

INTRODUCTORY.

Our public school system is the crown of glory of the United States. It should be guarded with jealous care against every thing that would impair its efficiency. There is a controversy as to the place the Bible and its code of morals should occupy in the school-room. There are three parties to this controversy. These are, first, the secularists, who would exclude the Scriptures entirely; second, the Roman Catholics, who would abolish the public schools as having no right to teach either the Scriptures or anything else; third, the great body of christian citizens, who believe that the Bible and its system of morals should be taught in every school. The first and second of these classes often join their forces against the custom of Bible reading. Too often they are successful in their efforts. Every such success is heralded as an indication of the trend of thought and purpose of the American people, and the prophecy is often uttered that soon our educational system will be wholly secularized.

The following pages give the results of an investigation made to learn where the Bible has been excluded from the schools together with the ground of its exclusion, and also where it is still retained together with the ground of its retention. The facts here presented show that the process of secularization has not proceeded as far as was feared on the one hand and hoped on the other. In only a few instances are constitutions and laws interpreted as prohibiting the use of the Bible in the schools. The number of school boards that have adopted prohibitory rules is comparatively small. The overwhelming sentiment of the country is in favor of retaining it. The practice prevails in the great body of our schools. While in some parts of our land the secularizing process may be advancing, in others the custom of reading a daily lesson from the Scriptures is gaining ground. This discussion shows that in twenty-one States there are laws or decisions sustaining this custom, while in sixteen others it prevails without such laws or decisions because supported by public sentiment. It is likewise shown that in nearly every State, even in those from whose schools the Bible has been excluded, the statute laws require moral training. In a christian land this should be considered a clear warrant for the use of the Bible, since morals cannot be taught without a moral

standard, and the Bible is the standard recognized by all christians. But facts show that this is not enough. Where the battle for the Bible has been lost it has been for want of a clear, unambiguous, legal provision for its use. The friends of Christian education are hereby admonished to strive for such a provision wherever it does not now exist. Hostile judges, members of school boards, or school superintendents, in the absence of such a provision, may banish the Bible from the schools in opposition to the wishes of the people. Public sentiment should rest satisfied with nothing less than a law safeguarding the Scriptures as the text-book on morals. But since State constitutions are sometimes interpreted as hostile to the Bible in the schools, Christian citizens should strive for the removal of the secularism of these constitutions. And since the National constitution by reason of its supreme position and imperial power tends to draw all laws, customs, and usages to itself, the people of all the States should unite in an effort to eliminate its secularism and to substitute for it a recognition of the Bible and of the Supreme Ruler of Nations Whom it reveals.

The ultimate aim in education lends its sanction to such a truly patriotic effort. That aim is not the mere acquisition of knowledge. Neither is it the mere furnishing of an equipment for a successful career in business or in one of the professions. Such materialistic aims result in rearing a class of shrewd criminals. Public schools are State institutions and are established for the State's own welfare. This can be secured only by making character the aim of the instruction given.

No public movement is more deserving of the support of christian patriots than the movement in behalf of christian education. None is fraught with greater blessings for our beloved country. None has a better prospect of success. This booklet shows what legal weapons are now in our hands for this work. It points out where such weapons are defective or are entirely wanting. It also indicates the lines of argument that have proved efficient in many a past controversy. May the Mediatorial Ruler of men and Nations use it for His own glory.

PITTSBURGH, PA., May 2, 1901.

OUR SYSTEM OF PUBLIC EDUCATION.

IS IT CHRISTIAN OR SECULAR?

BY REV. R. C. WYLIE, D. D.

In the year 1897 the school population of the United States was about 21,082,000. The number of pupils enrolled on the school registers was 14,652,492. In state normal schools, universities and other public educational institutions, there were enrolled 89,587 students. In denominational and private institutions there were enrolled 1,513,016.

In 1898 the school population was 21,458,294; the number of pupils enrolled, 15,038,636; the number in state normal schools, universities and other public educational institutions, 104,282; and the number in denominational and private institutions 1,554,725. These figures show a rapid increase.

In a few years these young people will be the men and women of our country, filling important positions in Church and State. Are the educational influences surrounding them such as will develop a strong Christian manhood and womanhood? To answer this question in so far as it relates to our public educational system is the task undertaken in these pages. It has become common to speak of this system as secular.

Hon. W. T. Harris, Commissioner of Education, in his report for 1896-'97 speaks as follows:

"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 closely 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. The secular institutions of man are organized as the family, civil society and the state. These provide for education, the procurement of the necessities of life, and the establishment of justice. But all these presuppose a deeper ground in the ideal of the origin and destiny of man and nature. They involve a world view. Hence all

people, whether connected with one or another denomination of Christians, or whether holding a religion other than Christian, or holding no conscious religion at all, must admit the importance of the religious instruction of the community. More than anything else the Sunday School has contributed to the sustenance of the church." [Vol. 1., p. xxiii]

Dr. Harris considers the matter of sufficient importance to warrant him in giving an elaborate report on Sabbath Schools.

Without entering into any discussion of the question as to what our schools originally were on the matter of religion and morals, without presenting any argument as to what they ought to be, without even presenting any definition of the word "secular" as applied to our educational system, the author of this pamphlet has set for himself the task of discovering and exhibiting the actual state of the case in the different States and Territories. To reach satisfactory conclusions every known and available source of information has been resorted to, and the results of the investigation are here presented.

I.

There are nine States, Georgia, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Massachusetts, Mississippi, New Jersey, North Dakota, South Dakota, in which the reading of the Bible in the schools rests securely on a legal basis, plainly written either in the State Constitution or in the school law.

GEORGIA.

The Georgia Common School Laws declare "that the County Board of Education shall prescribe, from time to time, what text books and books of reference shall be used in the common schools of the county: *provided*, that the Bible shall not be excluded from the common or public schools of the State; - - - *and provided further*, that the county boards shall not be permitted to introduce into the schools any text or miscellaneous book of a sectarian or sectional character." [School Laws, Sec. 21.]

INDIANA.

