements like these is beyond all doubt in a sorry state. But is it really so? Cannot Dr. Link be wrong? Let us see what others are saying.

Dr. Gerrit Verkuyl,¹⁰ in his book, Christ in American Education, devotes a chapter to our schools and calls them "inadequate." His opening sentence of this chapter is: "From an educational view-point our public schools show serious defects and only slow improvement."¹¹ He blames this on Board and State control, poor preparation of the teachers themselves, unsympathetic attitudes toward pupils, short terms coupled with truancy, low standards and useless subjects.

Let Dr. J. Sheatsley¹² speak next: "We are failing to train men for what they were created for. We have become unruly, let us rather say, ungovernable, children; like a team running wild, we have taken the bit,

⁸ Link, op. cit., p. 148.

⁹ Ibid., p. 149.

¹⁰ Dr. Gerrit Verkuyl is National Field Representative for Leadership Training, Presbyterian Board of Christian Education.

¹¹ Op. cit., p. 41.

¹² Dr. J. Sheatsley is a Lutheran pastor.

and are going our own ways, choosing our own goals, and training for those instead of the originally appointed goal. The result is just what must be expected: disorder, confusion, maladjustment, with comedy in minor affairs of life, but terrible tragedy in the more serious."¹³

Let one more quotation suffice. H. F. Osborn in Creative Education says: "Asymmetry and superficiality are the two words which sum up my criticism of our present American Education from bottom to top."¹⁴

Moral Criticism

Even more stringent criticism has been dealt our education in the sphere of morals and ethics. Dr. Verkuyl states: "In the vast majority of our grade and high schools moral instruction is either neglected altogether, or is left to chance occasion."¹⁵ Here is another quotation: "Christ is the Central Figure in the history of the world since His coming, and of every civilized nation today...Nevertheless, our public schools neglect Christ utterly in their historic studies or pay Him scant attention."¹⁶ As for the wholesome development of persons: "To leave out Christ is to leave out the supreme factor in the development process."¹⁷

¹³ Sheatsley, Jacob, The Bible in Religious Education, p. 28 (The Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus, Ohio.)

¹⁴ Quoted in Verkuyl, op. cit., p. 50.

¹⁵ Verkuyl, op. cit., p. 45.

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 48.

¹⁷ Ibid., p. 48.

Here is another voice, that of W. C. Bower,¹⁸ "No education that neglects the religious adjustment of persons or the religious aspect of culture past or present can on any account be considered adequate."¹⁹ And again: "The problem of making the resources of religion available in the total education of American childhood and youth is at once one of the most urgent and difficult problems of education under the existing conditions of American life."²⁰

We turn to J. M. Price,²¹ and we find this statement: "Any system of education that ignores the spiritual aspect of man's nature is incomplete."²² How do our schools deal with the "spiritual aspect of man's nature"? Professor Price answers: "In school, it seems, every pagan God in history may be the subject of the day's lesson but not the God of the Bible."²³

We next consult Dr. Sheatsley on this point. He tells us: "In view of the present conditions of society at large, relative to morals, the question may well be raised whether our whole system of education is not badly off balance...We are zealously enlarging the scope of education in order to keep up with the march of discoveries and inventions, we are perfecting methods - or at least we think we are, we are calling for more applied psychology from the kindergarten to post-graduate work, all of which

¹⁸ W. C. Bower is Professor of Religious Education in the Divinity School of the University of Chicago.

¹⁹ Bower, William Clayton, Christ and Christian Education, p. 101, (Abington-Cokesbury Press, New York, N. Y. 1943).

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 101.

²¹ J. M. Price, is Director of the School of Religious Education, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary.

²² Price, J. M., Chapman, James H., Tibbs, A. E., Carpenter, L. L., A Survey of Religious Education, p. 15 (The Ronald Press Company, New York, N. Y. 1940).

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 81.

is perfectly proper; but what is needed far more than any or all of these is the exercise of a larger measure of common sense in finding out what the purpose of life is, and in the development and application of the moral and spiritual principles that underlie right living."²⁴

But the objection can be raised that all these quotations are from the writings of professional religionists whose business it is to make a case for religion and religious education. Therefore it might be advisable at this time to pay particular attention to the statement of Professor Bower: "An increasing number of public school authorities have come to feel that the greatest weakness in the public education is at the point of values and motives. As a result, in a number of instances religion has been introduced into the curriculum of the public school on the same basis as language, general science, literature, history and the arts... There is evidence that this tendency is growing."²⁵ Note that the tendency is ascribed not to preachers and religious professionals, but to "public school authorities."

Much along the same line we have the recommendation of the 1939-40 White House Conference on Children in a Democracy: "Practical steps should be taken to make available to children and youth through education the resources of religion as an important factor in the democratic way of life and in the development of personal and social integrity."²⁶

²⁴ Sheatsley, op. cit., pp. 16-17.

²⁵ Bower, op. cit., p. 108.

²⁶ Quoted in Bower, op. cit., pp. 103-104.

The words of such a distinguished sociologist as Pitirim Sorokin should carry some weight. His opinion on the subject is: "Everything is covered with dirt because the world has lost its morals. The Twentieth Century is the bloodiest, most revolutionary in the world's history. I don't expect any end to the mess until education leads the way toward restoration of morality."²⁷

Here is what Professor Zollmann²⁸ says: "The consequences of a godless education can be studied today at close hand in any penitentiary, house of correction, or reform school. They are vitally felt by every teacher from the kindergarten to the University and by every business man from the corner grocer to the president of the most powerful bank. They fill the courts with litigations, the jails with inmates, and the cemeteries with corpses."²⁹

In the introduction to the United States report on Weekday Schools, Bess Goodykoontz, Assistant United States Commissioner of Education, makes these statements: "No extended inquiry is required to discover in this country a widespread and serious concern that education for children and young persons shall include attention to the development of ethical attitudes and practices. Examination of the writings of parents, school officials, public officials, and character-building agencies indicates that all agree on this need, which they see as vital to the implementing of democratic ideas and the perpetuation of our national ideals."³⁰

²⁷ Quoted in Roucek, op. cit., p. 550.

²⁸ Carl Zollmann is Professor of Law, Marquette University.

²⁹ Zollmann, op. cit., p. 82

³⁰ Davis, Mary Dabney, Weekday Classes in Religious Education, Bulletin 1941, No. 3., p. V, (U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C.).

Perhaps a quotation from Dr. Link will suffice for this phase of the topic. The concluding paragraph of his chapter on "The Vice of Education" reads thus: "There is a great need in the field of education for the codification of values and basic truths about human nature; for the preservation and honoring of the noble traditions which the race has acquired; for the subordination of intellectual arrogance to the discipline of the unselfish life. Where, better than in religion, can the basis for such a synthesis of the past with the present be found."³¹

Anti-Christian Tendencies

Not only has the religious element been ignored in much of our education, but views that are directly opposed to Christianity have been expressed and promulgated. Behaviorists have sought to explain everything, even the mind and soul, on the basis of stimulus and response. Freudians have tried to equate everything with sex and have advocated the giving of free rein to "natural desires." Dr. Albert Einstein in utter disregard of the Declaration of Independence and our Constitution urges us to "give up the doctrine of a personal God."³²

Dr. Link's own experience can best serve as an example of what education under such circumstances will do. Speaking of himself and his wife, he says: "We both profited by our education to such an extent that we became virtual agnostics. If we believed in God at all, it was the most vague and attenuated kind of belief. Certainly it had nothing to do with

³¹ Link, op. cit., p. 150.

