



THE
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

No. 37.—January, 1889.

I.

THE CALL TO THE MINISTRY.

THERE are some special reasons which urge this subject upon our attention.

First. There is an attempt in some directions to lower the choice of the Ministry to the same level with that of any other profession or avocation in life. It is claimed that men are called to the Ministry in the same way in which they are called to be Farmers, Merchants, Lawyers, or Physicians. The question would then be one simply of expediency and aptitude. The conditions of the choice would be the tastes and preferences of each individual, together with his talents and qualifications and such outward indications of Providence as seemed more favorable to the Ministry than to any other occupation.

This theory overlooks the *Divine character* of the Ministerial office. The Minister is no longer a *Mediatorial gift* to the Church.

It ignores also the immediate Headship of Jesus Christ over his Church. He no longer can say to Ministers, "Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you."

It sets aside also the *Divine Call* of the Spirit. It is no longer "the Holy Ghost who" makes them overseers of the flock.

A *second* reason which urges this subject upon our attention is the fact that while some go to the extreme which I have just mentioned and deny the necessity of the Spirit's call, there are others who fly to the opposite extreme, and so emphasize the internal call of the Spirit as to render appointment to office or ordination or any authentication by the Church entirely unnecessary. Upon this theory any man who can persuade himself that he is called by the

III.

ARE OUR PUBLIC SCHOOLS GODLESS?

I. Not by their origin.

Nothing is more common than to hear appeals to patriotic pride in defence of the "American" System of public schools. What is the "American" System? If one wishes to speak of the American principles of government he goes back to the Constitution, from which all later legislation derives its authority and force. That is not American but un-American which perverts the principles of our fundamental compact. Mormonism exists in America, and so does heathenism; in Utah we have a hierarchical despotism, and in Alaska tribal chaos; but neither becomes American by simply existing in America. Is the conduct of the public school put beyond all pale of criticism simply because it is found in America? Just now, they tell us, men are busy in New York erecting a new building for the use and occupancy of one of our great dailies. We learn that workmen by supplying a brace here and a pillar there are gradually carrying away every stone, beam, and brick of the original building and supplying from a wholly different quarry and forest and kiln the materials out of which the new edifice is to be erected. There is no cessation of the activities that are going on within—editors, pressmen, and compositors are yet busy at their various tasks; but little by little new ceilings cover them, new floors are slid in beneath them, and new walls enclose them. He must be a very susceptible soul who, having spent his youth in the old block, shall come back in later years to weep over the changed threshold of the reconstructed edifice.

What is the "American" System which we are under obligation as patriots to defend? One thing is certain—it is not a godless school. If it has become godless, or even agnostic, or simply deistic, it is not the school which can carry with it any reverence of hallowed or patriotic associations. The American school of our fathers, of our own youthful days, was in its aims, exercises, and text-books a Christian school. One may defend schools "colorless" as to religion upon what grounds he may choose other than this, they are *not* in any historic sense the "American" Public School.

“The motive which urged our fathers to the establishment of schools was professedly drawn from religion; the motive which impels us to-day is professedly drawn from politics.” So says Mr. Horace Scudder in the August *Atlantic*; and no one at all conversant with American history may contradict him. The American System of public education, in any historic meaning of the words, is so far from being godless that it is pre-eminently and thoroughly Christian. If godless schools exist anywhere in America to-day they are no more American than Mormonism—less American than Mormonism, for that had its birth here, and the “colorless” school is an importation, wholly foreign to the principles, purposes, aims, and practices of our fathers. A godless school is even less entitled to our patriotic veneration than a Canada thistle.