Indiana has the following clause in her Constitution: "Knowledge and learning generally diffused throughout a community being essential to the preservation of a free government, it shall be the duty of the General Assembly to encourage by all suitable means, moral, intellectual, scientific and agricultural improvement; and to provide by law for a general and uniform system of common schools, wherein tuition shall be without charge, and equally open to all." [Article VIII, Sec. 1.] The school law of Indiana [Chap. XIII, Sec. 154,] says, "The Bible shall not be excluded from the public schools of the State." On this law the Department of Education make the following annotations:

"The Bible, without note or comment, is installed in the common schools of Indiana. Its continuance as the moral class book in these nurseries of her future citizens will as surely mark the period of her prosperity and grace the zenith of her glory, as its exclusion would prove the precursor of her decline." "Our law, therefore, wisely leaves the whole matter of Bible reading and prayers with the good judgment and conscience of the teachers. To obligate them by contract to read the sacred Scriptures and hold prayers in their schools would be in exceedingly bad taste, if not sacrilegious; to refuse them the right, when they, in good faith and conscience, desire to do so would be the very worst of tyranny."

IOWA.

The Constitution of the State of Iowa says: "The General Assembly shall encourage, by all suitable means, the promotion of intellectual, scientific, moral and agricultural improvement." (Art. IX., Sec. 3.) The Iowa school laws declare that "The Bible shall not be excluded from any public school or institution in the State, nor shall any child be required to read it contrary to the wishes of his parent or guardian." [Sec. 2805.]

An important case was decided by the Supreme Court of Iowa at the September term of 1884. [Moore *vs.* Monroe *et al.*, 64 Iowa, 367.] The following extracts are of value:

"The plaintiff, as a resident and tax payer of the independent district of Bloomfield, and patron of the public school taught in the district, brought action against the teachers of the school and directors of the district, and prayed for an injunction to prevent the reading or repeating of the Bible or any part thereof, in the school, and to prevent the singing of religious songs in the school." The Court refused to grant an injunction, and from the order of refusal the plaintiff appealed. In rendering the decision the Supreme Court said:

"The record shows that the teachers of the school are accustomed to occupy a few minutes each morning in reading selections from the Bible, in repeating the Lord's prayer, and singing religious songs: that the plaintiff has two children in school, but they are not required to be present during the time thus occupied." After citing the law, the opinion continues: "Under this provision it is a matter of individual option with school teachers whether they will use the Bible in schools or not, such option being restricted only by the provision that no pupil shall be required to read it contrary to the wishes of his parent or guardian."

The plaintiff insisted that the law was unconstitutional. The Court said: "The plaintiff's position is, that, by the use of the school house

as a place for reading the Bible, repeating the Lord's prayer and singing religious songs, it is made a place of worship, and so his children are compelled to attend a place of worship, and he as a tax payer is compelled to pay taxes for building and repairing a place of worship.

"We can conceive that exercises like those described might be adopted with other views than those of worship, and possibly they are in the case at bar, but it is hardly to be presumed that this is wholly so. For the purpose of the opinion it may be conceded that the teachers do not intend to wholly exclude the idea of worship. But it seems to us that, if we should hold that it is made a place of worship within the meaning of the Constitution, we should put a very strained construction upon it. The object of the provision, we think, is, not to prevent the casual use of a public building as a place for offering prayer or doing acts of religious worship, but to prevent the enactment of a law whereby any person can be compelled to pay taxes for building or repairing any place designed to be used distinctively as a place of worship. The object, we think, was to prevent an improper burden. It is, perhaps, not to be denied that the principle carried out to its extreme logical results might be sufficient to sustain the appellant's position, yet we cannot think that the people of Iowa, in adopting the Constitution, had such extreme view in mind. The burden of taxation, by reason of the casual use of a public building for worship, is not appreciably greater. We do not think, indeed, that the plaintiff's objection grows out of the matter of taxation. We infer from his argument that his real objection is that the religious exercises are made a part of the educational system into which his children must be drawn, or made to appear singular, and perhaps be put to some inconvenience. But, so long as the plaintiff's children are not required to be in attendance at the exercises, we cannot regard the objection as one of great weight. Besides, if we regarded it as of greater weight than we do, we should have to say that we do not find anything in the Constitution or law upon which the plaintiff can properly ground his application for relief.

"Possibly the plaintiff is a propagandist, and regards himself charged with a mission to destroy the influence of the Bible. Whether this be so or not, it is sufficient to say that the courts are charged with no such mission. We think that the injunction was properly denied."

The Supreme Court affirmed the decision of the inferior court.

KANSAS.

The Constitution of Kansas declares that "The legislature shall encourage the promotion of intellectual, moral, scientific and agricultural improvement, by establishing a uniform system of common schools and schools of higher grade, embracing normal, preparatory, collegiate and

university departments." [Art. VI, Sec. 2]. The school laws of Kansas [Sec. 125], in providing for schools in cities of the first class, declare that "No sectarian or religious doctrine shall be taught or inculcated in the public schools of the city, but nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit the reading of the Holy Scriptures." Article 7, which treats of cities of the second class, says [Sec. 157], "No sectarian doctrine shall be taught or inculcated in any of the public schools of the city; but the Holy Scriptures, without note or comment, may be used therein."

The Kansas State Superintendent of Public Instruction, writes as follows: "In my judgment, a majority of the teachers in the State conduct religious exercises every day. Moral instruction is given generally." He also sends an opinion recently rendered. After quoting the two sections of the law given above, he says: "There is nothing in the statutes touching upon this subject concerning district schools. but, by implication, the same law will govern. It is evident that our law makers have not intended to prohibit the reading of the Scriptures in the public schools of the State, provided they are read without note or comment. The reading of the Scriptures would also permit the repeating of the Lord's prayer."

MASSACHUSETTS.

