

LARGE SERIES.



National Reform Documents.

VOL. III.

NO. 3.

APRIL, 1900.

Issued Quarterly.

Price, 25c. a Year.

— REPORT —

OF THE

NEW YORK CONVENTION,

DECEMBER 5-7, 1899.

Office of

National Reform Association,

No. 216 Park Way, Allegheny, Pa.,

1900.

CONVENTION ADDRESSES.

Our National Religion as a Basis for Teaching the Christian Morality with Christian Sanctions, in Our Public Schools.

BY DR. S. F. SCOVEL.

I. Let us, in beginning, clearly state what the American doctrine of Religion and the State is. It exists and may be defined.

1. It proceeds upon the assumed fact that there is a distinctly moral nature in the State. Omitting Mulford's well-known statement, which has received such distinguished assent, we present that of Freeman the philosophic historian: "That a nation in its public dealings should be guided by the same general principles of moral conduct by which an individual is or ought to be guided in his private conduct, is a truth which seems involved in the very conception of national being." (Princeton Review, November '78). That eminent penologist Dr. E. C. Wines (father of the one now so favorably known) wrote thus: "The State has now become by this submission of will (he held a modified form of the social-contract theory) a moral person, invested with personal attributes, subject to personal obligations, and capable of deliberating, resolving and acting in a personal capacity. It is a body politic It is a unit not an aggregate. It is an organized product having an internal vitality, working out its own growth and ripeness—though dependent all the while, in its organic capacity, on the Great Being who is the founder of nations, no less than Creator of men" (Heb. Laws, p. 42.) So Burlamaqui (that wise old French author I heard Tom Corwin commend to one of his law students) says: "The condition of the being of the Nation, as the power and minister of God in history, is in its moral personality."

This moral nature of the State underlies the American doctrine not because any act of Congress ever explicitly affirmed it, or because Courts ever decided so in terms, but because common sense (with no nonsense of Realism, or refinement of speculation, or folly of assuming

a subjective thing to have necessarily an objective existence) decides that when men who are moral agents are united together in government, according to necessities implanted in their nature by their Creator and for distinctively moral ends: men do, in the collective body thus formed, come under moral responsibility which implies a clearly moral nature in the body politic. Otherwise we are launched into the absurdity that men may obtain, concerning moral obligation, in a body what they neither desire nor could obtain as individuals, viz.—the liberty of action without corresponding responsibility.

2. The moral State looks for direction in the morality it must adopt and for sanction which will make that morality effective and supreme; and it finds both in the nature and will of God. This is the familiar truth of history being found as Plutarch shows, everywhere even among the heathen.

3. The State, now become religious that it may accomplish its moral mission, must not legislate anything contrary to the moral precepts which God makes known; and must enforce these precepts only so far as they concern overt acts.

4. The State, religious for itself, is under bonds to carry out justice to the utmost attainable limit, in its administration because its laws are founded upon and represent the justice of God.

5. The State, religious for itself, may and of right ought to employ all its educational appliances and facilities toward the preparation of its citizens for the exercise of every virtue demanded in the laws and in the life they establish—thus providing for the minimum of physical restraint by providing the maximum of moral impulse.

6. At the same time, the State, religious for itself, may and must grant fullest liberty of conscience in all matters of opinion, since the divine law has charged it only with superintendence of action. It may not force any to the belief in or support of religion, it may not exclude any from its emoluments or privileges on account of unbelief. The just limits of religion in the State embrace (1) Toleration of different sects: (2) No penalty or disability on account of religious preferences: (3) No tithings or church-rates: (4) No compulsory legislation concerning the spiritual interests of men but only their moral interests and conduct.

7. And it must be added to all that this State, religious for itself, must be such at the free choice of its constituent citizens. The American idea was the outgrowth of conviction at the beginning. Its practical supremacy is still the outgrowth of conviction. Its extension into the future must be the result of the same state of feeling. It cannot tolerate the idea of a religion forced upon an unwilling people. There must be no dictation of Pope, or Priest or Protestant church. The adopted religion must be no political fiction. An honest clinging to God is the only one He can bear without abhorrence, and the only one a nation can bear without utter final demoralization.