Not long since the Commencement exercises of the High School in one of our inland cities were prefaced with prayer and closed with a benediction, as in the days of our fathers pretty nearly every public assembly of citizens was; but forthwith two papers published in the vicinity issued formal protests against identifying a public function with religious acts. Significantly each protest was printed in a foreign language: one in an infidel journal, the other in a Romanist organ. Some of us who were born in this country, and of Pilgrim and Puritan stock, do not go to new-comers to learn our national principles. It is quite useless to take any freshly imported idol, and setting it in an improvised shrine, command our prostration before it. Such a trick is as transparent as that of the apostates of Aaron’s day, who mounted the golden calf upon its pedestal and cried, “These be thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt.” Whatever may be the advantages of schools that ignore Christianity, we certainly do not owe to them any debt of gratitude for liberties won before they were fashioned of men’s hands.

“Historically,” says Buisson in the *Dictionnaire de Pedagogie*, “the school has been in all countries the daughter of the Church.” Pre-eminently is this true of America. Beginning, as our system does, with that first educational legislation of the Massachusetts colony in 1647, ordering that “every township in this jurisdiction, after y^e Lord hath increased y^m to y^e number of 50 householders, shall then forthwith appoint one in y^e towne to teach all such children as shall resort to him,” and providing a system of support by public taxation; no one ever heard of the demand that the school should be other than religious in its aim and Christian in its spirit until Bishop Hughes* in 1840 demanded a change in the policy of

* *Christianity in America*, Dr. Dorchester, p. 552.

the system. For close upon two centuries the American Public School had known a consistent and homogenous development ; and during all that time no one ever dreamed, much less asserted, that a godless school was the logical outcome of a Christian free State.

If there is any one man who by a life of self-sacrificing service may be justly called "the father of the Common School," that man was Horace Mann ;* and so far was he from regarding that system as necessarily colorless that when some one told him an attempt was being made to reject the Bible from the schools of Massachusetts he promptly replied, "Never, so long as there remains enough of Plymouth Rock to make a gun-flint of." Judging by the size and the spirit of the meetings lately held in Faneuil Hall, there remains something of that historic rock yet.

It has happened to the writer of this article to be preparing during the past year a history of the Presbyteries which covered the northern part of the State of Illinois in the early days of its political existence, and he finds among the records of its first ecclesiastical organizations appointments of "standing committees" whose duty it shall be "by all legitimate means to further the organization of school districts and the establishment of a system of free education." While the Indian trails were still deeply marked in her prairies, while the buffalo skulls still gleamed white in the grass of her sloughs, the Christian settlers of the State, bringing with them the principles which had governed and controlled the public policy of their fathers, founded their churches and their schools with almost equal zeal. If our public schools are godless to-day they have ceased to be what they were in the purposes and aims of their founders. For over two centuries, of the little more than two and a half centuries of our American life, our public schools were distinctively and intentionally Christian.

II. Not by any constitutional or statutory requirement.

There is more nonsense, ignorance, and demagogism talked about "liberty of conscience" than upon any other theme connected with our national affairs. For the most part the gentlemen who were born in Ireland and educated at Rome, or born in Germany and educated in France, have given to this historic phrase an unhistoric meaning. Few better illustrations may be found of how easy it is to "construe things clear from the purpose of the things themselves," than in the assumptions founded upon the meaning of "liberty of conscience." A little plain common sense is of the utmost value here.

"Liberty of conscience," says the Great Commoner of England,

* See Mr. Mann's Reports, pp. 710-15, On Religious Education.

“is simply the right to believe according to one’s own conviction, and to worship according to that belief.” There is more of truth, historic and legal, in that one sentence than in whole volumes which have been written upon “The School Question.”

“To train the child in reading, writing, arithmetic, and the rudiments of science, is, and from the nature of their organization can be, the only end aimed at in the public schools.” So says the Rt. Rev. Richard Gilmour,* Roman Catholic Bishop of Cleveland. How does he know that?