Massachusetts has a clause in her Constitution [Chap. V., Sec. 2], which says, "Wisdom and knowledge, as well as virtue, diffused generally among the body of the people, being necessary for the preservation of their rights and liberties," etc. The law in carrying out this provision of the Constitution [Chap. 44, Sec. 32,] says, "The school committee shall require the daily reading in the public schools of some portion of the Bible, without written note or oral comment; but they shall not require a pupil whose parent or guardian informs the teacher in writing that he has conscientious scruples against it, to read from any particular version, or to take any personal part in the reading. Nor shall they direct to be purchased or used in the public schools school books calculated to favor the tenets of any particular sect of Christians." The Supreme Court in an important decision upheld this law.

In the case of *Ellar R. Spiller vs. Inhabitants of Woburn* [12 Allen, Mass., p. 127], this Court held that "The school committee of a town may lawfully pass an order that the schools thereof shall be opened each morning with reading from the Bible and prayer, and that during the prayer each scholar shall bow the head unless his parents request that he shall be excused from doing so." "The Court declared that the regulation did not prescribe an act which was ne-

cessarily one of devotion or religious ceremony. It went no further than to require the observance of quiet and decorum during the religious services with which the school was opened. It did not compel a pupil to join in the prayer, but only to assume an attitude which was calculated to prevent interruption by avoiding all communication with others during the service."

The annotated edition of the public statutes of Massachusetts relating to education contains the following explanatory paragraphs:

"It is the settled policy of the State to require the use of the Bible in the public schools, and since the passage of the act of 1855, there have been but few objections made.

"The duty of the committees is performed if they require the Bible to be read by the teachers as a part of the morning devotional service. The law does not prescribe, as a rule from which there are to be no deviations, that every pupil who may be able to read the Bible shall be required to do so. In this respect a discretion is vested in the committees. No sectarian books are used in the schools."

The course of studies prepared under the Massachusetts Board of Education lays emphasis upon moral training. It declares that under the Massachusetts statutes, "it is plainly the duty of every school teacher to turn the attention of the pupils to the moral quality of their acts, and to lead them into a clear understanding and constant practice of every virtue." [P. 125.]

MISSISSIPPI.

The Mississippi State Constitution declares that "No religious test as a qualification for office shall be required; and no preference shall be given by law to any religious sect or mode of worship; but the free enjoyment of all religious sentiments and the different modes of worship shall be held sacred. The rights hereby secured shall not be construed to justify acts of licentiousness injurious to morals or dangerous to the peace and safety of the State or to exclude the holy Bible from use in any public school of this State." [Art. III, Sec. 18.]

NEW JERSEY.

The school law of New Jersey declares that "It shall not be lawful for any teacher, trustee or trustees to introduce into, or have performed in any school receiving its proportion of the public money, any religious service, ceremony or forms whatsoever, except reading the Bible and repeating the Lord's prayer."

Many of the cities of the State have rules requiring these exercises. In most of the schools throughout the State the Bible is regularly read.

NORTH DAKOTA.

The Constitution of North Dakota says that "A high degree of intel-

ligence, patriotism, integrity and morality on the part of every voter in a government by the people being necessary in order to secure the continuance of that government," etc. [Art. VIII, Sec. 152.] As to the reading of the Bible the North Dakota school law says: "The Bible shall not be deemed a sectarian book. It shall not be excluded from any public school. It may at the option of the teacher be read in school without sectarian comment, not to exceed ten minutes daily. No pupil shall be required to read it nor be present in the school room during the reading thereof contrary to the wishes of his parents or guardian or other person having him in charge. Moral instruction tending to impress upon the minds of the pupils the importance of truthfulness, temperance, purity, public spirit, patriotism, and respect for honest labor, obedience to parents and due deference to old age, shall be given by each teacher in the public schools." [School Laws of North Dakota, Art. XII, Sec. 734.]

SOUTH DAKOTA.

The South Dakota Constitution contains the following clause: "The stability of a republican form of government depending on the morality and intelligence of the people, it shall be the duty of the legislature to establish and maintain a general and uniform system of public schools," etc. [Art. VIII, Sec. 1.] The school law of the State declares that "Moral instruction, intending to impress upon the minds of the pupils the importance of truthfulness, temperance, purity, public spirit, patriotism, and respect for honest labor, obedience to parents, and due deference to old age, shall be given by every teacher in the public service of the State." [Chap. VI, Sec. 6.]

Concerning the Bible the law says: "No sectarian doctrine shall be taught or inculcated in any of the schools of the corporation; but the Bible without sectarian comment may be used therein." [Chap. X, Sec. 18.]

The corporation referred to in this section is any city, town or other independent district, as may be seen from the title of the chapter in which it occurs.

II.

There is a second list of States, twelve in number, in which, while there is no specific mention of the Bible in the Constitution or law, there are decisions of Courts and State School Superintendents, of an authoritative character, which give to the custom of Bible reading quite a secure legal status. These decisions and opinions, however, in many cases rest upon legal provisions for instruction in morals. Extracts from the Constitutions and the laws of these States are therefore given in such cases. The States here included are Arkansas, Idaho, Illinois, Maine, Michigan, Nebraska, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Utah, Vermont and West Virginia.

ARKANSAS.

The Constitution of Arkansas declares: "Religion, morality and knowledge being essential to good government," etc. [Art. II, Sec. 25.] In another place the following is found: "Intelligence and virtue being the safeguards of liberty, and the bulwark of free and good government, the State shall ever maintain a general, suitable and efficient system of free schools." [Art. XIV, Sec. 1.] Section 7074 of the school law says: "No teacher employed in any of the public schools shall permit sectarian books to be used as reading or text books in the school under his care." In the annotations on this section by Junius Jordan, Superintendent of Public Instruction, the position is taken that "The law leaves the discretion of reading or not reading the Bible with the school boards, and the courts have uniformly refused to restrain, coerce or interfere with the discretion." The decision of the Supreme Court of Wisconsin is quoted from and spoken of as deserving "the most careful study of all educators."

IDAHO.

Article IX of the Idaho State Constitution treats of "Education and School Lands." The following sections of this Article bear on the question now under discussion:

"Sec. 5. Neither the Legislature, nor any county, city, town, township, school district, or other public corporation, shall ever make any appropriation, or pay from any public funds or moneys whatever, any thing in aid of any church or religious society, or for any sectarian or religious purpose, or to help support or sustain any school, academy, seminary, college, university or other literary or scientific institution, controlled by any church or sectarian or religious denomination whatsoever; nor shall any grant or donation of land, money or other personal property ever be made by the State or any such public corporation to any church or for any sectarian or religious purpose.