The American idea is that the State (1) being of a moral nature; (2) holds itself responsible to God for its moral law and moral life:

(3) will not legislate against His precepts and confines its legislation to overt acts; (4) is bound to execute justice to all men; (5) may and must educate to morality with divine sanctions; (6) is commissioned to guarantee freedom of conscience, the most precious of human liberties; and (7) means in its very essence the genuine conviction of the popular heart.

II. Proof that this is the American Idea and Indication of How we should Estimate It.

1. Our origin is Christian and origin is vitality. Of religion and language Max Muller tells us the former is the stronger modifying influence in religious life. Never did history furnish so clear an illustration as is found in our history. Church and State never existed as a national institution. Ultra-montanism was never even hinted at. The commercial, or secular, view of government was happily unknown, so that we were born into this American idea of a State religious for itself. This was an origin possible only by and along with the great world impulse described as that

"When civil and religious liberty were not only formulated as principles, but achieved through myriads of martyrdoms, when thus the modern State and the modern Church first emerged and began to be adjusted into their relation as independent organisms subject to the same supreme head and ministering in different spheres to the accomplishment of the same ultimate designs." (Dr. A. A. Hodge.)

We cannot lose sight of the impressive fact that divine Providence seems to have allotted this land to the possession of a nation of just such a Christian character as we bear. It was reserved until religious freedom had been established in England and partly in Europe. The land was filled with selected immigrants who were religious in earnest, but with too many forms of religion to allow an establishment. Our institutions were forced into ways of equality and liberty and fraternity which are favorable to the pervasiveness and popularity of real religion. We were finally freed by punitive dispensation from the slavery which contradicted our whole political and social and religious fibre, and all has been confirmed by the marvelous development of religion freed from state control but free to influence in turn, by its own native force, the life it had done so much to form. This origin was not designed by us any more than our republican government was. It was found in the situation, as Providence presented it, and its central idea was the only *modus vivendi* which could be found. It was evidently of God since it was the only class over the vast plateau of progress.

2. Our colonial period is full of the same teaching. Without the religious element our final union would have been impossible. Had there been Ultra-montanism we know what would have resulted. Had there been Episcopacy alike in all the colonies we never should have left the mother country. It was freedom of form combined with real religious earnestness which resulted in the peculiar combination which still persists.

3. In the national period church and state is gone forever, but the Christian state remained to blossom into fruitage in our whole experience of the formative period. Transitional periods best disclose life tendencies. After the rapids we find the ballast of the Christian idea of the state lying unmoved in the whole and steadying the vessel for its onward voyage. The five great documents which mark the formative stage are sufficient proof. I but enumerate but dare not discuss them. We have earliest the declaration of Rights of the Continental Congress of 1774, the deputies of which were to meet in the city of Philadelphia "in order to obtain such establishment as that their religion, laws and liberties may not be subverted." Then we have the Articles of Confederation and a definite religious tone in the document which submitted them to the legislatures and in the devout acknowledgement of their having been accepted. The Declaration of Independence glows with its four-fold appeal to God. The federal constitution is not neutral toward all religions—see Justice Storey's declaration as to the first amendment; and not thoroughly secular because it contemplated the widest moral ends and not positively irreligious since it is one thing to be silent about and another to oppose religion. It is almost religiously positive in its date, in the recognition of the Sabbath, in the first amendment, which protects religion, as well as forbids its abuse, in the permission of a religious oath, though it does not prescribe one, and in the extension of that oath to state officers. That the powers of government are derived from the consent of the governed is not an anti-Christian sentiment, since it refers to the form and not to the essence of government, and is so understood by most eminent religious-political authorities. The constitution is cryptogamously religious and may become phaenogamous at any time the people may desire without any radical change. Remember Bancroft's explanation of the constituent's negatively religious character—"Not from indifference, but that the infinite spirit of eternal truth might move in its freedom and purity and power."

The Northwest Territory Ordinance, born in the same eventful year (1787), not only stands for itself in this matter, but illuminates the constitution which was accepted by the same Congress. Its matchless declaration can never be effaced from our records, nor its massive work all ready accomplished be ignored in our national life.