Let us turn to the Constitution of the United States, the source and spring of all our political and civil institutions. Put your finger upon a single phrase which indicates that it is “unconstitutional” to teach a child by any public act to recognize God. “It is well known, as a matter of history, that long after the Constitution went into operation the power of taxation for the support of religion in the Protestant form was *actually exercised* in some of the States. That power still exists, and might be exercised by any State to any extent, and in favor of Christianity or any other religious system.” † As Bishop Gilmour is writing of the whole public-school system, and not of that of any one State, he can only affirm this as true by the “nature” of the national Constitution; and he can only affirm that by wilful perversion of facts, or by what his own Church is pleased to call “invincible ignorance.”

Yet the scene is presented to us of a regent of the University of Wisconsin, upon the platform of one of its normal schools, publicly protesting against the prayer with which the commencement exercises were introduced, upon the ground that “the moment a teacher in his capacity as such begins to exercise any religious function whatever, *to exert any religious influence* upon the minds of those under his instruction, that moment he infringes upon the reserved rights of the people.” ‡ It is a pity that gentleman had not been present to answer Benjamin Franklin when he made his celebrated motion for the opening of the daily sessions of Congress with prayer! But the *Popular Science Monthly*, which heads this attempt to banish the worship of God from the public school and the name of God from the text-books, asks (by one of its contributors), “What more dishonest and unworthy method of pre-empting and prejudicing the minds of the young could possibly be devised than that of school worship?” And, adds the same writer, “The one thing in connection with religion in the schools which is most indefensible of all is

* Catholic National Series, Fifth Reader, Preface.

† Religion and the State, p. 225.

‡ *Popular Science Monthly*, vol. xxx., p. 356.

worship." We are reminded by such affirmations of the pertinent question of Dr. Woolsey, "Why permit evolution to be publicly professed more than predestination?" * So it has come to this, that a citizen by accepting some petty place under the public service is forbidden to do anything publicly which shall even "exert a religious influence" upon those brought into contact with him. This is the new theory of our principles of government which confronts us, that that religion which is embodied in text or preamble of nearly every Constitution of the States of the Union may not be "constitutionally" presented even as an "influence" in any public function in those States!

It is probable that few persons know how freely and devoutly the being and providence of God are confessed in the fundamental law of the States where we are told it infringes upon the "reserved rights of the people" to offer prayer in their presence. Did the regent above quoted ever read the Constitution of his own State to see what were the rights reserved to him? It declares that "the right of every man to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience shall *never be infringed.*" Is it upon this that he bases his theory that he has a right to forbid a school-teacher of that State to ask God's blessing, publicly, upon his public acts? Does this provision of the Constitution which guarantees his right to worship God exclude him from even exercising "a religious influence upon the minds of those brought under his control"? †

In the State of Illinois, to take for an example a State whose Constitution is undoubtedly representative, the preamble to that fundamental compact begins with praise "to Almighty God for the civil, political, and religious liberty which He hath so long permitted us to enjoy," and concludes with a prayer that He will bestow that "blessing which will enable us to transmit the same to succeeding generations." And yet in this State also it is supposed to be "unconstitutional" to do in a district school what is done in the very Constitution of the State itself!

Illinois has adopted, as have some other States, what is perhaps

* Political Science, vol. II., p. 408.

† Since this article was put into the hands of the printer, in the courts of this same State of Wisconsin, a case in which suit was brought by Catholic taxpayers to prevent the reading of King James' version of the Bible in the public schools was decided November 19. Judge Bennett held that such reading was not sectarian instruction, the children of the petitioners not being obliged to listen if they did not desire, and the Bible having been decided upon by the authorities as one of the text-books for Wisconsin schools. There was nothing, however, to prevent the children from reading a version of the Bible accepted by the Catholic Church, if they preferred.

the most stringent restriction upon the matter of grants to denominational schools, and it is this : *

“ Neither the general assembly, nor any county, city, town, or township, school district or other public corporation, shall ever make any appropriation, or pay from any public fund whatever, anything in aid of any church or sectarian purpose, or to help support or sustain any school, academy, seminary, college, or university, or other literary or scientific institution, controlled by any church or sectarian denomination whatever.”