"Sec. 6. No religious test or qualification shall ever be required of any person as a condition of admission into any public educational institution of the State, either as teacher or student; and no teacher or student of any such institution shall ever be required to attend or participate in any religious service whatever. No sectarian or religious tenets or doctrines shall ever be taught in the public schools, nor shall any distinction or classification of pupils be made on account of race or color. No books, papers, tracts or documents of a political, sectarian or denominational character shall be used or introduced in any schools established under the provisions of this Article; nor shall any teacher or any district receive any of the public school moneys in which the schools have not been taught in accordance with the provisions of this Article."

The school laws, in prescribing the duties of teachers, say that they are to "endeavor to impress upon the minds of the pupils the principles of morality, truth, justice and patriotism, and to teach them to avoid idleness, profanity and falsehood." [Sec. 89.]

Section 91 declares that "No books, papers, tracts or documents of a political, sectarian or denominational character must be used or introduced in any school established under the provisions of this Act, and any and every political, sectarian or denominational doctrine is hereby expressly forbidden to be taught therein," etc.

Section 134 treats of "General Duties and Powers of Boards of Trustees of Independent School Districts." The tenth is "To exclude from the schools and the school libraries of said district all books, tracts, papers and catechisms of a sectarian nature." The twelfth, "To protect the morals and health of the pupils while at school."

Article XVII relates to Lewiston State Normal School. Section 189 says, "The Board of Trustees in their regulations, and the principal and assistants in their supervision and government of said school, shall exercise a watchful guardianship over the morals of the pupils at all times during their attendance upon the same, but no religious or sectarian tests shall be adopted in said school."

Special attention is called to these provisions of the Constitution and statutes of Idaho, inasmuch as they have been commonly understood to exclude the Bible from the schools of that State. When the Constitution was framed this was the popular conception of its meaning. At one time the State Superintendent of Public Instruction said, "Our school law prohibits any reading of the Bible, or, at least, that is the recognized construction." Recently this opinion has been reversed, and the Superintendent now says, in answer to an inquiry concerning the legality of Bible reading, "The ruling of this office is that it may be." As to repeating the Lord's prayer, he says there is "no law against it.

ILLINOIS.

The Constitution of Illinois in providing for a system of free schools declares that "Neither the General Assembly nor any county, city, town, 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, university or other literary or scientific institution, controlled by any church or sectarian denomination whatever; nor shall any grant or donation of land, money or other personal property ever be made by the State or any such public corporation to any church or for any sectarian purpose." [Art. VIII, Sec. 3.]

The Superintendent of Public Instruction, in his report in 1895, said: "The value of the moral status of an educated citizenship, built upon the foundation of moral rectitude, can not be estimated in silver and gold, or any national currency, of whatever mould it may be." After speaking of the school population of the State and the expenditures for school purposes, he says: "But an outlay in this direction by State legislation will add to her future strength a sum not paid over the bank counters, but only estimated when the value of an educated Christian citizenship is realized." [P. 121.]

Article V, Section 26, Ninth, of the Illinois school law declares that "The directors shall direct what branches of study shall be taught, and what text books and apparatus shall be used in the schools, etc." Under this provision boards of directors have authority to prescribe the reading of the Bible and to require decorum on the part of the pupils during this exercise, as the following decision of the Supreme Court shows:

In the case of *Edward McCormick vs. Cora Burt et. al.*, filed at Ottawa, March 17, 1880, [95 Illinois, p. 263], the Court held that in an action on the case against school directors for suspending the plaintiff, a scholar in one of the public schools of which the defendants were directors, from all rights and privileges of such school until he should express a willingness to comply with a rule of the school which required such scholars as might be in attendance at the time set apart for reading the Bible in the school by the teacher to lay aside their books and keep quiet during that exercise, it was held to be a fatal defect in the declaration that it omitted to aver that in directing the suspension of the scholar from the privileges of the school the directors acted either wantonly or maliciously.

The section of the school law [48] which empowers the directors of each district to direct what branches are to be taught and what text books are to be used is quoted, and the Court declares that the presumption is that the defendants acted in good faith and that "the rule is certainly a reasonable one."

MAINE.

The Supreme Court of the State of Maine in its decision in the case of *Donahoe vs. Richards*, gave utterance to similar principles. In this case, action was brought by plaintiff, through her father, against the superintending school committee, to recover damages for maliciously, wrongfully, and unjustifiably, expelling her from one of the town schools of Ellsworth. The plaintiff was 15 years of age and was expelled for refusing to read in the school of which she was a member,

the Protestant version of the English Bible, which had previously been ordered to be used therein by the defendants.

"The questions involved in the decision of this case are their (the school committee's) liability, when acting in good faith in the discharge of their duty, to an action at the suit of the individual expelled, even if the exclusion was erroneous—their powers as to the selection of books to be used—their legal right to expel a scholar in case of a refusal to read in a book by them prescribed—the constitutionality of a regulation by which the Bible, or any version of it is designated as one of the books to be used."

"The right to prescribe the general course of instruction and to direct what books shall be used must exist somewhere. The Legislature have seen fit to repose the authority to determine this in the several superintending school committees. They may therefore rightfully exercise it."

"If the right to direct the course of instruction and the books to be used is given, the right to enforce obedience to the determining power must manifestly exist, or the determination will be ineffectual. It would be worse than idle to grant this power to direct, if any one can set at naught the action of the committee."

"The committee may enforce obedience to all regulations within the scope of their authority. If they may select a book they may require the use of the book selected. If the plaintiff may refuse reading in one book she may in another, unless from some cause she is exempted from the duty of obedience. If she may decline to obey one requirement, rightfully made, then she may another, and the discipline of the school is at an end."