"Religion, morality and knowledge being the condition of human happiness and of good government, schools and the means of instruction shall forever be encouraged in this territory."

And all that these documents contain has been carried out in a consistent line of continuous legislation concerning the things which most intimately touch and most powerfully affect the interests and well-being of every community and local unit of government. I need not even enumerate them. Our land is full of them, and owes its noblest position among the nations of the world to such consistency with them as we have been able to exhibit.

4. The varied acknowledgements of this national doctrine, with explanation of some apparent denials. I must here leave out of consideration, only alluding to the last and most signal—because most deliberate, extended, argumentative and judicial. That is the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States rendered by Justice Brewer in the Alien Contract Labor Case, February 29, 1892. It is explicit and has never been contradicted. It resumes the history of the matter, cites various judicial decisions and closes thus:

"These and many other matters which might be noticed add a volume of unofficial declarations to the mass of organic utterances that this is a Christian nation."

We cannot too highly estimate the position which is thus given us. It is no small thing that we may put first among all the sources of public thanksgiving and reasons for mutual congratulation this unique and thoroughly original position of the United States in its religious position and practice. We must emphasize the fact that our country presents the first great commonwealth of the world's history in which religion has played (even approximately) its proper part on the extended field of national life. This position once properly estimated, we shall never be either cajoled or threatened into the abandonment of it. It contrasts with all the ancient empires, with Greece and Rome, and with all uncivilized nations, while it differs widely from the practice and excels the theory of the civilized. We cannot avoid satisfaction and a just pride and profound gratitude for a position in this difficult matter concerning which there are so many varieties of present opinion and practice in this closing year of the nineteenth Christian century. The general doctrine where the Roman Catholic Church rules is Church over State. The Russian idea would seem to be State over Church, though both are so blended as to be hardly distinguishable to the outside world. The German idea is State over Church within the limits which vary largely with times and occasions. The French conception is State over Church under the definitions of Napoleon's oppressive Concordat. The English believe in State over Church but modified by the popular will as expressed by the House of Commons. Everywhere in the world of to-day it is either the oppression of conscience by the slowly developing power of the Romish supremacy or the heavy hand of state interference benumbing spirituality, and repressing Christian activity. Our American idea drops away from the State the word and the idea of the Church, and deals with religions as a positive and preservative inner force and presents a State religious for itself and a government that can respond to the deeply religious character of the people (the source of all power) without injury to personal liberty or freedom of conscience.

It is clear therefore, that we should have no hesitation or uncertainty or concealment in this matter. National religion should be as distinct and effective in its sphere as personal religion is—of which it has been well said that it is everything or nothing. We should watchfully conserve all the Christian features of our national life. We should

more openly confess our Christian national character. We should more unhesitatingly conform our legislation and life to our Christian principles—never forgetting the central securities for liberty of conscience.

III. There is a whole series of considerations which demonstrate the importance and value of our National Religion—which can here receive the merest mention.

1. The social science of our day is teaching the supreme importance of religion as a force in national life and development.

2. Equally does it appear as fundamental in the account given us of the origin of the State by political science.

3. And we cannot understand the function of the Nation in History without the underlying religious tendencies.

4. By our national religion we select our national morality.

5. We make that Christian morality effective by conforming to it the great body of our laws.

6. According to those laws we make our demands upon all those who live under them for a character and a conduct conformed to them and worthy of them, and we labor thus to create a patriotism which shall be serious enough and strong enough to encounter the exigencies of our times.

7. In the name of our national religion we enforce the equality which makes America the land of the average man beyond any soil under the sun.

8. In the name of our national religion we seek that dominance of conscience in the emerging American character which is alone worthy of our origin and which alone can give us that "moral power" which Emerson declares to be "the fire of fire, the soul of soul and the force of force."

9. By appeal to our national religion we aim to constitute such international relations as to make us at once the destroyers of inhumanity in Cuba and the most effective pleaders for peace among the assembled world-powers at the Hague.