Twice in this State has the attempt since been made to identify our common Christianity with a “ sect,” and twice has it failed. The “ reserved rights of the people” are to pray, not to prevent others from praying simply because they have accepted public functions under the State. Once was suit brought against the officers of a school district where religious exercises were maintained, and by the courts it was held that the officers of the school had full constitutional authority for their action.† The second case was a most important one of reference from the State University of Champaign to the Attorney-General of the State, and the decision must be good reading for men who think the “ reserved right” to pray means the right to forbid somebody else praying. In this case a certain adult pupil of the University, Mr. Christopher North, had refused to attend the religious exercises with which the University’s daily sessions were opened ; and when excused from the same, refused to attend any of the recitations of the University until the religious exercises should be discontinued. He was for this suspended. The action of the Faculty being called in question by certain of the regents—Mr. North demanding the right to be examined and to receive a diploma notwithstanding his suspension—the case was submitted to the chief legal officer of the State for his decision.

“ Stripped of all disguises,” says the Attorney-General,‡ “ what is the real purpose of Mr. North in thus refusing to conform to the usages of the University, and his subsequent proceedings ?

“ *It is not the defence of his rights.* It is not the protection of his conscience. His avowed and only purpose is to overthrow, not the requirement to attend, but the exercise itself. It is not simply to compel the Faculty to say that students may attend the religious services or not as they may see fit, and to be present or absent as caprice or whim may dictate. It is to compel the Faculty to abolish

* Constitution of State of Illinois, Art. VIII., § 3.

† Common School Decisions, Bateman-Pillsbury, p. 126.

‡ Report of the University of Illinois, 1886, p. 69.

the exercise altogether, to the end that no Scripture may be read and no prayer offered within the buildings provided by the State for the University of Illinois. It is not to relieve his conscience from coercion; it is to coerce the consciences of all the God-fearing and Christian men and women who may in any way be connected with the University as officers or students.

“That the people of the State ever dreamed that as the outcome of a misinterpreted constitutional provision Christianity, the God of Heaven and Earth, and the Bible as His written Word could be ruled out of its State University so that it should be unlawful to read the Scriptures or pray to Him within its walls, is a conclusion too monstrous to be entertained.”

This decision, given in 1885, is in complete harmony with the affirmation of the only recognized authority in the courts of the State, which says,* “The Constitution of the State neither requires nor forbids the reading of the Bible, or prayer, or any other form of religious or devotional exercise in schools, and the school laws are entirely silent on the subject. Hence, while it is most fit and commendable for a teacher to open his school by devoutly reading a brief portion of the Sacred Scriptures, and by humbly seeking the blessing of God in a few words of prayer, for declining to do so, he could not be discharged. If, on the other hand, a teacher feels it to be his duty to read from the Bible, or offer prayer, at the opening of his school, it is his privilege to do so—it is a sacred personal right of which he cannot be deprived.”

This is a theory of “reserved rights” differing *toto cælo* from that of the Infidel and the Romanist; but it is one entirely in harmony with the history of our liberties and of the schools themselves.

Yet once again the question must be answered, for we have not yet inquired into the actual practice of the schools.

III. “*The last parley is now in progress*,” says Professor William H. Payne,† of the University of Michigan, “*before the final surrender*.” To tell the truth, as one surveys the field it looks very much like it.

Two years ago the writer of this article published certain facts in *The Christian at Work*, which called forth from Dr. A. A. Hodge ‡ the last contribution to the press he ever penned. Since that time he has been in active correspondence with ministers, teachers, and school officers in all parts of the State of Illinois, and the writer is more deeply than ever impressed by the feeling that Dr. Hodge did

* Common School Decisions, Bateman-Pillsbury, 1887, p. 127.

† Contributions to The Science of Education, p. 204.

‡ Religion in the Public Schools, *The New Princeton*, vol. iii., p. 28.

not over-state the truth when, referring to what had been published, he said, "Under these problems there lurks the most tremendous and most imminent danger to which the interests of our people will ever be exposed, in comparison with which the issues of slavery and intemperance sink into insignificance."