"The plaintiff seeks to avoid these conclusions by denying that the book selected was one in which she could be constitutionally compelled to read upon pain of expulsion, in case of her refusal to obey. She claims exemption from the general duty of obedience, from the particular character of the book in which she was required to read. The question is therefore, if the Legislature should by statute direct any version of the Bible to be read in schools, and should impose the penalty of expulsion in the case of refusal, such statute would be a violation of the Constitution. The use of the Bible is not prohibited by any express language of the Constitution. Is its use for that purpose in opposition to the spirit and intention of that instrument? If it be not, if it be a book which may be directed within the spirit and meaning of the Constitution, to be used in schools, it is obvious that its use may be required of all; for a regulation which any scholar may violate with impunity would cease to have the force and effect of a rule."

"The Court finds that the superintending school committee directed that the English Protestant version should be used in all the public schools of Ellsworth, and that all who were of sufficient capacity to read therein should be required to read that version in school. This is the requisition of which complaint is made.

"The common schools are not for the purpose of instruction in the theological doctrines of any religion, or of any sect. The State regards no one sect as superior to any other - and no theological views as peculiarly entitled to precedence. It is no part of the duty of the instructor to give theological instruction—and if any peculiar tenet of any particular sect were so taught, it would furnish a well grounded cause of complaint on the part of those who entertained different or opposing religious sentiments.

"But the instruction here given is not in fact, and is not alleged to have been, in articles of faith. No theological doctrines were taught. The creed of no sect was affirmed or denied. The truth or falsehood of the book in which the scholars were required to read was not asserted. No interference by way of instruction with the views of the scholars, whether derived from parental or sacerdotal authority, is shown.

"The Bible was used merely as a book in which instruction in reading was given. But reading the Bible is no more an interference with religious belief than would reading the mythology of Greece or Rome be regarded as interfering with religious belief or an affirmation of the pagan creeds."

"It is made [by C. 193, Sec. 2, Art. 7], the duty of all the instructors of youth, whether in public or private institutions 'to take diligent care and exert their best endeavors to impress on the minds of children and youth committed to their care and instruction the principles of morality and justice, and a sacred regard to truth, love to their country, humanity and universal benevolence, sobriety, industry and frugality, chastity, moderation and temperance, and all other virtues, which are the ornaments of human society.' It will not be insisted that this duty, so beautifully set forth, is other than in entire conformity with the Constitution. Neither is it claimed that the Bible, in any of its translations, is averse to sound morality or those virtues here designated as proper to be inculcated.

"The plaintiff, indeed, makes no objection to the Bible as a book which she may not rightfully be required to read in school, but only to a particular translation. Indeed, the report finds that she was willing to read from the Douay version."

"The Catholics deny the accuracy of portions of the version commonly used by Protestants. The Protestants assert that in some

aspects the Douay version is erroneous. Different sects of Protestants express dissatisfaction, in some instances, with both. The adoption of one is no authoritative sanction of purity of text or accuracy of translation. School committees could rarely be found competent to settle these questions. It is simply the adoption of a particular version of a work, which from the idiomatic English of the translation, and the sublime morality of its teachings, furnishes the best illustration which the language affords of pure English undefiled, and is best fitted to strengthen the morals and promote the virtues which adorn and dignify social life.

"The controversy seems to resolve itself into the inquiry whether there is anything in the Constitution which, in case of different translations of a work fitting and proper for schools, forbids the requirement of the use of a particular version as a reading book by those who may conscientiously believe it to have been, in some respects, erroneously made. If so, it is obvious that the particular version must be entirely prohibited, for if the plaintiff has a constitutional right to be absolved from a regulation of the school requiring its reading, because it is in conflict with her religious conscientious belief, it is not easily to perceive why she has not an equally valid ground of objection to hearing it read. If so, as others may have their consciences, it follows, not merely that no translation of the Bible can be used, but that no book can be used which may contain any proposition opposed to the conscientious belief of any scholar." The clauses of the Constitution of Maine on which the plaintiff relied are then quoted, and the Court held that they do not give any such right.

The Court held that "the duties imposed upon the superintending school committee, as to expelling scholars from a public school, partake of a judicial character, and for an *honest* though *erroneous* discharge of them, they are not liable to a suit for damages to the person expelled.

"With such committee, the Legislature have reposed the power of directing the general course of instruction, and what books shall be used in the schools, and they may rightfully enforce obedience to all the regulations by them made, within the sphere of their authority. For a refusal to read from a book thus prescribed, the committee may, if they see fit, expell such disobedient scholar. No scholar can escape or evade such requirement when made by the committee, under plea that his *conscience* will not allow the reading of such book. Nor can the ordinance be nullified because the church of which the scholar is a member hold, and have so instructed its members, that it is a *sin* to read the book prescribed.

"A law is not unconstitutional because it may prohibit what one may *conscientiously* think right, or require what he may *conscientiously* think wrong.

"A requirement by the superintending school committee, that the Protestant version of the Bible shall be read in the public schools of their town by the scholars who are able to read, is in violation of no constitutional provision, and is binding upon all the members of the school, although composed of diverse *religious sects*." [38 Maine, 389-413.]

MICHIGAN.

The General School Laws of Michigan forbid the applying by school districts of "any of the moneys received by it . . . for the support and maintenance of any school of a sectarian character, whether the same be under the control of any religious society or made sectarian by the school district board." [Chap. VIII, Sec. 11.] The "State Manual and Course of Study for the District Schools of Michigan" is prefaced by this quotation from the ordinance of 1787: "Religion, morality and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall ever be encouraged." On "Morals and Manners" this book says: "The Golden Rule is the basis of all good manners." "Since an educated rascal is a much worse enemy to society than an ignorant one, education without morality is a curse. All teaching should therefore possess the vital elements of morality; not that every lesson or day's work should have a moral tacked upon it, but back of the teacher's every look, word and act there should be purity and honesty. Character in the teacher will develop character in the pupil." [P. 129.]