10. The stability of our liberties and the permanence of our institutions depend upon our national religion. That this is our deep conviction De Tocqueville asserts—thus. "I am certain that the Americans hold religion to be indispensable to the maintenance of republican institutions. This opinion is not peculiar to any class of citizens, or a party, but it belongs to the whole nation and to every rank of society (D. in A. p. 285). Washington did not believe we could have morality without religion, nor stability without both these pillars of the State. (See Farewell Address). Dr. Storrs of Brooklyn, (serus in coelum redeat) has said: "It has been held from the beginning that Christianity is the basis of our republican empire, its bond of cohesion, its life-giving law." And Ex-Secretary Evarts declares that "One might as well expect our land to keep its climate and fertility, its salubrity and its beauty, were the globe loosed from the law which holds it

in an orbit where we feel the tempered radiance of the sun, as to count upon the preservation of the delights and glories of liberty for a people cast loose from religion whereby man is bound in harmony with the moral government of God."

IV. Now we come to the assertion that—on this basis of our American Doctrine of Religion and the State, so easily defined, so clearly discernible in our history, so freely and so frequently acknowledged by our national authorities and so important to our future national welfare—our national religion has its place in our schools as indisputably and in the same proportion as it has in the State.

The proposition is almost self-evident. The foundation is ample and the logic irresistible. Nothing is more familiar than the well-known declaration: "What you want in the nation you must put into the children." A nation, religious for itself, may and must have an education that contains all the religion in it which experience has proven necessary for the purpose which the State must subserve. The Christian morals are to be taught to the children of the moral state and on the basis of the Christian sanctions which have determined the choice of the Christian morality by the State.

Nothing can be more important than the right conclusion here as nothing can be more destructive than a wrong one. Many voices are heard, as recently at the National Educational Association at Los Angeles. One plead for the ignoring of all that had been held sacred hitherto and the substitution of the morals of evolution—if any one could discern them amid the theoretical antitheses of the paper. Another dwelt upon the propriety of carefully guarding environment and studying heredity, but seemed not to see that far more robust and direct treatment was demanded in order to counteract evil and moralize a generation. Painful uncertainty is shown even by such an authority as our Commissioner of Education. He writes thus in the report of 1896-7: "While the education of the American people supported by taxes and public funds is becoming more and more rigidly secular in character, and the lines drawn more clearly which separate it from ecclesiastical and religious instruction, yet the true importance of religious instruction is coming to be better understood among scientific and philosophical thinkers." Here the system of public education seems to be going one way and the thinkers another. The trend of public education seems to be away from that which intelligent thinking perceives to be the right way, and that because it must be secular, since it is supported by taxes. In our public schools, says Edward Everett Hale, it is not a choice between a teaching of morality "without enlisting the aid of any theological system" and teaching "enforced by the sanction of any particular religious opinions." "It is a choice between the former teaching and none."

It is evident that we need a strong reassertion of the doctrine which has made and kept our education Christian thus far. The necessity is

plain for proclaiming the indispensability and sufficiency of the foundation already set forth. A Christian nation's right and duty is to teach in all its schools the Christian morality which can make such citizens as Christian institutions demand; and that upon such a basis of Christian sanction as will make (since it alone can make) this morality effective, pervasive and permanent. President Eliot, of Harvard, has said: "Nobody knows how to teach morality effectively without religion. Exclude religion from education and you will leave no foundation on which to build a moral character."

The point of contact between Religion and the State in education cannot possibly be ignored or denied. "Three links," said Dr. Schaff, "connect the State with religion: The family, the Sabbath and the Public School." This must be so, by the nature of education itself which cannot be less than the development of the whole nature with each part in its proper relations. That means not only moral education but the supremacy of the moral in character and conduct. No reasonable philosophy of education is left to deny this. It is writ large in history, also. Only the smallest exceptions can be found to the law that national religion does control the national education. Moreover the extent of the task to be accomplished necessitates this contact. Churches and individuals may do all they will, and even all they can, but the State must enter effectively or the undertaking can never be overtaken (as, indeed, it never has been). When the State enters it cannot ignore the moral nature nor the fact that the only practicable morality is the Christian nor the kindred fact that the Christian morality cannot be realized without the Christian sanctions. This is simply to say that the State must educate as a civilized institution—since there is but one civilization in the world to-day and that is Christian. When the State would educate for citizenship it cannot forget that the citizenship of intelligent conscience is the only one consistent with security on the one hand and progress on the other. These are the two things which the world most needs and most vigorously demands and the very things for which the State exists as society's chief instrumentality for the public welfare. What other welfare is so radically important? It is impossible to make a final adjustment in education which does not depend upon some reasonably satisfactory adjustment of relations of the State to Religion.