³² Gilbert, Dan, The Fifth Column in Our Schools, p. 51ff. (Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1941).

the Church, the practices and preachings of which had by this time become repugnant to us. We considered ourselves above such antics."³³ How could it be otherwise when geologists stated that "the world could not have been created in seven days nor man in one"; when historians described "the mythologies of different religions"; when anthropologists explained "the Ten Commandments as the mores or customs peculiar to a certain race and therefore not binding on another race under different conditions;" when philosophers described "the emancipation of the mind from anthropomorphic and religious conceptions of the world;" when teachers of ethics discussed "hedonism, stoicism, and the different schools of conduct" and left "the student free to choose his own?"³⁴ How often has this case-history been repeated in America without a successful "return to religion?" "Eliminate God, make man a mere animal, give free rein to instincts, and the jungle life is the inevitable result."³⁵

The point here is not whether a particular educator has the right to hold agnostic or atheistic views. Our Constitution and laws grant everyone religious liberty and freedom of conscience. The point is whether the students must needs be exposed to such views in apparently nonreligious courses; whether their freedom of conscience is proscribed upon their entrance into the classroom; whether confidence in meagerly supported theories is preferable to ancient and historic creeds.

³³ Link, op. cit., p. 87.

³⁴ Ibid., p. 147.

³⁵ Price, op. cit., p. 82.

Summary

What does all this add up to? Without a conceivable doubt we need religion and religious education as never before. Somehow it must be provided. Just what is being done, what can and should be done, is altogether another matter. That shall be the next phase of our investigation.

Chapter 3

CHRISTIAN AGENCIES FOR RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

Train up a child in the way it should go:
and when he is old, he will not depart from it.

Proverbs 22, 6.

Chapter 3

CHRISTIAN AGENCIES FOR RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

From the foregoing discussion it might be imagined that we have no religious instruction in our country at all. This is not so. We do not have it, as a rule, in our public schools, but otherwise there is a great deal of religious education going on all the time. Naturally enough, the churches get most of the credit, be they Christian, Jewish, or of any other faith. In the present discussion, we shall limit ourselves to the discussion of Christian educational programs.

Parochial Schools

The history of the Christian Church testifies that education was one of its chief concerns from the very beginning. First came the Catechetical Schools, then the Monastic and Cathedral Schools, then the ancient Universities which were usually chartered by the Pope and always closely associated with the Church. Finally, as one of the fruits of the Reformation and the Renaissance, came the popular parish schools for the common people. Eventually they were attached to almost every church throughout Europe and America, in fact, wherever Christianity reached.

This is no longer true, in America especially. More and more the parochial, parish, church school is going out of existence. Although individual schools may be found here and there, really only two major systems of such schools remain in our country. One is that of the Roman Catholic Church and the other that of the Evangelical Lutheran Church.

Many people have expressed surprise at the phenomenal growth of the Catholic Church in the United States. The basic reason, however, is not hard to find. The Catholics believe in education, especially for the young. They had in 1938, 7,916 elementary schools with an enrollment of 2,086,071. They had 1,984 secondary schools with an enrollment of 302,154. They had 188 colleges and universities with 143,678 students in attendance. Such a program is bound to bear fruit, both in membership and influence, since emphasis is placed on religious ideals throughout.

Much the same can be said for the Lutheran Schools. According to the 1936 Census of Religious Bodies the Lutherans had 1,522 elementary schools with an enrollment of 94,258. In addition they have many secondary schools, Junior Colleges, and Seminaries and Universities. In fairness it must be stated, however, that the high figure for elementary schools is due largely to the educational program of one particular body, namely the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States. This body, which has only a third of the Lutherans in its midst, nevertheless has over 1200 grade schools, 2,200 teachers, and 18 Colleges and Seminaries, 16 of which include a high school. The influence of such a religious

program is bound to tell in the life of individuals and in their social contacts.

Dr. Verkuyll evaluates the Catholic and the Lutheran Parochial Schools thus: "These educational systems, so far as they reach and for their purpose, are eminently successful; they tie their pupils to the Church. Rarely does a Church-trained Catholic or Lutheran forsake his denomination to neglect religion or to affiliate with another Communion. The Lutheran system is successful, further, in the imparting of much Scripture knowledge."¹

Sunday Schools

The Sunday School as originated in 1780 by Robert Raikes in England was altogether unlike the institution we know by that name today. The early Sunday Schools, both in England and in America, were chiefly for the children of the poor, the illiterate and the underprivileged. Instruction consisted of reading, writing, spelling, grammar, arithmetic - and religion.

The first change in the American Sunday Schools came with the establishment of our Republic. More and more these schools became distinctly religious in character. The chief reason was, of course, the secularization of curriculum in the public schools. Some agency for religious instruction had to be found. Quite naturally Christian people turned to the Sunday Schools for assistance.

¹ Op. cit., pp. 60-61.

The second forward step came in 1824 when the American Sunday School Union was organized. This ushered in a period of development and progress. Missionaries traveled the country from one end to the other, organizing Sunday Schools and later churches. Some even went to foreign shores. Work was centralized in the national organization, districts were formed, conventions held. Since some denominations objected to the unionizing efforts of the organization, they formed their denominational Boards. The Methodists were first in 1827, Lutherans second in 1830, and the Presbyterians third in 1832. Other Boards were formed later still. But even these independent groups cooperated with and were influenced by the Union. This was especially true in regard to the "lessons" to be used in the Sunday Schools.

Subsequent history shows improvement, world-wide expansion, integration and coordination. There is little doubt that despite all handicaps, inefficiencies, and even stupidities, the American Sunday Schools, especially the better kind, have had a tremendous influence on the moral and spiritual values of America. For many years they were the only organized agencies besides the parochial schools which sought to give religious education to our children and young people.

But now it seems that the Sunday School movement has just about reached its zenith. In fact, some claim that it has passed it. Although once hailed as the educational agency of the church, today it is falling into disrepute. The cry has gone up and is being repeated more and more; "The Sunday School is not enough." One of the most severe criticisms of the

Sunday School has come from the pen of the Rev. Lockhart Amerman, a Presbyterian, and appeared in The Christian Century, Feb. 19, 1944.

Mr. Amerman goes so far as to call the Sunday School a "menace" to the church, a supposed "hour of charm," heretical in its "exaggeration and overemphasis of a nonessential," tending to make "second things first," defending "peripheral opinions" which are "the tassels in the lunatic fringe" of religious education.

If only half of these things are true - and some would say this is not even the half of it about some Sunday Schools - then the Sunday School is heading for its Waterloo. It's death will not be sudden, but nevertheless sure, and its devotees better take stock and that right quick.

Part Time Schools and Agencies

Of all the part time agencies for religious education the Vacation Church School is first. According to Dr. Verkuyl, Lutherans unable to maintain parochial schools were first to utilize the summer vacation for religious instruction.² Other Protestants did not adopt the idea until it was popularized by Robert G. Boville who organized the first school of this nature in July 1898, in New York City. In the present century the movement has spread from coast to coast and serves thousands upon thousands of children.

The vacation idea appears in other part time schools. Many churches use Saturdays for religious education, many have schools after the public school sessions. The Lutherans and Episcopalians have confirmation classes.

² Op. cit., p. 98.

which prepare primarily for intelligent church-membership, but at the same time inculcate invaluable moral principles and ideals.

In addition to all this we can list the various organizations that directly or indirectly teach religion, such as the Young People's Society, the Men's Club, Ladies Aid Society, Missionary Society, Bible Classes and similar groups. Then there are the Y.M.C.A. and Y.W.C.A., Boy Scouts, Campfire Girls and similar agencies.