Taking this State, in the centre of our republic, with its mixed population, as an exponent of what is being done in the States north, we find that the State has practically driven out competition in all grades of education below the collegiate. There are enrolled in the various public schools of this one State * over 743,000 pupils. Forty years ago private and denominational academies were planted in all its thriving new communities. One by one the public system has forced these into an almost universal bankruptcy. In three neighboring cities of our immediate vicinity stand their abandoned buildings. The State which declines to interfere with the "vested interests" of telephones, and telegraphs, and railroads, feels no such compunction in crushing out the life of Christian schools.† What chance to live has "private competition" when brought into conflict with a system that can expend in a single year in a single State over \$10,000,000, and whose "plant" in one State alone is estimated at upward of \$23,000,000?

And what *is* this system whose Christian origin we have traced and whose legal status and rights we have exhibited—what is it giving us for the training of 743,000 children in the things that shall fit them for their earthly and heavenly citizenship?

We have upon our table written returns from all the principal cities, towns, villages, and corporate communities of the State, showing a total enrolment in the public schools, in these centres of population, of 203,303 pupils; and of these 119,842 are returned as attending schools where there are no religious exercises whatever—Christian, Jewish, or Pagan! Particular attention is asked to the

* Report of Commissioner of Education, 1885-86.

† As illustrative of the spirit in which many defenders of an education "purely secular" regard the institutions planted and honored by our fathers, the writer of this calls attention to the article in the last number of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, American edition (vol. xxiii.), p. 952, entitled "Universities and Colleges in the United States." Speaking of the multiplication of institutions of learning in the United States by religious denominations, the writer, Mr. D. O. Kellogg, says: "Scores will die from atrophy, while other scores will remain as denominational seminaries for those whose faith it is not desirable to expose to contact with critical learning" (p. 958). The writer of that article evidently considers it one of the functions of the secular education to annihilate the faith of its pupils. This may explain the grounds upon which three Western State Universities within the last three years have forced the resignation of their respective presidents, three of the most honored Christian educators in America.

accompanying table, which presents at a *coup d'œil* these and related facts :

Whole number of pupils in public schools of Illinois	743,000
Whole number in cities, towns, and villages reporting	203,303
Number reported in schools where there is reading of the Bible and extempore prayer	30,217
Reading of the Bible and the Lord's prayer.....:....	39,950
Reading of the Bible without prayer.....	13,294
<i>Neither reading of the Bible nor prayer.....</i>	119,842

It will thus be seen that in the entire enrolment of 105 incorporated communities of the State, more than 119,800 are deprived of the hallowing influences of worship *without one shadow of legal necessity, and contrary to the historic purposes and aims of the system itself*. Such a condition of educational institutions, out of harmony with our history, our customs, our written constitutions, and the spirit of our laws, could only be brought about by the apathy of those who, as parents and tax-payers, are most deeply interested in its outcome. It is not in accordance with the wishes of the teachers themselves, for in each of the late assemblies of the National Association of Teachers, high grounds have uniformly been taken as to the duty of embracing moral and Christian aims in the whole conduct of the schools ; and of the 105 cities and towns reporting to the writer, only 4 are reported as supporting schools not manned by Christian instructors. Nor does it come from the demands of the Catholic laity, for 30 cities report Catholic teachers at the head of various departments, and of these 25 report that such Catholic teachers join without hesitation or protest in the simple Christian exercises that are held.

There is no escape from the conviction that a handful of ecclesiastics, mostly aliens by birth, and propagandists of infidelity, nine tenths of them imported, have simply terrorized these native Christian communities into an acquiescence in *a state of things which threatens the continuance of the system itself*.

But if such is the case with the devotions of the schools, how does it stand in the matter of their text-books ?