Our need of an actually prevalent morality can, also, neither be ignored nor denied. All our records are full of it whether social, political or penal. The increasing growth of crime is a special and signal note of alarm. Morality is not less needed in public life than in private but more because the interests visibly affected are greater. Now the morality that cannot step out of privacy and get itself registered and effective in and by public will may as well abdicate at once. Something will override it at every point of importance as long as human nature remains the same. A system of right and wrong which has not virility and positive truth and sanction enough to control men and communities, and produce moral unity in the body politic, and

get itself expressed in those great records of the deeper moral convictions we call our laws, must be pronounced thoroughly inadequate for the need of modern society. And from the side of the Christian morality itself who that has a spark of religious conviction, will assert that it is meant for private and not for public life—that it is unfit for men in masses, that it is inadequate for modern life. He who would assert such a thing must be strongly forgetful of the moral history of the world, as well as strangely willing to limit God who watches over that history.

The sanctions and the morality must go together. 'This, too, is in the nature of the case. The two are revealed together. The two are urged together. Either is incomprehensible without the other. Men would always find the demands of Christian morality far too exacting were it not for the illumination given them in the sanctions by which they are accompanied. Duty and reward, disobedience and punishment, here within and hereafter, before an assembled world cannot be torn asunder. Such duty demands such sanction. Such sanction is appropriate only to such duty. Vainly do men attempt to tear apart this warp and woof of the divine weaving. It is as true to our nature as it is to the nature of virtue, and as both are to the nature of God. Well does Dr. Schaff exclaim: "What will become of the State or school which is indifferent to the fundamental virtues of honesty, integrity, justice, temperance! And how can these or any other virtues be more effectually maintained and promoted than by the solemn sanctions of the religion which binds man to God?"

Just here becomes apparent another necessity for exhibiting a solid basis for Christian-morality teaching in our public schools. It is in the brief logic which I heard read at the National Teachers' Association last July by the Bishop of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Los Angeles. Basing his undeniably correct assertion upon the language of George Washington's Farewell Address, he claimed that religion is necessary to a symmetrical education. And this was followed immediately with the proposition: "But our State is secular and cannot teach Religion." That was enough. Grant the postulate and the conclusion he wished that audience of thousands of teachers to reach was inevitable—viz: the Roman Catholics must be allowed to have separate schools (which means ultimately the division of the school-fund with all which that means). To break the force of this logic, however, the enthusiastic speaker remembered that it would be urged that a non-sectarian religion could be found which might be taught in the public schools. To which he immediately replied: "I am unable to conceive of a non-sectarian religion."

But immediately we make answer by the true American doctrine that our State is not a secular but a Christian State; that it can and must teach the Christian sanctions; that this is just that non-sectarian religion we need in our public schools, being that "general and tolerant Christianity" which Webster puts so aptly, and with such general consent at the basis of our laws, and which Washington's Farewell Ad-