In short, there is a tremendous amount of religious education going on, fostered mainly by the churches of our country. Some 25,000,000 children are served one way or another. And yet the cry goes up: "It isn't enough! We need more religious education!"

And it's true! Despite all these efforts it has been estimated that 17,000,000 children and young people in our country are without any religious instruction whatsoever! To improve present instruction and enlarge it, must be the goal of everyone who prizes religious values to any degree whatever. The International Council of Religious Education and the Religious Education Association both want to see to it that there is more and better religious education in our country. But -

What about the Public Schools?

Even as the realization of the insufficiency of our present facilities sinks deeper and deeper into the hearts and minds of interested people, they more and more cast a longing look at the public schools and hope that somehow, sometime religion will get back into the classroom. Can it be? Shall it be? For years it seemed an utter impossibility.

America was dedicated to the proposition that the State and the Church shall ever be separate and that the public schools shall ever be secular or nonreligious. Then came the Weekday Church School movement with a promise of a bright future. The International Council made it one of its chief concerns. The Religious Education Association seeks to clarify the issues and promote it wherever possible. According to many opinions the Weekday Church Schools must bear the brunt of the religious education in the future.

Objections

If religious courses do become a part of the public school curriculum it will not happen without a fight. Many are looking askance at the whole movement and are determined that no religious education shall ever be given in our public schools.

Already some 20 years ago a book appeared containing arguments for both sides. This was The Reference Shelf Vol. V No. 2; Religious Teaching in the Public Schools.³ Here is a partial list of points against religious teaching in the public schools.

1. It violates the doctrine of separation of Church and State.
2. Many parts of the Bible are unfit for children.
3. It is the business of the Church and the Home to teach religion and not of the school.
4. Morals and ethics can be taught without involving religion.
5. There will be too great a temptation to proselytize.

³ Beman, L. T., compiler, The Reference Shelf Vol. IV No. 2. Religious Teaching in the Public Schools (H. W. Wilson Co. N. Y. 1927).

6. All religious teaching is sectarian and partisan.
7. Catholics, Protestants, and Jews have different versions of the Bible and no choice can be made as to which one is correct.
8. Children should be left alone to choose their own religion after they grow up.
9. There is no agreement as to the things that should be taught and should not be taught children.
10. We do not have enough qualified teachers.
11. There is too much danger of friction between the various pupils and classes.
12. The public schools are doing well enough - leave them alone.

More recently, Rabbi G. George Fox of Chicago headed his article in Religious Education October-December 1941: "Religious Education, but Not In The Public Schools." He gives three reasons for his stand, the need of harmony and good will; second, the atomistic nature of the proposed instruction; and third, the social pressure created against the contrary minded.

Similarly, in a rather involved and hazy discussion in four successive issues of the International Journal of Religious Education (Sept. - Dec. 1941) between Dr. George A. Coe⁴ and F. Ernest Johnson⁵, we find these statements by Dr. Coe: "At the present time, the opening of such questions [Involving church policy] would create such a religious rumpus that would endanger the existence of such approximately democratic schools as, fortunately, we now have." (Oct.) And again: "Our present situation is

⁴ Dr. George A. Coe is Columbia's retired Professor of Education.

⁵ F. Ernest Johnson is the Executive Secretary, Department of Research and Education, Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.

deplorable enough, but it would be made worse if the state schools should give their backing to religions that are not ready for public, democratic inquiry into their institutional habits and leadership." (Nov. issue.)

The Voice of John Dewey

It has been said that Prof. John Dewey is the most influential living educator. Certainly this is true of the "progressive" wing among educators. And John Dewey is against any formal religious education in the public schools! He took his stand in 1908 and has given no indication of any changed attitude up to the year 1940.

Mr. Dewey is against formal religious education in the public schools, in the first place, because he believes the fundamental tenets of historic Christianity have outlived their usefulness. Here are his words on that point: "Nothing is gained by a deliberate effort to return to ideas which have become incredible, and to symbols which have been emptied of their content of obvious meaning. Nothing can be gained by moves which will increase confusion and obscurity, which tend to an emotional hypocrisy and to a phrasemongering or formulae which seem to mean one thing and really import the opposite."⁶

In the second place, Mr. Dewey does not know what can be taught as religion. "We certainly cannot teach religion as an abstract essence. We have got to teach something as religion and that means practically some religion. Which? In America, at least, the answer cannot be summarily given even as Christianity in general. Our Jewish fellow-citizens not only have the same 'hands, organs, dimensions, senses, affections, passions'

⁶ Dewey, John, Education Today, p. 75 (G. P. Putman's Sons, New York, N. Y. 1942).

as the Christians, but, like them, they pay taxes, vote, and serve on school boards. But we should not be very much better off even if it were a question of Christianity alone. Which Christianity? Oriental in its origin, it has been since Latinized and Germanized, and there are even those who have dreamed of humanizing it."⁷

His third objection revolves around the purpose of religious instruction. He asks: "What shall knowledge of religion as an outcome of religion mean today? Shall it mean the accumulation of information about religion? Or are there those who still believe in some magic power resident in memorized words, phrases, and facts of transmitting themselves into personal insight, the development of fundamental mood and the formation of permanent attitudes toward experience?"⁸

His fourth point deals with method. He places his faith in the popular "scientific method" and demands an evolutionary view of religion and experimental inquiry into its teachings. He puts forth the claim that professed religionists do not want this historic view nor the open and above board inquiry into the truths of religion. "Can those who take the philosophic and historic view of religion as a flower and fruition of the human spirit in a congenial atmosphere tolerate the incongruity involved in 'teaching' such an intimate and originally vital matter by external and formal methods? And can those who hold that true religion is something externally imported tolerate any other method? Is it not confusion to seek a reconciliation of such disparate ideas?"⁹

⁷ Ibid., p. 80.

⁸ Ibid., p. 81.

⁹ Ibid., p. 82.

In the fifth place, after we have settled the matter of content, purpose and method - where shall we get the teachers? So asks Mr. Dewey. "Where are the authoritative teachers? There are theologians: do we want theology taught? There are historians, but I fear the day has not come when the history of religion can be taught as history."¹⁰

Finally, Mr. Dewey puts forth the claim that our public schools are teaching religion already. How? Here is the answer: "Our schools, in bringing together those of different nationalities, languages, traditions, and creeds, in assimilating them together upon the basis of what is common and public in endeavor and achievement, are performing an infinitely significant religious work. They are promoting the social unity out of which in the end genuine religious unity must grow."¹¹ Again: "Under certain conditions our schools are more religious in substance and in promise without any of the conventional badges and machinery of religious instruction than they could be in cultivating these forms."¹²

Mr. Dewey does, however, see two other possibilities. The one is that some kind of a "nonsupernatural" religion be taught, the other that the teaching of religion be given to the various denominations, as in fact it is being done in the Weekday Church Schools. Neither of these alternatives receives his approval. About the nonsupernatural religion he says: "It is lucidity, sincerity, and the sense of reality which demand that,

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 83.

¹¹ Ibid., p. 84.

¹² Ibid., p. 85.

until the nonsupernatural view is more completely elaborated in all its implications and is more completely in possession of the machinery of education, the schools shall keep hands off and shall do as little as possible. This is indeed a *laissez-faire* policy."¹³ "The alternate plan of parceling out pupils among religious teachers drawn from their respective churches and denominations brings us up against exactly the matter which has done most to discredit the churches, and to discredit the cause, not perhaps of religion, but of organized and institutional religion: the multiplication of rival and competing religious bodies, each with its private inspiration and outlook."¹⁴

These words of Mr. Dewey make several things clear. Among the very first is Mr. Dewey's great presumption. He declares that there are no "experts in religion" and immediately proceeds to say what is and is not religion, what may and may not be taught. Does he believe he is the only one whose views on this subject are correct and authoritative?