It is not to be expected by any one who has studied the spirit lying beneath all these changes that this "sop to the whale" will satisfy either imported infidels or Romish Bishops. Writers in both the *Popular Science Monthly* and the *Forum* tell us plainly that they "will never rest until the last vestige of religion is driven from the public school." School officers who are thinking to soothe the tiger by compromises have learned little of the hatred which both these classes bear to evangelical Christianity. Directors who think

to compromise by selecting a few passages from the Bible which lend themselves easily to the purposes of a ritual, and who cut down the free exercise of devotion to the mere repetition of a form of petition, however sacred in itself, would do well to turn their attention to the books which are rapidly supplanting the text-books used when the public-school system was in harmony with its origin and the religious convictions of its supporters.

Among the founders of our public-school system, Benjamin Rush, and Fisher Ames, and Thomas Scott Grimke, and Horace Mann * contended for the daily use of the Bible as either a book of devotions or, in addition thereto, as the common reading-book of the school. This same proposition is revived in the September number of the *Century* by one of our popular literati. Now let us see what sort of reading books have been discarded and what are to-day retained.

At the close of the American Revolution the reading-book in almost universal use was the Columbian Orator. We have a copy with the date of 1797. From our shelves we take down the various reading books which have been popular and those which we find in most common use in the public schools of to-day, and compare them, with the following result :

Readers.	Date.	Per cent of religious selections.
Columbian Orator.....	1797	.29
Murray's Sequel.....	1817	.33
New English Reader.....	1830	.18
National Reader.....	1836	.15
Sanders' Union Reader.....	1863	.18
McGuffie's.....	1866	.22
Educational Reader.....	1873	.14
Appleton's Reader (4th and 5th).....	1876	.08
McGuffie's Revised.....	1879	.10
Sheldon's (4th).....	1882	.03
Standard.....	1883	.07
Swinton's (4th).....	1883	.06
Barnes' (4th and 5th).....	1884	.02

No one can look upon such a table as that without knowing why Professor Payne says that the Church, "by which we mean," he says, "the organized aggregate of religious influences in a community," is "engaged in the last parley before the final surrender."

But if the showing by percentages is "too fairly writ for so foul effect," the drift is still more clearly seen when we come to sift over the matter which is still retained in our count as "religious." In the case of the one series, used to the almost complete exclusion of

* State, Church, and School, Professor C. H. L. Schuette, p. 340.

all others in this State, scarcely anything that can be called religious is retained except certain extracts from the Psalms and Sermon on the Mount,* sandwiched in between writers such as Victor Hugo and Ralph Waldo Emerson ; while in another series the only selections which even "in the judgment of charity" can be called religious are taken from the writings of three Unitarian ministers! Thus to escape the reproach of "religion" the editor has fallen into the ditch of "sectarianism."

It is not to be forgotten that the tone of a school is governed by the character of its "Readers" more than by the matter contained in any other text-book. It is from the Readers that the child derives its impression of the life and genius of the people of which it forms a part. Mr. Horace Scudder † truly says that "the place of literature in our public-school education is in spiritualizing life, letting light into the mind, inspiring and feeding the higher forces of human nature. In this view a reading-book becomes vastly more than a mere drill book in elocution. The standard which we set in the reading-book will inevitably affect the pupil's choice of reading out of school ; the conceptions which the child forms of literature and the ideal life will be noble or ignoble according as we use our opportunities. It is for us to say whether the American child shall be brought up to have its rightful share in the great inheritance of America." Thus do we find, from a purely literary point of view, reaffirmed what one of the Synods ‡ of our Church asserted last year, that "under the cry of a school 'colorless' as to religion, our publishers had succeeded in giving us books from which are necessarily excluded those essays, addresses, poems, and orations in which the minds of American scholars have expressed their profoundest convictions in their most glowing words."

But the further we push our investigations the more are we reminded how quietly and persistently and treacherously the work is going on of reducing our public-school system to an atheistic basis.