dress recognizes so clearly as utterly indispensable to our national morality and thus to our national welfare. Standing on the platform of the National Reform Association which seeks to underline and exhibit and thus to strengthen the really Christian character of our national life, we are at once able to settle this most important question. Here we are at the parting of the ways. Take away what is now so much our pride and our security—the place of Christian morals on a Christian basis in our public schools—and you have made of education a most powerful engine of destruction. Kindle for it, if possible, a yet more blazing enthusiasm, pour it yet a greater proportion of our marvellous material wealth, interest in it yet more profoundly the keenest thinkers and the deepest social sympathies, and you have only, upon this supposition, increased its destructive power. This is no more than the common sense that expects the greater mass which has escaped control, to work the greater mischief. Hand may join in hand, secularist and Romanist may be found strangely united in denying the place of Christian sanctions in our schools, but we can never be defeated and our noble system of public education can never be shattered by any conspiracy or accidental conjunction of opposing forces. It is the best expression of the deepest principles of our national life and on it we depend for bringing our heterogeneous masses into homogeneity. To it we look largely for the creation of that typical American character by which we shall be recognized even more clearly in the political world of the future. From it we expect the lessening of crime and the fitting of our twentieth-century population for the twentieth-century problems and demands. We cannot surrender our schools and we will not attempt to keep them by any compromise which will sacrifice the essential condition of their value and power.

Thus there becomes visible as we hold our American doctrine of Religion and the State in close comparison with our American system of education a most exact and inspiring relation between them. They are complementary and mutually indispensable. They proceed, in fact, from the same source—viz., the vital religious sentiment of the American people. There is general tolerant Christianity in one and in the other, and it has a right to be in both as well as in either. It is folly to dream of a middle ground here. Between secularism in the State with extinction of Christian teaching in the schools on the one side, and the Christian State with Christian schools, there can be no compromise. Ultimately this country can no more endure being half-secular and half-Christian than it could endure being half-slave and half-free. Neither our nation nor our school system can ever be secularized in the sense of an absolute divorce from religion. If chaplains are in congress, why not in schools where men are fitted for congress? If chaplains and religious observances go into the army, why should they be denied to the boys who will be all the better soldiers in any just cause for all the inspiring and molding influences which the religious sanctions of character and conduct can bring to bear in their plastic youth?

If thanksgiving anthems can be heard from one end of the earth to the other on days set apart by national custom, should the voices of youth in our own schools be kept silent? What useful office can thanksgiving days accomplish which school-worship will not make more certain and more valuable?

Here let me quote a declaration of the Supreme Court of Michigan (rendered Dec. '98), which sustains forcibly the claim now made: "The ordinance of 1787 declared that religion, morality and knowledge were necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, and provided that for these purposes, schools and the means of education should be encouraged. It is not to be inferred that, in forming a constitution under the authority of this ordinance, the convention intended to prohibit in the public schools all mention of a subject which the ordinance, in effect, declared that schools were to be established to foster." Further the Court says, "It was doubtless the opinion of the framers of that great document (Ordinance of 1787) that public schools would of necessity tend to foster religion. . . . The language of this instrument when read in the light of the fact that this was at that date a Christian nation, is such as to preclude the idea that the framers of this Constitution, in harmony with the principles contained in the Ordinance, intended . . . to exclude wholly from the schools all reference to the Bible." Then the Court refers to the constant custom which had been observed, and emphasizes the strength given that custom by its originating coincident with the Constitution. It suggests that "this universal usage extending over so long a period" would be "deemed decisive" in any ordinary matter as a practical construction made by the administrative branch of the government." Then Judge Cooley is quoted as holding that generally accepted construction, contemporaneous with a Constitution may be strongly presumed to be correct as an interpretation of its meaning. And this whole case may be taken in essentials from Michigan to the United States. The principle is the same. The general sentiment, when our foundations were laid, was wholly and decidedly in favor of such moral teaching in our schools as should be buttressed and made effective by the sanctions of the commonly received religion.

And the duty of putting the sanctions behind the morals in our schools becomes only the clearer when you remember that every nation puts its best thing (so considered) most carefully into its schools. The Mohammedans put their Koran there. The Chinese put their Confucius there. The Germans plant their military and intellectual spirit there as well as their religion. For us, the Christian in us, is confessedly our best thing. What an anomaly, then, to leave it out of our schools, while we claim it as our greatest distinction.

That noble body of teachers, steadily coming to a most important force in our national life, known as the National Educational Association, in session at Chicago, gave utterance to this declaration: "Resolved, first, that the attempt to separate the cultivation of moral and intellectual powers which prevails to a certain extent in the school

system of to-day is unphilosophical, injurious to children and dangerous to the State: Second, that in the judgment of this association the Bible should be recognized as the text-book of ethics, and that the Word of God, which made free schools, should hold an honored place in them."