The second thing that is very clear is Mr. Dewey's rejection of anything having the stamp of historic Christianity upon it. To him the old christian principles are "incredible ideas" and "emptied symbols." One is tempted to remind him that the same claim has been made by people, both wise and foolish, for hundreds of years. But somehow those very ideas so repugnant to him have survived to the present day and they give promise to do so for a long time to come.

¹³ Ibid., p. 77.

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 84.

Finally, Mr. Dewey not only rejects everything that can be called specifically christian, but propounds a religion of his own. He declares that the public schools are doing a "religious" work, that they are "more religious" without formal courses in religion, than they would be with them. This leads H. Shelton Smith to assert: "So far as Dewey is concerned it is clear that a positive bias in favor of a naturalistic brand of democratic religion in the schools, rather than mere neutrality, underlies his long-time opposition to having organized religion introduced into the curriculum of state education."¹⁵ Mr. Smith goes even further and declares: "...a paramount question now presents itself to the American people in respect of the relation of Hebrew-Christian faith to the public school. The question is not, as many have supposed, Shall the public school teach a religion? For, according to our survey, religion of a kind is already in the state school. It is that sort which we have called anthropocentric religion, and which Dewey in 1908 implied in the phrase, "the positive creed of life implicit in democracy and science." Whether or not the experimentalist educator may ever have formulated his creed in terms of commonly recognized religious ideology is beside the point. The main point is that he considers progressive education to be essentially religious. It is this assumption that either explicitly or implicitly motivates his fundamental opposition to other forms of religion and especially

¹⁵ Smith H. Shelton, Faith and Nurture, p. 176 (Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, N. Y. 1941).

these forms associated with the organized faiths, Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant. Thus the paramount question is this: "What kind of religion shall the public school teach--the religion of the churches or the religion of humanistic experimentalism? Sooner or later this must become the focal point of a crucial battle. On its outcome largely hangs the fate of democratic culture in America."¹⁶

Summary

Although there is much instruction in religion throughout our country, it is thought to be insufficient. The contention is that not only must the present agencies redouble their efforts, but that the public schools should be opened for religious education by means of the Weekday Church School. We turn to them next.

¹⁶ Smith, op. cit., p. 202.

Chapter 4

THE WEEKDAY CHURCH SCHOOL

All thy children shall be taught of the Lord;
and great shall be the peace of thy children.

Isaiah 54, 13.

Chapter 4

THE WEEKDAY CHURCH SCHOOLS

Definitions

Just what are these Weekday Church Schools in which so much confidence is placed? De Blois and Gorham define them as follows: "Weekday church schools consist of classes for moral-religious instruction given during released time from the public school for a period approximating the school year, conducted by a church or a group of cooperating churches which provide the instruction, housing and support of the classes."¹

The International Council of Religious Education, the chief sponsor of these schools, defines them thus: "The weekday church school is a school of religious education, distinguished from all other weekday church groups by its close relationship with the public school, with which it cooperates, but with which it has no organic relationship. Weekday church school pupils meet in graded groups at regular intervals during the public school year to follow some organized course of religious instruction."²

¹ De Blois, Austen Kennedy and Gorham, Donald R., Christian Religious Education: Principles and Practice, p. 303 (Fleming H. Revell Co. New York, N. Y. 1939).

² The Weekday Church School, p. 5 (The International Council of Religious Education, 203 N. Wabash St. Chicago, Ill. 1940).

This definition has been accepted by the United States Office of Education.³

Early History

The earliest appeal for a Weekday Church School was made in 1905. When the Inter-church Conference met in Carnegie Hall, New York, N. Y. Dr. George U. Wenner read a paper before the said conference, following which, this resolution was adopted: "RESOLVED: That in the need of more systematic education in religion, we recommend for favorable consideration of the public school authorities of the county the proposal to allow the children to absent themselves, without detriment, from the public schools on Wednesday or some other afternoon of the school week for the purpose of attending religious instruction in their own churches; and we urge upon the churches the advisability of availing themselves of the opportunity so granted to give instruction in addition to that given on Sunday."⁴

No records are available about the outcome of this appeal. We do know, however, that a Weekday Church School was in operation in the Christ Lutheran Church, New York, N. Y., in 1906-7. This may have been or may not have been a direct result of the resolution passed by the Conference.

The first organized plan of Weekday Schools came in the fall of 1913 when the Superintendent of Schools in Gary, Ind., William Wirt, offered

³ Bulletin 1941, No. 3: "Weekday Classes in Religious Education." p. 2 (U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C.).

⁴ Quoted in De Blois, Austen Kennedy and Gorham, Donald R., Christian Religious Education: Principles and Practice, p. 301 (Fleming H. Revell Co., New York, N. Y. 1939).

to release pupils from the public schools for religious instruction. Soon several churches acted upon this offer. Gradually the work was expanded along denominational lines. In 1918 five Protestant denominations joined to form a Board of Religious Education. This work is still going on and these schools in Gary, Indiana, are the oldest Weekday Church Schools in existence.

Toledo, Ohio, was not far behind Gary. There the weekday schools were instituted in 1916, after thorough study and preparation by the Federation of Churches of Toledo. The feature of the Toledo plan was the fact that it was interdenominational right from the beginning.

Two other communities soon organized Weekday Church Schools. They were East Greenwich, R. I., and Cuyahoga Falls, Ohio. There were other such schools operating about this time in widely separated cities, but little information about them is available.

Recent Growth and Expansion

In the last twenty years the Weekday Church Schools have had phenomenal growth. While in 1915-20 only four new programs were initiated, the figure jumped to 49 in the period 1920-25. In 1935-40 this was more than tripled, and 177 programs were initiated. By 1940, 488 school systems from 38 states of the Union reported that pupils were being released for religious courses. The total number of pupils served, according to reports from 357 systems, was 164,013, as of January, 1940. Of these the majority (135,877) were elementary pupils. Many other public school systems are making plans to introduce Weekday Schools.

Even when we make allowances for discontinued programs, these figures indicate that the movement is getting stronger from year to year. This is no doubt due to the promotional efforts of the International Council of Religious Education with its subsidiary State and Local Councils throughout the country. Whether the public school officials like it or not, the movement is here and they will have to deal with it sooner or later and perhaps repeatedly.

Organization

How do such schools get started? Behind them all there is some interested person or persons who must sweat and strain and sacrifice in order to get things moving. Church and school boards must be consulted and persuaded in favor of the schools, teachers must be found, public interest aroused. And there are such people. They may be ministers, or business men, or teachers, or anybody else.

Types

Once the point is reached where a Weekday Church School is feasible, the next question that has to be decided is what type of organization it is to be. This is regulated both by the community and the promoters. In general there are three different kinds of schools: the community type, the semi-community type, and the parish type.

The full community type is of two kinds, inter-faith and inter-church. In the inter-faith kind, all faiths - Catholic, Jewish, Protestant - cooperate by means of a joint agency in general planning, grading, and

similar matters. In the inter-church kind, all evangelical churches join to carry out a joint program, with one teaching staff and one curriculum. In 1940, 40.4 percent of all Weekday Schools were of this community type.

The semi-community type delegates such external problems as organization, publicity, time for classes to a joint agency, but reserves such matters as curriculum and teaching staff to the various denominations. Possibly a better name for this would simply be the denominational type of Weekday Religious School. Nine and eight tenths percent of all schools were of this denominational type in 1940.