During the past year the writer has taken notes of all the more

* The compilers of our school Readers have gone further than to lower reverence for the Word of God by placing it upon the level of secular literature ; they pare and trim their very extracts from the Bible to suit themselves. After the writer of this article had presented the above table in a meeting of ministers, the facts asserted were called in question. "Let us test the matter," said the one who was acting as host, "by the books nearest at hand. Here is the Reader used by my little girl in the public school." Taking up the same, the first religious selection which the father found was what purported to be the fifth commandment, with the very name of God carefully expurgated from the Table of the Law !

† *Atlantic Monthly*, August, 1888, Literature in the Public Schools, Horace Scudder.

‡ Minutes of the Synod of Illinois, 1887, p. 36.

prominent text-books used in the schools of his own State, books which are popularly used elsewhere. Largely for the purpose of interesting other ministers in the study, he has requested various clergymen to examine critically such and such works as were in use in their own schools, and to enclose to him a written report upon the same. As samples of the whole he copies from letters received while engaged upon this article.

“ I have examined W——r’s Political Economy, and must say the author seems careful not to use the word ‘God.’ He makes no reference at all that I can find to Christianity or religion. He writes nature with a capital ‘N,’ and calls ‘it’ beneficent. The nearest approach to a religious sentiment that I find is where he speaks of ‘the harmonies of Providence.’ ”

“ I have examined R——h’s History of the United States, and report a studied ignoring of God’s hand in History. Absolutely secular. All results traced to human causes.”

“ I have examined H——r’s Zoology. It nowhere recognizes the Christian religion as the religion of the author or of the people using it ; neither does it anywhere teach creation as an act of God.”

“ Our schools a few years ago were using Tenney’s Natural History, which tells its students that the works of creation ‘are interesting not merely on account of their varied and beautiful forms and colors, but because they are the works of God, His thoughts expressed in visible forms. If we study these wonderful objects in the right spirit, we shall learn more of Him who made them, and who careth for them, suffering not even a sparrow to fall without His notice.’ The school afterward introduced Hooker’s text-book, which sees in the human body ‘the only fit tenement of a soul made in the image of God.’ We have discarded both these works, and are now using a book published by the great house of A——n, in which man is simply the last of a series of developments, and his physical resemblance to the ape is traced laboriously in text and illustration. That he has a soul, or that there is a God for him to adore, is not so much as hinted at.”

“ At your request I have examined D——n’s Physiology. I do not find in it anywhere any indication that Christianity is the religion of the author, or supposed to be that of the pupil. So far as this book is concerned, the Creator might have been Jupiter as well as Jehovah. There is not a suggestion as to the wisdom exhibited in the arrangements or adaptations of the human body. It is far less religious than Plato.”

“ The author of H——r’s School Geography seems not to have heard of God, and mentions the Bible only once—in connection with

Jerusalem. He speaks freely of the religions of Asia, but carefully avoids mentioning any religion in America."

"We have discarded Guyot's Physical Geography and Maury's, both of which were written from the standpoint of a grateful faith. Now we are using W——n's, in which the pupils are told that some people think the race of man began with a single created pair, while others hold that the race was developed from the inferior creatures of the earth."

"As to D——'s Physical Geography, he mentions religion in connection with America but once, and then it is Mormonism that has attracted his notice."

"I have examined P. V. N. M——'s* Ancient History and H——r's Zoology. The first is Robertson Smith reduced to the use of children, the second Herbert Spencer in primer form. The one finds nothing supernatural in the Bible, but only a development of Babylonish myths; the second graphically presents all the premises of evolution, and nothing which has led such men as Quatrefages and Gladstone to reject it. Both of these books are in common use in the schools of our State."