On the 6th of December, 1898, a most important decision was rendered by the Supreme Court of Michigan, in the case of Pfeiffer vs Board of Education of the City of Detroit. [Brooks 118, pp. 560-599.] This decision shows such a thorough investigation of the whole matter at issue and is so clear, pointed, and logical, that it is given entire. In this decision, rendered by Justice Montgomery, Chief Justice Grant and Judges Hooker and Long concurred.

The relator applied to the Circuit Court of Wayne county to compel the respondent to discontinue the use of a certain book, known as "Readings from the Bible," in the public schools of Detroit. The answer of respondent contains the following statement, which we quote: "It is not true that said book is devoted almost entirely or principally to the subject of religion, to the subject of relations of man to Almighty God, or to the subject of worshipping God, or to all these subjects, but this respondent says that said book is, for the greater part, made up of moral precepts affirming and emphasizing the moral obligations laid down in the Ten Commandments, and which are intended

merely to inculcate good morals,—that is, our duty to each other,—which ought to be understood and practiced by every good citizen, and concerning the fundamental principles of which the religious sects do not disagree. No teacher in said schools is required by law to give instructions from the last said book, except such as is absolutely necessary for the use of the same as a supplementary text-book of reading, and that no teacher is by said board allowed to make note or comment upon anything in said book contained. And, further, that said book is used as a supplementary text book on reading, as aforesaid, and not otherwise.” “It has never been the purpose nor intention of said board to require of the pupils of the grammar grades in said school to listen to the readings from said book, and on the contrary, avers that such readings take place at the close of the sessions of said schools, and that any and all pupils, by the order of said board, are excused therefrom upon the application of either their parents or guardians; and further says that said superintendent is not vested with, nor is he authorized to exercise, any discretion whatever in the matter, but is required, under and by rules of the board, to excuse any and all pupils from being present at such readings whenever an application therefor is made by the parents or guardians of such pupil or pupils.” The contention of relator is that the action of the board is forbidden by the Constitution of the State. The provisions touching this question are as follows (article 4):

“Sec. 39. The Legislature shall pass no law to prevent any person from worshipping Almighty God according to the dictates of his own conscience, or compel any person to attend, erect or support any place of religious worship, or to pay tithes, taxes or other rates for the support of any minister of the gospel or teacher of religion.

“Sec. 40. No money shall be appropriated or drawn from the treasury for the benefit of any religious sect or society, theological or religious seminary, nor shall property belonging to the State be appropriated for any such purpose.

“Sec. 41. The Legislature shall not diminish or enlarge the civil or political rights, privileges and capacities of any person on account of his opinion or belief concerning matters of religion.”

The precise question is not whether the pupil can be compelled to attend religious exercises, nor necessarily whether the reading of the Bible, or an extract from it, constitutes religious worship, but whether such reading of extracts from the Bible, at which reading pupils whose faith or scruples are shocked by hearing the passages read are not required to attend, constitutes the teacher a teacher of religion, or amounts to a restriction of civil or political rights or privileges of such students as do not attend upon the exercises. Is the reading of extracts taken from the Bible a violation of the provision of the Constitution which inhibits the diminishing or enlargement of the civil or political rights, privileges, and capacities of the individual on account of his opinion or belief concerning matters of religion? We do not think it can be maintained that this section has any application to this subject. The primary purpose of this provision was to exclude religious tests, and to place all citizens on an equality before the law as to the exercise of the franchise of voting or holding office. The language is inapt to be applied as restricting the use of school rooms or school funds. It might be said that many of the scholars in our schools are not in position to avail themselves of the opportunity to study the dead languages. Is it therefore an unjust discrimination to provide for

instruction in Latin and Greek for such pupils as are able to devote their time to those studies? Does it harm one who does not, for conscientious reasons, care to listen to readings from the Bible, that others are given the opportunity to do so? Is it not intolerant for one not required to attend to object to such readings? It may be said, of course, that the services of the teacher while engaged in these exercises are paid out of the fund in which all are entitled to share; but the same is true of the time which the teacher devotes to the languages, or instruction in higher mathematics. Does it follow that the civil rights or privileges of the students who do not accept teaching in those branches, or those who do, have been, on the one hand, diminished, or, on the other, enlarged? I do not think it should be so held. Nor has section 40 any other appropriate application. This section has a very plain meaning, which is that the public money may not be turned over to a religious sect to maintain churches or seminaries; and unless the readings from the Bible, or selections from the Bible, constitute the public school a religious or theological seminary, this section has not, in my judgment, any application. As is stated in the opinion of the learned circuit judge, the most significant provision is section 39, and the meritorious question is whether any student or any taxpayer has been compelled to attend, erect or support a place of religious worship, or to pay tithes, taxes or other rates for the support of any minister of the gospel or teacher of religion. In determining this question, we should endeavor to place ourselves in the position of the framers of the Constitution, and ascertain what was meant at the time; for, if we are successful in doing this, we have solved the question of its meaning for all time. It could not mean one thing at the time of its adoption, and another thing to-day, when public sentiments have undergone a change. *McPherson vs. Secretary of State*, 92 Mich. 377, 52 N. W. 469. It is therefore essential that we determine the intent of this provision by reference to the state of the law or custom previously existing, and by the contemporaneous construction, rather than attempt to test its meaning by the so-called advanced or liberal views obtaining among a large class of the community at the present day.