The parish type is found where a single church accepts full responsibility for the whole program. Of course, that places a greater burden on that particular church than would a cooperative program. Nevertheless 32.9 percent of the schools were of this parish type in 1940.

In regions where the pupils are practically of one denomination, or where denominational loyalties are weak or non-existent, the community type of schools is the best arrangement. In places where differing denominations are strong, a denominational setup will be found better. In instances where a single church is far removed from other churches, or where no basis of cooperation can be found, the parish type is about the only thing left. At times the schools are changed from one type to another when and if advisable.

Time Allowed

Just as there are three types of schools, so there are three different arrangements as to the time allowed for religious instruction. Weekday Church School sessions may be held on "free time," "dismissed time" and "released time."

"Free time" means at other hours than the customary public school hours; this may be after school or on Saturday. The instruction may last for an hour or an hour and a half. This the least popular arrangement because it places an extra burden on the children taking the courses and thus creates odium toward religion.

When religious classes are held on "dismissed time," pupils are dismissed from school earlier than usual in order that those who wish may attend. In this arrangement all the grades of the school are dismissed some 45-60 minutes earlier on a specified day, or days, of the regular school week. Those who do not take the religious courses go home, while those who take them, stay for these classes. This has the psychological effect that religious instruction is an added burden. Too many pupils will be tempted to drop the course and have the time to themselves. In order to get away from this, some schools require those not taking the religious courses to remain in school and do some other work. This arrangement also calls for a large teaching staff, since all the classes must be taught at the same time and no teacher can have two classes in the same school on the same day.

The most popular arrangement is "released time" - pupils receive time out from regular work at some definite time in the day to attend religious classes. On released time, the periods are usually 50-60 minutes long. Each school has its particular day for religious instruction. Grades may be dismissed in rotation, so that one teacher can teach the various grades throughout the day. This usually is the best arrangement.

Place of Sessions

Some classes meet in nearby churches, others meet in the public school rooms, according to local circumstances. If churches happen to be near and available, the classes meet there. If not, and if the school authorities permit, classes meet in the public school buildings. Each place has its advantages and disadvantages.

In favor of holding classes in churches are such things as a more satisfactory atmosphere for worship, the centering of religious education around the church, making it known to the church people that it is really their project and responsibility. Above all, when classes are held in churches, no accusation can be made that the article of separation of church and state is violated or that public funds or facilities are used for sectarian purposes.

In favor of meeting in the public school buildings are such things as the saving of heating costs and janitor service, lessening of the traffic problem, no waste of time in going back and forth. Above all, this connects the religious course with the other things the children are learning and makes it more like going to school.

Courses

There are four different types of courses used in the Weekday Church Schools. Some are based on the study of the Bible, Church History, and Religious Literature. Others grow out of the public school studies. Still others revolve around national holidays, birthdays of great men, or similar social events. Last of all some deal chiefly with social problems.

The first, and most frequent, is the standard, traditional course in religion. The second seeks to give a religious slant to public school curriculum. The third is particularly good when short and disconnected lessons are needed. The last is a topical course on such things as the Christian use of time, money, property, ability, etc.

In actual practice reported by 322 school systems, Bible Study received the main emphasis, character education came next, and church doctrine and good citizenship vied for third place.

In some cases special syllabi are provided for these Bible Studies. One of the most extensive is the one compiled by the Virginia Council of Religious Education. A special book is issued for each of the seven elementary grades. Another book has been provided for use in Virginia High Schools.

There are no set methods for teaching these courses. Discussion, story-telling, dramatics, and even handcraft may be introduced. They may be further supplemented by music, song, and prayer. One of the best ways, of course, is the modern motion picture, which is only now being accepted as a powerful means of teaching.

Just which courses and methods are to be used is left up to the community leaders. It is up to them to ascertain their local needs and find the best way to meet them. Due attention is to be paid the prevailing theological ideas and concepts of religion, whether liberal or conservative.

The matter of credits to be given, especially for the High School courses, is a vexing one. There is no unanimity on the issue. Some schools grant credits for the religious courses and some do not. It is understandable that pupils would want the credits. After all, if they do the work in a satisfactory way, why should they not be credited for it? But to many minds such crediting is a transgression of the principle that these schools have no official connection with the school system. In time an equitable solution will in all probability come.

Teachers

The success of any course depends to a large extent on the teacher. This is as true in religion as in any other sphere of education. In order to place these schools on as high a plane as possible, careful selection of teachers is necessary. Wherever possible the teachers of religion meet the standards of the public school teachers. It is, of course, of the utmost importance that they have special training in religious education and religion.

Beyond all doubt this has been one of the chief problems in connection with Weekday Church Schools. Though marked improvement can be noticed, a great deal more is needed. Of 330 systems questioned on this point 54.5% said they had no regulation, 30% said they had local regulations, and only 10.9% had state-wide regulations, concerning the qualifications of teachers in Weekday Schools.⁵

⁵ Davis, Mary Dabney, Weekday Classes in Religious Education, p. 46 (Bulletin 1941, No. 3, U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C.).

An interesting question in this connection deals with the appointment of Weekday Class teachers. Replies from 399 systems answering the question indicate that 59.4% were appointed by the churches through their agencies, 36.8% by church and public schools jointly, and 3.8% by the public school officials. No doubt to some it will seem as if the public school officials had no business to have a hand in such appointments. But evidently this is just a way to make sure that the teachers are satisfactory and do meet the standards of the public schools.

The number of paid and volunteer teachers was reported by 341 school systems. Surprisingly enough the greatest percentage are paid, 39.3%. Volunteer teachers averaged 37.5%. Some (6.8%) used both volunteers and paid teachers. In smaller communities the classes were taught by ministers or priests, often without remuneration. Nearly half of the 153 systems which had paid teachers, were in the elementary schools, while nearly one-fourth of the high school programs were taught by ministers or priests.

Finances

Every educational program costs money. There is, however, no single method used to defray the expenses of the Weekday Schools. The methods that have been used include general subscription, contributions of parents, entertainments, endowments, appropriations by denominational boards, contributions by local industries, Sunday school associations, councils of religious education, and regular tuition.

The costs of the various programs vary. Much depends on the courses given and the teachers employed, whether they are paid or not. Many of the Weekday Church Schools, in fact, suffer from a lack of funds. Many others are held on a rather low level because the finances are lacking.

Legality

One of the most frequent questions and all in all the most important one, is that touching the legality of the whole system. Many of those that oppose religious education in the public schools do it because they think it is illegal, contrary to the policies of the public schools, and in opposition to the doctrine of the separation of church and state. Unfortunately many of the arguments rest on supposition rather than on fact and are governed more by bias than by actuality.

In the first place, there is no Federal Law which would bar religious education from our public schools. In fact there is no Federal Law concerning anything that should or should not be taught! Generally speaking the school laws are state laws and they vary with state boundaries.

Secondly, the Weekday Schools are Church Schools; they are under the control of the church; they have no organic connection with the public school system. Their purpose is not to oppose the public school system, nor to control it, but to complement it.

In the third place, no child is forced to attend these classes. Moreover, only such pupils are eligible to attend them who receive the written permission of their parents to do so.

Finally, legal authority has been given these schools in many states. In Iowa, Kentucky, Maine, Minnesota, New York, Oregon, South Dakota, West Virginia, special legislative authority has been passed. In Illinois, Nevada, Pennsylvania, and Idaho, the respective State Attorneys General have authorized the release of pupils for attendance in religious classes. In Vermont, Kansas, New York, Washington court decisions have done the same under certain prescribed conditions. Opinions of State Boards of Education for Connecticut, Delaware, Nebraska, New Jersey, Rhode Island, Ohio and Utah leave the matter in the hands of the local school officials.