We must teach Christian morals on a basis of Christian sanction because nothing else can consistently be taught. We are not of any pagan religion and we are not atheistic, and we are not indifferent. The books of the East, with their ethics of despair or of political expediency, all repudiated by bitterest centuries of experience are not to be thought of. The morals of theism always remind the world of the horrors of the Reign of Terror in Paris. We are far too earnest a people to be indifferent. You cannot dechristianize America." The task is far beyond any set of men or any combination of hostile influences which can be brought to bear. Religion is going ever deeper into the nation's heart. Any serious attempt to banish it from government and education will awaken the opposition of even the apparently apathetic when once the attempt is fully comprehended. It will be like Secretary Seward's prophecy of what the nation would do (and what substantially it did) when the people should come to understand that the Union was really in danger.

Our national religion appears constantly in our laws (both State and Federal). What an anomaly it would be to establish schools to ensure glad and conscientious obedience to law and yet exclude the teaching of the great underlying truths concerning God and man which have given those laws their place in the statute-book by first writing them in the hearts of the people.

Nearly the whole decalogue finds expression necessarily in our legislation. All of it does, which clearly concerns conduct (overt act). What an anomaly to prevent the repetition in our schools, in an atmosphere of reverence for the God who gave them, and of kindness to all men whom they protect and befriend, the matchless precepts and promises of the Ten Commandments! Mr. Moody, (God keep his memory green in this land he has done so much to bless) longed for a "Ten Commandments revival." The place where it should begin to be permanent and pervasive is in our schools. There is the place to plant deep the principles that will endear to the heart and commend to the judgment these conservative and prophylactic regulations. Out of such influences will grow the population which will consider obedience to these commandments in civil affairs as natural as breathing—and as delightful. Only the sanctions can make the laws acceptable to human selfishness. What consummate folly to leave that selfishness to get into adamant resistance instead of softening it to ready compliance by effective sanctions for justice and self-restraint. The Decalogue is in our courts and excluded from our schools. That is just the way to graduate untold numbers from the schools where the ten commandments were forgotten, into the courts where they must confront them from the prisoner's dock. Strip these precepts of their

majesty, of their origin, and take out of them the thrill of the divine voice that uttered them and then turn to the wretchedness of the police-court as a substitute! Take away from the decalogue its sublime condensation into supreme love to God and equal love to man and then depend upon the harsh voice of man's retributive justice to produce the character without which men will perpetually transgress these precepts! What madness! How shall we have the right-doing, conscience-obeying, God-fearing and man-loving citizen who is the ideal of our laws, by banishing that ideal from our schools.

Nor will there be found any belief for those who desire secularization, in the plea that moral culture on a Christian basis may safely be referred to the homes and the churches, the Sunday-schools and the Reformatories. The deception is too transparent. Not any or all of them can be considered as adequate to the task without the public-school system. Remember with what indifferent success the whole congress of influences is now being exerted. Hear the almost terror-stricken inquiry: "Is this the best our whole system of moral culture home, school, church, state and society, all included, can do for us?" Remember how aggressive the school has become. By the necessity of the case, and because nothing else can do the work, it is claiming the child earlier in life and holding him later, and for more days of the year and more hours of each day. Remember that the fierce competitions of our modern life are making it far from a matter of choice whether the parents shall surrender the children to these school-demands. No! The school must stand by the home and the church and be the true annex of both, or we shall have such a disruptive force born within our social organism as will rend it in pieces. Think for a moment with what hindrances to the right product of righteous homes and spiritual churches we have now to contend. Tear away the school and make it of another spirit; put away from its teaching the divine sanctions upon which homes and churches must rely, then claim for it more and more of the waking hours of the plastic period and what have you not done to ruin the product? There is the *most intimate* need that the entire spirit of the whole great series of molding and educating influences shall be absolutely one in all great essentials that tell upon character and ultimately control life. There is no hope if the unity be changed to contrariety. There is no possibility of the highest result if any one of the series should relapse into simple indifference to that which is so vital as are the Christian sanctions of the moral life.