A similar provision was introduced into the convention of 1835. This provision was as follows: "Every person has a right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience and no person can of right be compelled to attend, erect or support against his will any place of religious worship or pay tithes, taxes or other rates for the support of any minister of the gospel or teacher of religion." As is pointed out in the brief of the learned counsel for the respondent (to whom we are much indebted for a most laborious and careful research into the historical origin of this provision), the provision was doubtless taken from the Virginia Constitution of 1830. It is clearly shown by that research that the inhabitants of that commonwealth were by statute compelled to attend upon divine service; ministers were, in public statutes, referred to as "teachers of religion." In 1784 a statute making provision for the support of ministers of the established church was introduced, under the title of "A bill to establish a provision for teachers of the Christian religion." This statute was repealed by a general statute adopted in 1786, entitled "An act for establishing religious freedom," the preamble of which clearly shows that the term "teacher of religion" was used as synonymous with "minister." The Constitution of 1830 was but an embodiment of this enactment in the organic law of the State. Can it be said that the adoption of this provision into our

Constitution of 1835 was intended to have a wider scope? I think not. It is significant that this Constitution was adopted in pursuance to authority conferred by article 5 of the articles of compact contained in the ordinance of 1787 (*Scott vs. Society*, 1 Doug. 122), which gave to the people of the territory a right to form a constitution in conformity with the principles contained in the articles. 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 shall 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,—particularly as the provision when traced to its historic origin, is shown to have been aimed at quite another evil. In my opinion, this provision, when incorporated into our organic law, meant simply that the inhabitants of the State should not be required to attend upon those church services which the people of Virginia had been by this same enactment relieved from, and that no one should be compelled to pay tithes or other rates for the support of ministers. If this meaning attached at that time, it has not been changed since. I do not wish to be understood as assenting to the proposition that the ordinance of 1787 makes it imperative that religion shall be taught in the public schools. It was doubtless the opinion of the framers of that great document that public schools would of necessity tend to foster religion. But the extent to which I go is to say that 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 the Constitution, “in conformity with the principles contained in the ordinance,” intended, in the absence of a clear expression to that effect, to exclude wholly from the schools all reference to the Bible. I should certainly mistrust my judgment if it led me to a different conclusion, and on the best of grounds. The return in this case shows that since the admission of this State into the Union, a period of more than half a century, the practice has obtained in all the State institutions of learning of not only reading from the Bible in the presence of students, but of offering prayer; that the text books used in the public schools of the State have contained extracts from the Bible, and numerous references to Almighty God and his attributes; and all this without objection from any source. These usages we may also take judicial notice of. In a doubtful case, involving any other question than one which appeals so strongly to the prejudices of men, would not this universal usage, extending over so long a period, be deemed decisive by every one as a practical construction made by the administrative branch of government? Judge Cooley, in his *Constitutional Limitations* (page 67), says: “When a particular construction has been generally accepted as correct, and especially when it has occurred contemporaneously with the adoption of the constitution, and by those who had an opportunity to understand the extent of the instrument, it is not to be denied that a strong presumption exists that the Constitution rightly interpreted the intention.” See, also, *McPherson vs. Secretary of State*, 92 Mich. 293, 52 N. W. 469, and cases cited. In treating of the effect of the provision in the several State constitutions corresponding to that under discussion, Judge Cooley, in the work above cited, says, at page 470: “The American constitutions contain no provisions which prohibit the authorities from such solemn

recognition of a superintending Providence in public transactions and enterprises as the religious sentiment of mankind inspire, and as seems meet and proper in finite beings. Whatever may be the shade of religious belief, all must acknowledge the importance of recognizing in important human affairs the superintending care and control of the great Governor of the Universe, and of acknowledging with thanksgiving His boundless favors, or bending in contrition when visited with the penalties of His broken laws. No principle of constitutional law is violated when thanksgiving or fast days are appointed, when chaplains are designated for the army and navy, when legislative sessions are opened with prayer or the reading of the Scriptures, or when religious teaching is encouraged by the general exemption of the houses of religious worship from taxation for the support of the government." The weight of the authority of the adjudicated cases sustains the contention of the learned counsel for the defendant. The subject came before the Supreme Court of Maine as early as 1854. The question arose as to whether the Constitution prohibited the reading of the Bible in the public schools, in *Donahue vs. Richards*, 38 Me. 398. The provisions of the Maine Constitution are substantially different from ours, and the decision, not, therefore, necessarily decisive. For its force as an argument, however, we quote the following language from pages 398, 399: "The common schools are not for the purpose of instruction in the theological doctrines of any religion or of any sect. The State regards no one sect as superior to any other, and no theological views as peculiarly entitled to precedence. It is no part of the duty of the instructor to give theological instruction, and, if the peculiar tenets of any particular sect were so taught, it would furnish a well-grounded cause of complaint on the part of those who entertained different or opposite religious sentiments. But the instruction here given is not in fact, and is not alleged to have been, in articles of faith. No theological doctrines were taught. The creed of no sect was affirmed or denied. The truth or falsehood of the book in which the scholars are required to read was not asserted. No interference, by way of instruction, with the views of the scholars, whether derived from parental or sacerdotal authority, is shown. The Bible was used merely as a book in which instruction in reading was given. But reading the Bible is no more an interference with religious belief than would reading the mythology of Greece or Rome be regarded as interfering with religious belief or affirming the pagan creeds. A chapter in the Koran might be read, yet it would not be an affirmation of the truth of Mohammedanism, or an interference with religious faith. The Bible was used merely as a reading book, and for the information contained in it, as the Koran might be, and not for religious instruction. If suitable for that, it was suitable for the purpose for which it was selected. No one was required to believe, or punished for disbelief, either in its inspiration or want of inspiration, in the fidelity of the translation or in its inaccuracy, or in any set of doctrines deducible or not deducible therefrom." Article 1, Sec. 3, of the Constitution of Iowa, is as follows: "The General Assembly shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; nor shall any person be compelled to attend any place of worship, pay tithes, taxes, or other rates for building, repairing places of worship, or for the maintenance of any minister or ministry." I have endeavored to show that "religious teacher," when used in our Constitution, is synonymous with "minister." If I have been successful in this, the provision of the Iowa Constitution is, in substance, identical

with section 39 of article 4 of our Constitution. In *Moore vs. Monroe*, 64 Iowa, 367, 20 N. W. 475, the Supreme Court of Iowa had occasion to consider this provision, and it was held not violated by the reading of the Bible in the public schools. See, also, *Nessle vs. Hum*, 1 Ohio, N. P. 140; *Spiller vs. inhabitants of Woburn*, 12 Allen, 127. Contra, *State vs. District Board of School Dist. No. 8*, 76 Wis. 177, 44 N. W. 967.

In my opinion, the reading of the extracts from the Bible in the manner indicated by the return, without comment, is not in violation of any Constitutional provision. I am not able to see why extracts from the Bible should be proscribed, when the youths are taught no better authenticated truths of profane history. The order of the Circuit Court should be reversed.