Many states, on the other hand, are silent on the whole matter, while adverse decisions by the Attorneys General have occurred only in California, Oregon and Washington.

This, of course, does not settle the matter. Evidently more and more decisions will be handed down, both for and against the movement. But the trend seems to be for, rather than against.

Characteristic Religious Philosophy

This study of the Weekday Church Schools would be incomplete without a reference to the distinctive religious philosophy associated with them.⁶ An examination of the promotional literature and the recommended textbooks

⁶ In the following discussion, when the Weekday Church Schools are mentioned, the references are to the ideal schools as envisioned by their sponsors and promoters and not to the schools organized along denominational lines. In the denominational Weekday Schools, as the name already implies, the denominational philosophy prevails and approved textbooks are used.

soon reveals the chief characteristics of this philosophy.⁷ The first, and most revealing, is its conception of the Bible. While biblical material is extensively used, it is never held to be authoritative, but only illustrative. The religious principles of the Scriptures are invariably taken to be the old Hebrew or early Christian ideas on the subject. As such, they may be accepted or rejected. Usually they are rejected, both in the name of science and in the name of Higher Criticism.⁸

Once the authority of the Bible is undermined, the rejection of Christ's Messiahship follows as a corollary. His example is indeed cited, His teachings are held in high regard, but he is not presented as the divine Redeemer of the world, His death on the cross is described as heroic, but in no way vicarious, His resurrection and His ascension are either passed over in silence or they are described in terms calculated to be vague and misleading.

Other religious tenets that predominate in the Weekday Schools need only brief mention. They are: evolutionism - the doctrine that the universe came into existence by an unknown process of gradual development

⁷ See especially the "Guide" to "The Bible in the Building of Life," by Mildred A. Magnuson, a book intended for Junior Groups in Vacation and Weekday Church Schools; "The Prophets and the Problems of Life," by Sydney A. Weston, particularly his interpretations of Jonah; and above all, the twin volumes, "Beginnings of Life and Death," by Sophia L. Fahs and "Beginnings of Earth and Sky," by Sophia L. Fahs and Dorothy T. Spoerl, together with their "Guide."

⁸ Higher Criticism as distinguished from Lower, or Textual, Criticism, by an alleged scientific study of the origin, the dates, and the literary structure of the books of the Bible, operates with theories which tend to subvert the very foundations of belief in the Bible.

and not by direct fiat of God; unionism - the doctrine that denominational lines mean nothing and that Christianity is only one of the great and true religions of the world; anti-sectarianism - the doctrine that distinctive dogmas are without religious value and therefore should not be promulgated; and last of all - we have no name for it - the doctrine that you can have a religion without a creed.⁹

The conservative Christian will readily recognize these characteristics as the very credo and fides of American Protestant Liberalism, which stems from the eighteenth century Rationalism. More particularly, contemporary American Protestant Liberalism is the fruit of New England Theology popularized by Jonathan Edwards and fostered by William E. Channing, Theodore Parker, and Horace Bushnell. Today the adherents of this Liberalism are found more or less in every Protestant denomination in America, even though they diametrically oppose every fundamental doctrine of traditional Christianity. No wonder then that Fundamentalists of every denomination have denounced this religious Liberalism! No wonder that they look askance at the Weekday Church School, which seems to be the special ward of these Liberals. The only religious philosophy that would be in any way adequate to the Fundamentalists, would be one that could be called Christocentric in the fullest sense of that word. The exponents of such a theory would

⁹ To verify this, consult the literature in which the aims and purposes of the Weekday Church Schools are described.

be determined with the Apostle Paul: "Not to know anything..save Jesus Christ, and him crucified."¹⁰ They would confess with Paul: "I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ; for it is the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth."¹¹ They would declare to every child in the Weekday School, yea to the whole world, with Apostle Peter: "Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved."¹²

But the Fundamentalists are not the only ones that are dissatisfied with the religious philosophy connected with the Weekday School. Some leading Liberals have gone to such extremes in their divergence from the old faith, that a reaction has set in among their own associates. This has been christened "neoorthodoxy," for purportedly it demands a rapprochement with the old patterns of belief. Just how far the movement will go and what changes it will bring about in American Protestantism cannot be said as yet. But the neoorthodox position is well stated by Dr. H. Shelton Smith, thus: "Contemporary liberalism as a creed is basically outmoded, and must therefore be critically reconsidered and revised. This means, to be sure, that the theological roots of liberal Protestant nurture must also be re-examined and reconstructed."¹³ If that is true, then it would

¹⁰ 1 Cor. 1, 16.

¹¹ Rom. 1, 16.

¹² Acts 4, 12.

¹³ Op. cit., p. 32.

be both logical and practical that this reformation and reconstruction be effected at once also in the general religious philosophy and the textbooks of the Weekday Church School. Otherwise the thunderous words once hurled at the traditionally orthodox by John Dewey will apply to the traditionally liberal: "Nothing is gained by a deliberate effort to return to [An this case, retain] ideas which have become incredible, and to symbols which have been emptied of their content of obvious meaning."¹⁴

Summary

The Weekday Church Schools are schools set up by the churches singly or in cooperation, in which attending pupils are released or dismissed from their usual public school program, at the written request of their parents, to go to the church of their choice or some other building (or perhaps remain in the public school buildings) for religious instruction. In the last 23 years the movement has had tremendous growth and has spread to 38 States. It does not in any way violate the principle of "separation of church and state" since no public funds are used for it, neither is there any organic connection between it and the public schools. The freedom of religion is also observed, since no one is forced to attend the classes and no religious group is preferred or discriminated against. Many states have already legalized them and others contemplate doing so. About the only serious difficulty in their way in the liberal religious philosophy associated with them, which has never been accepted by the traditionally orthodox and has been renounced by many liberals themselves.

¹⁴ Dewey, op. cit., p. 75.

Chapter 5

COMMENTS AND CONCLUSIONS

Prove all things; hold fast that which is good.

1 Thessalonians 5, 21.

Chapter 5

COMMENTS AND CONCLUSIONS

From the preceding discussion it is clear that the relationship between religious education and the public schools is still problematical. The solution of the past, namely to have a purely secular curriculum in the public schools, is no longer considered as ideal as it was heretofore. A chorus of voices is asking that formal religious instruction be introduced into the public schools by means of the Weekday Church School. But good as this agency may be, it is not perfect. Therefore it cannot offer a perfect solution to our problem. And even if the Weekday Church Schools were perfect, the problem would be solved only in part. The reason for this is that the heart of religious education lies much deeper than is generally recognized. It is not enough just to add a religious course to the public school curriculum. Before any religious education, in public schools or out, can have a telling effect on our lamented moral chaos, not only the schools must act but also the churches and the homes. Only the combined forces of these three great institutions for moral control can produce a lasting effect.

What the Churches Can Do

That churches should be vitally concerned in religious education bears no denial. A church that does not educate is doomed. Unfortunately many churches seem to have forgotten their educational task. We have churches that act as if our national salvation hinged on the return of prohibition. They fail to see that drunkenness is only one of the vices that must be eradicated and that the means for that is education and regeneration and not legislation. Others seem interested only in peace terms and representation of the church at the peace table. But the task of the church is not to sit in judgment on the affairs of the nations, but to seek the regeneration of individual hearts. Once that is accomplished a just peace will be a natural by-product, or, to use a more theological term, the natural fruit of faith.