Moreover, the very way to build up and broaden and deepen the whole public school system (including our State Universities) is to practice the right inference from the Christian character of our nation and put into the system more and more of the effective power of the impressive Christian principles which govern character and conduct. The way to destroy the system is wholly and violently to secularize them. Religion must live whatever else may die. Men cannot have the final form of it in the Christianity that has won its way around the

world and entwined itself with the historic roots of all that shall blossom in the coming centuries. Dissolve the connection of our schools with vital religion in the Bible, the text-book, the school-room spirit, and the convictions and example of the teachers and you will so devitalize and dessicate it that those who know the larger life with God and for man will turn away from it en masse. This is no idle threat. Religion will again make its own schools as it has already done.

And all know that it is easier to preserve than to change in any great national institution. Our schools are not now secular, if secularity means freedom from all moral or Christian influence." They are non-sectarian but that is the poles apart from secular. "Our schools as they exist" (says Dr. Wylie in the most able and exhaustive analysis of the situation ever published) "are a protest against the folly of the effort to divide human life into two parts called sacred and secular and to exclude religion from the latter"—The law which governs the District of Columbia is as nearly perfectly balanced legislation on the whole matter as can be found. It provides that the teachers shall "inculcate in their pupils truthfulness, self-control, temperance, frugality, industry, obedience to parents, reverence for the aged, respect for the rights of others, politeness to all, kindness to animals, desire for knowledge and obedience to the laws of God; but no teacher shall exercise any sectarian inference in the school." "The opening exercises in every school shall consist of reading by the teacher, without note or comment, a portion of the Bible, repeating the Lord's Prayer at the option of the teacher, and appropriate singing by the pupils."

[The final proposition would have been that this American doctrine of Religion in the State, with the education it authorized and created, is abreast of the highest ideals of education we now possess, and is alone adequate to the demands of our country and the exigencies of our times.—Omitted for want of time.]

THE KINGSHIP OF CHRIST.

BY DR. T. P. STEVENSON.

The theme assigned to me is "The Kingship of Jesus Christ." Stated thus broadly it brings before us the whole kingly office of our Redeemer. But as limited by the design and scope of this Conference, it is the Kingship of Christ over the nation which we are to consider.

No subject could be of greater theoretical interest, or of greater practical importance. Is there a sovereign power, to which this nation, and all nations, are responsible? If so, is it God, in his essential character, or is it Christ Jesus, the Mediator between God and man, to whom the nation owes its allegiance? If Christ is the Ruler of nations, how does He exercise His authority? Where are His laws recorded? What does He require of nations, and how does He enforce His requirements? These questions are of interest to every Christian patriot, to every lawmaker and every magistrate, to every minister of Christ who is concerned to be a faithful ambassador and to deliver his message faithfully.

We hold this truth—the Kingship of Christ over the nations—in no mystical or extravagant sense. We are not dreaming of a visible kingdom to be set up on the earth in some future dispensation, with the Lord occupying a palace and a throne, and administering His government after the manner of earthly potentates. We simply mean that the revealed will of Jesus Christ is law for nations and governments as well as for individual men. We mean that since Christ has spoken plainly on the subject, for example, of marriage and divorce, no nation to whom these words of Christ have come is at liberty to make laws for the family which contravene His laws. All Christian men call Jesus, Master and Lord, and find in His will, the supreme motive of their lives. We simply mean that nations and governments ought also to have regard for His will; that governmental acts and national policies are to be judged by the spirit and teachings of Christ; that Queen Victoria and Emperor William, the British Parliament and the American Congress, ought to look up to Him who was crucified and say: "Lord, what wouldst Thou have us to do?" We mean that the Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount are binding on nations and governments as well as on individual men; and binding because they are the law of One who is the nation's king.

NECESSARY TO HIS WORK AS SAVIOUR.

That Jesus Christ is, in this sense, the actual Governor among the nations, may be inferred from the simple fact that he is the Saviour of Men. There is nothing which the world so sorely needs, or so ardently craves, as leadership. Competent leadership unites men, welds