Our school officials and book publishers must know that they have started on a road which knows no logical turn. If our schools are not to be continued in accordance with their historic purposes, or in the spirit of the Christian States which support them, but simply by the greatest outcry—religion is not the only thing which "must go." Considering what has already been yielded to simple clamor, that saloon-keeper who sat upon the school platform last summer in Brooklyn, when one of the youths denounced the drink traffic, may yet accomplish his avowed purpose of rendering the repetition of such sentiments impossible in a public school. Beer, if not his religion, is at least his politics, and he does not propose to see the schools turned into a propaganda of "prohibition." Nor can our school boards satisfy the enemies of the Bible by rejecting the name of God from their text-books. A volume lately published by the Assistant Attorney-General† of the United States demands the rejection of Webster's Dictionary from the public schools, on the

* The author of this pretentious History is announced upon its title-page as "President of B—— College," in one of the largest cities of the Union. A reference to the Report of the Commissioner of Education gives the "President" the modest literary degree of "A.M.," and his "College" the credit of 32 pupils, "in all departments," of whom only 7 are males.

† Poison Drops in the United States Senate—the School Question from a Parental and Non-Sectarian Standpoint, by Zach. Montgomery, Assistant Attorney-General of the United States, pp. 38, 39.

ground of its "political" complexion. There is no argument valid for the banishment of religion from the schools which is not as valid for the banishment of disputed questions in politics. And when we can teach neither the tenets of our common religion, nor the fundamental principles of our Christian morals, nor the theories of our federal life as a nation, because upon each theme there is a variety of opinion in the State, we shall have succeeded not only in banishing "the last vestige of religion from the public schools," but in banishing the schools themselves. This plan reminds us of the witty saying of a famous preacher, that some parties were ever ready to kill a man, but strenuous to preserve the corpse. If the present tendencies go on unchecked for another generation the corpse will be all that is left of the public school; and the people will not try to preserve that very long.* They tell us that in Holland, under the pressure of Romanism and rationalism, it is no longer permitted to teach the heroic history, that Motley has made familiar to English readers, of the struggles of the Dutch fathers and princes for liberty of conscience and a free Bible. And that where the students can no longer read the noble deeds of their Protestant and believing ancestors in their gymnasia, the few that do attend spend a goodly part of their time in studying dancing. Those of our own schools are not far from that which have banished the Bible, the inspiration of those mighty impulses leading to the founding of free States, from their desks, and introduced the cook-book!

There is such a thing, Poor Richard says, as "paying too dear for one's whistle." A question which involves the annual expenditure † of \$111,304,927 will be looked into with increasing carefulness. A child can learn to doubt the faith of his mother and to scout the religion of his father more cheaply than that. "There are," says M. Emilie Laveleye, ‡ "certain principles which the State affirms in its assemblies, in its judicial tribunals, in its Constitution, upon the scaffold itself—and the only place where it is forbidden to teach them is in its schools!" Such a course is as irrational as it is intolerable; and we believe that no one can look upon the facts here presented without feeling that the public school must either again,

* The writer has found in his investigations, at least one city in which this foreign theory has been carried to its full and logical conclusion. In that city there is no prayer at the opening of the school session, no Bible in the pupils' desks, no avoidable mention of the name of God in the text-books; but the teachers and scholars have annually provided for them by the "liberality" of the directors a yearly picnic, upon which occasion free gambling tables and a "bar" forty-five feet long are elements in the education of the children. This is surely secularism—run to seed.

† Report, Commissioner of Education, 1885-86.

‡ *L'Instruction du Peuple*, M. Emilie Laveleye. Paris, Librairie Hachette et Cie, p. 9.

as in its historic past, reflect the fundamental faiths, principles, hopes, and aspirations of those who support it, or cease to be. "One thing is absolutely certain. Christianity is ever increasing in power, and, in the long run, will never tolerate the absurd and aggressive claims of modern infidelity. The system of public schools must be held, in its sphere, true to the claims of Christianity, or they must go, with all other enemies of Christ, to the wall." *

H. D. JENKINS.

Freeport.

* Religion in the Public Schools, *New Princeton*, vol. iii., p. 47, Professor A. A. Hodge.