And what better means do the churches have for achieving their goal than their own parochial schools? If the churchmen really believe that the only way religion can be successfully taught is by intergration of the whole curriculum, as is often claimed, then parochial schools are the ideal type. There religion can be made a prime subject. There the teachers with particular qualifications can be selected. There the day can be started "In the name of the Lord," continued in that spirit, and closed in that spirit. All this can be done without fear or favor, according to the best dictates of one's conscience. It is enigmatic then to find that only a few church leaders favor these schools. Some are even against them.

Mr. Culver approves the move led by the Presbyterian to abandon parochial schools: "Proposals made by some Protestants to establish parochial schools were wisely abandoned."¹ Dr. Bower, brings out the fact that parochial schools involve double expense for school purposes and then continues: "Whatever other limitations the parochial system may have - and they are many - it can scarcely be said to fit into a democratic society."² Dr. Verkuyl puts it even more strongly: "The parochial system is not in agreement with the genius of America; neither with the Christian genius of brotherhood."³

In many communities, where there are only weak and small churches, a good, adequate, thoroughly furnished parochial school is out of question. But that should not mean that religious education is out of question. It is our conviction backed by several years of experience that free time and vacation time can be used by churches much more than it is. Does anybody really believe that the mental capacities of children will be overburdened by attendance at a church school on Saturday, during the summer vacation, and even after regular school hours? If religious education is as important to the churches as we are often led to believe then the churches surely ought to use every opportunity to furnish it to growing youth. To demand that the public schools carry the whole burden would have to be branded as the shirking of the church's duty.

¹ Culver, Raymond B., op. cit., p. 220.

² Bower, William Clayton, op. cit., p. 105.

³ Verkuyl, Gerrit, op. cit., p. 61.

What the Home Can do

The home without a doubt is a major influence in the lives of our children. What the parents think, say and do, will naturally effect the behaviour of their children. And the trouble is that many parents live without God and bring up their children in the same spirit. Yes, some even teach them their own vices from their very youth. J. Edgar Hoover, the Chief of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, has time and time again placed the blame for much of our present juvenile delinquency on the parents. He has said specifically that many of the delinquents come from homes in which God and religion are seldom if ever mentioned. Other investigators corroborate Mr. Hoover.

If it is true that many of our adolescents have no moral standards and principles, the parents should be the first concerned. If they would impart these standards to their children in the home, a marked improvement would certainly be made in the whole field of behaviour. This improvement would be all the greater if the parents would cooperate with the Church which has been the traditional institution for moral control.

It would seem then that before we can have religious children, we must have religious parents and religious homes. That we have many thousands of them, is undoubtedly true. That many more thousands, while not particularly religious, are good and moral, is also true. Truer still is the great need for real homes and real parents - parents that care, parents that will do the best they can for their children. To the writer that means Christian parents, Christian children, Christian homes.

What the Public Schools Can Do

Since the public schools play such a prominent part in the lives of our children, they cannot be left out of this discussion. The attitude of the public schools toward religion and morals is bound to have a profound effect upon the children who attend them. Traditionally this attitude should be one of strict neutrality. Unfortunately this has not always been the case. As has been already pointed out, anti-Christian tendencies have been observed in some public schools and this has given all of them a bad reputation. The following suggestions would be of great help if they were adopted by all public school authorities:

1. No overt anti-religious propaganda should be permitted in any public school classroom. All too often teachers have taken advantage of their superior position and have mocked the faith of their pupils, declared the Bible untrue, jibed at the dogmas of the churches. All this has been done and no doubt still is being done in the name of academic freedom. It should be remembered that the pupils have the same freedom. If Christ is not to be confessed in the public schools, neither should he be denied and mocked!

2. Along with the overt anti-religious propaganda also the more subtle should be ruled out. This would mean a general reexamination of the textbooks and library books, many of which contain denials of the most fundamental Christian concepts. All too often these denials are made in the name of science. But a closer scrutiny of this "science" soon reveals that it is nothing more than unsubstantiated theorizing and pure guesswork. This

is especially true in the field of origins, metaphysics and the like. If the school books cannot contain the Christian philosophy on these matters, they certainly should not contain the anti-Christian one.

3. The popular theory of education generally in vogue should be carefully revised. In its popular form this theory seeks to meet all the essential needs of the pupil, to develop his whole personality, and give him an adequate philosophy of life. And it attempts all this without even mentioning religion! In fact it follows Mr. Dewey to the very extreme position and calls itself religious!⁴ No sincere Christian can possibly accept such a theory, neither can he have his children educated under its influence without a protest.

The suggestions enumerated above are in the main of negative nature.

A few positive ones might be added:

1. The attitude of the public school teachers and officials toward the Church and religion should be sympathetic. They should recognize the limitations under which the public schools must function and freely advise their pupils not to neglect the religious values usually associated with the organized churches.

2. The public schools should strive to create in the hearts and minds of the pupils greater respect for law and order than has been the case heretofore. In our civilization we have specific laws governing our relations to our fellow-citizens. No public school pupil should be left without a thorough conception that it is wrong and contrary to the law of the land

⁴ Smith, H. Shelton, *op. cit.*, pp. 173-202

to rob and steal, assault and kill, lie and deceive. They will not have such a conception unless they are taught these things repeatedly and dogmatically.

The questions of formal religious education in the public schools by means of the Weekday Church School cannot be decided definitely as yet. The movement is too recent for proper perspective and evaluation. If our moral disorganization, especially among the young, is as bad as some think it is, it might not hurt anything to try the arrangement on a trial basis at least. Should it prove satisfactory, then it can easily be made permanent.

Summary

The relationship between religious education and the public schools remains an unsolved problem. To a large extent the problem will remain unsolved even if religious courses are introduced into the public school curriculum, for no single agency can cope with the whole problem. For any telling effect the church, the home and the public school must combine their efforts to stem the present tide of moral disorganization. Where authorities see their way clear, they might give the Weekday Church School a fair trial.

RECAPITULATION

1. Education in the United States has passed through two distinct phases. Schools in the colonial period were under the control of the various churches and religious instruction was one of the chief functions. Later education came under the control of the state. With that transition the secularized curriculum in the schools came into favor, which meant that no provisions were made for the formal instruction of public school pupils in religion.

2. Our modern education is being severely criticized by many persons despite its vaunted excellence. The criticism is twofold, that our schools fail to educate and that they are godless in effect.

3. Although we still have agencies for Christian education such as the parochial schools, the Sunday Schools, etc., many feel that the public schools could assist in formally imparting religious principles to the younger generation without violating the principle of separation of church and state.

4. The agency which is looked upon as the best for the purpose of once more associating religious instruction with the public schools, is the Week-day Church School. That many regard this agency as satisfactory cannot be

doubted when we note its tremendous growth in recent years. Unfortunately the Weekday Church School has some inherent weaknesses which will prevent its speedy adoption and general endorsement, especially in the more conservative circles.

5. The problem of religious education is so deep and its relationship to the public schools so involved that no satisfactory solution has yet emerged. At least three established institutions are vitally concerned in it: the church, the home, and the school. Each should do its part conscientiously with due respect for the work of the other two.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

General

The Holy Bible, King James "Authorized version. Concordia Publishing
ing House, St. Louis, Mo.

Encyclopedia of Social Sciences

World's Best Quotations, Western Printing and Lithographing Co.

Books

Athearn, Walter Scott; Character Building in a Democracy. The
Macmillan Co. New York, N. Y. 1925

Betts, George Herbert; How To Teach Religion. The Abington Press,
New York, N. Y. 1910

Beman, L. T.; Compiler, The Reference Shelf Vol. IV No. 2.
Religious Teaching in the Public Schools. H. W. Wilson Co. N. Y.
1927

Bower, William Clayton; Christ and Christian Education. Abington-
Cokesbury Press, New York, N. Y. 1943

Culver, Raymond B.; Horace Mann and Religion in the Massachusetts
Public Schools. Yale University Press, New Haven, Conn. 1929

De Blois, Austen Kennedy and Gorham, Donald R.; Christian Religious
Education: Principles and Practice. Fleming H. Revell Co.
New York, N. Y. 1939

Dewey, John; Education Today. G. P. Putman's Sons, New York, N. Y.
1942

Ferre, Nels F. S.; Return to Christianity. Harper & Brothers,
New York. N. Y. 1943

Books (Continued)

Fergusson, E. Morris: Historic Chapters in Christian Education in America. Fleming H. Revell Co. New York, N. Y. 1935

Frost, B. E. Jr.: The Basic Teachings of the Great Philosophers. The New Home Library, New York, N. Y. 1942

Kretzmann, Paul E.: The Teaching of Religion. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 1934

_____ : A Brief History of Education. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

_____ : The Religion of the Child. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 1929

Lewis, C. S.: Christian Behaviour. The Macmillan Co., New York, N. Y. 1943

Link, Henry C.: The Return to Religion. The Macmillan Co., New York, N. Y. 1936

Myers, Gustaves: History of Bigotry in the United States. Random House, N. Y. 1943

Price, J. M., Chapman, James H., Tibbs, A. E., Carpenter, L. L.: A Survey of Religious Education. The Ronald Press Company, New York, N. Y. 1940

Roucek, Joseph S. and Associates: Sociological Foundations of Education. Thomas Y. Crowell Co. New York, N. Y. 1942

Sheatsley, Jacob: The Bible in Religious Education. The Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus, Ohio.

Smith, H. Shelton: Faith and Nurture. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, N. Y. 1941

Verkuyl, Gerrit: Christ in American Education. Fleming H. Revell Co., New York, N. Y. 1934

Zollmann, Carl: American Church Law. West Publishing Co. St. Paul, Minn. 1933

Pamphlets

Brumm, Arthur: The Church and the Christian Education of Children. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

Gilbert, Dan: The Fifth Column in Our Schools. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. 1941

Tanner, Jacob: Ten Studies on the Child. Augsburg Publishing House, Minneapolis, Minn. 1941

Zollmann, Carl: Church and School in the American Law. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 1918

Selecting and Using Curriculum Materials in the Weekday Church School. The International Council of Religious Education, 203, No. Wabash St. Chicago, Ill. 1940

The Weekday Church School. The International Council of Religious Education, 203 N. Wabash St. Chicago, Ill. 1940

United States Government Reports

Davis, Mary Dabney: Weekday Classes in Religious Education. Bulletin 1941, No. 3. U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C.

Keesecker, Ward W.: Laws Relating to the Releasing of Pupils from Public Schools for Religious Education. Pamphlet No. 39. U. S. Office of Education 1933

Murphy, T. F.: Lutherans. Census of Religious Bodies 1936. U. S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

Textbooks for Religious Education

Carrier, Blanche and Clowes, Amy: Building a Christian Character. Pupil's Book. Harper & Brothers Publishers, New York, N. Y. 1928

Fahs, Sophia L.: Beginnings of Earth and Sky. The Beacon Press, Inc. Boston, Mass. 1937

_____ and Spoerl, Dorothy T.: Beginnings of Life and Death. The Beacon Press, Inc., Boston, Mass. 1938

Textbooks for Religious Education (Continued)

- _____ and Tenny, Mildred T. A Guide Book for Beginnings of Earth and Sky. The Beacon Press, Inc. Boston, Mass. 1938
- Hayward, Percy R. and Myrtle H.: Achieving a Christian Home Today. Abington-Cokesbury Press, New York, N. Y. 1935
- Keiser, Armilda Broms: Learning from Jesus. The Pilgrim Press, Boston, Mass. 1943
- Magnuson, Mildred A.: The Bible in the Building of Life. Teacher's Book and Pupil's Book. Abington-Cokesbury Press, New York, N. Y. 1943 I and II.
- Moles, Eleanor: Exploring the Bible with Juniors. The Methodist Publishing House, Richmond, Va. 1934
- Slattery, Margaret: The Christian Church. The Pilgrim Press, Boston, Mass. 1935
- Smith, Roy L.: How Your Bible Grew Up. Abington-Cokesbury Press, New York, N. Y. 1943
- Weston, Sydney A.: Jesus and the Problems of Life. The Pilgrim Press, Boston, Mass. 1942
- _____: The Prophets and the Problems of Life. The Pilgrim Press, Boston, Mass. 1943

Magazines

- The American Lutheran, Vol. XXVI, No. 9. September 1943. Lutheran Press, 1819 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
- The Christian Century, Vol. LX, No. 45, Nov. 10, 1943. The Christian Century Press, 407 So. Dearborn St. Chicago, Ill.
- _____. Vol. LXI, No. 6. Feb. 9, 1944. The Christian Century Press, 407 So. Dearborn St. Chicago, Ill.

International Journal of Religious Education

Vol. 18 No. 1 Sept. 1941

_____ No. 2 Oct. 1941

_____ No. 3 Nov. 1941

_____ No. 4 Dec. 1941 The International Council of Religious
Education 203 No. Wabash Ave. Chicago, Ill.

Religious Education: Vol. XXXVI, No. 4, Oct. - Dec. 1941; Vol.
XXXVII, No. 1, Jan. - Feb. 1942; Vol. XXXVII, No. 6, Nov. - Dec.
1942. The Religious Education Association 1501 W. Washington
St., Mendota, Ill.

Other Material

Descriptive and promotional literature was furnished by the following:

Information Service, Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in
America

Indiana Council of Religious Education

International Council of Religious Education

Massachusetts Council of Religious Education

Southern California Council of Religious Education

Virginia Council of Religious Education

VITA

I was born on March 3, 1912, in the village of Lalit, Yugoslavia. At the age of two weeks my father left for America, the Land of Opportunity. Before mother and I could follow the World War I began. When I was six years old I entered the village Lutheran School. The teacher was crippled and so escaped military service. He did teach us how to read, write and do a few simple arithmetical computations. We used the Slovak language.

Mother and I arrived in America on September 14, 1920. Two weeks later I entered the first grade of the Kent School in Akron, Ohio. Two years later I entered the fourth grade of the Zion Lutheran School in Akron, Ohio.

In September 1926, I began studies in the Academy of Concordia Junior College, Ft. Wayne, Indiana and was graduated six years later from the College department. In September 1932, I entered Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Mo. (Lutheran).

In June 1934, I served as supply pastor in Immanuel Slovak Lutheran Church, Youngstown, Ohio, and taught the church school during the summer and on Saturdays.

In June, 1936, I received the ministerial diploma from Concordia Seminary and accepted the call to Youngstown, Ohio. Ordination into the Lutheran Church ministry took place August 2, 1936. While ministering to the congregation I taught in the church school and for one year in the Weekday Church School of the Chaney High School in Youngstown.

On January 27, 1942, I married my wife, Elizabeth. A few days later I accepted the call to St. Paul's Slovak Lutheran Church in Prince George, Va. Here too church duties were combined with teaching the children on Saturday and during the summer vacation.

In June, 1943, I matriculated in the University of Richmond, and began work for the Master's degree.