NEBRASKA.

Nebraska has a clause in her Constitution concerning sectarian instruction which reads as follows: "No sectarian instruction shall be allowed in any school or institution supported in whole or in part by the public funds set apart for educational purposes, nor shall the State accept any grant, conveyance or bequest of money, lands or other property to be used for sectarian purposes." [Art. VIII., Sec. 2.] The Superintendent of Public Instruction says that moral instruction is given in the schools of Nebraska, that religious songs are sung, and that in many schools the Bible is read, the Lord's prayer repeated, and the Ten Commandments recited.

In 1899 the question as to the legality of these exercises was raised and brought before the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. In an opinion given November 25th of that year, he says: "The Bible surely cannot be considered as falling within the category of sectarian books. Indeed the Bible is the rarest and richest book in the department of thought and imagination which exists. In its poetry, its history, its oratory, and its logic it rises into the solitude of matchless preeminence. It is a library in itself. It has been the inspiration of more literature than any ten thousand other books put together." The opinion closes as follows: "Section 4, Article I, of the Constitution of Nebraska recognizes religion, morality and knowledge as being essential to good government. I am therefore of the opinion that in this enlightened age and Christian land the public school teacher ought not to be deprived of reading, without written or oral comment, the Bible, or of repeating the Lord's prayer.

The case was taken to the civil court and the opinion of the Superintendent was sustained.

NEW YORK.

Article IX of the Constitution of New York treats of "Provision for maintenance of free schools." Section 4 of this article declares that "Neither the State nor any subdivision thereof shall use its property or credit or any public money, or authorize or permit either to be

used, directly or indirectly, in aid or maintenance, other than for examination or inspection, of any school or institution of learning wholly or in part under the control or direction of any religious denomination, or in which any denominational tenets or doctrine is taught."

Hon. Charles P. Skinner, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, writes as follows: "There is no provision in the school law of this State in reference to moral instruction. We assume that all teachers who aspire to teach children will exert a moral influence upon their pupils in all their relations with them. I am aware that this assumption is not always borne out, but as a rule the teachers of this State do exert a constant healthful moral influence. Our school laws make no reference to the reading of the Bible, the repetition of the Lord's prayer or the recitation of the Ten Commandments; neither does it make any reference to the singing of religious songs."

"The general law which created Greater New York contains a provision in the educational chapter providing for the reading of the Bible in the schools of that city." Mr. Skinner writes that they are agitating a revision of the school laws of the State, which revision will embody a provision for teaching "good morals, and for this purpose the Bible may be read either as a part of the school exercises or otherwise, such reading to be from any version, but must be without note or comment."

The New York State superintendents of public instruction have repeatedly rendered decisions in favor of Bible reading.

PENNSYLVANIA.

The Constitution of Pennsylvania declares that "No money raised for the support of the public schools of the Commonwealth shall be appropriated to or used for the support of any sectarian school." [Art. X, Sec. 2.]

The decision of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of the Commonwealth is as follows: "The Scriptures come under the head of text-books, and they should not be omitted from the list. The common school is no place for controversy or the implanting of the habit of it, neither on religious or political subjects; much less for books or lectures of questionable morality." [The Common School Laws of Pennsylvania and Decisions of the Superintendent. Page 146.]

The law declares "That no teacher in any public school of this Commonwealth shall wear in said school or whilst engaged in the performance of his or her duty as such teacher any dress, mark, emblem or insignia indicating the fact that such teacher is a member or adherent of any religious order, sect or denomination." [Pennsylvania School Laws, CXXXV., p 133.]

For the year ending June 7, 1897, Dr. N. C. Schaeffer, Superintendent of Public Instruction, reported that of the 18,565 schools in the Commonwealth, the Bible is read in 15,980.

RHODE ISLAND.

The Rhode Island law relating to moral instruction is as follows: "Every teacher shall aim to implant and cultivate in the minds of all children committed to his care the principles of morality and virtue." [Chap. 61, Sec. 7.] The General Assembly of Rhode Island at the May session of 1876 passed the following resolution: "Resolved (the Senate concurring), That the Commissioner of Public Schools be instructed to report to the General Assembly, at the next January session, whether any and what means are used in the public schools 'to implant and cultivate in the minds of all children therein, the principles of morality and virtue,' as provided in section 6 of chapter 54 of the General Statutes." In accordance with this action, Thomas B. Stockwell, Commissioner of Public Schools, presented a report in which he says: "It needs, however, but a survey of the various reports of the school committees of the several cities and towns in the State for the last few years, and especially for the past year, to show conclusively that the school authorities throughout the State are deeply alive to the importance of the subject, and that they are ready and anxious to take as advanced ground in the matter as the sentiment of their respective constituencies will permit, and that now they are exerting a constant influence in all directions, upon both teacher and pupil, in order to bring them up to a higher moral level."

"Of the means used to secure moral and virtuous development, we naturally consider the Bible first. As a result of my inquiries on this subject, I have received information from all but two of the thirty-six cities and towns in the State. I find that in ten towns the reading of the Bible is required by a rule of the committee; that in five it is simply recommended by them; that in six either the reading of the Bible or a prayer, generally the Lord's prayer, is required; while in one town 'some moral or religious exercise' is made obligatory."

"Passing now from rule to practice, I find from the testimony of the several town superintendents that not only in those towns where there is a specific rule or recommendation, but also in all of the others, it is almost the universal custom to open the daily session with some form of devotional exercise, of which the reading of the Scriptures forms generally an important part, and often the whole. As a result of my own observation, I have noticed that it is now much more common than formerly for the teacher to read the Scripture selection alone, instead of making the exercise a concert or responsive one. This course

I believe to be the best calculated to produce the desired impression upon the minds and hearts of the pupils. It will thus be seen that there are but few schools in the State wherein the pupils are not brought into daily contact with the Scriptures, the fountain of all truth, the source of all virtue, the essence of all morality." [Thirty-second Annual Report of the Commissioner of Public Schools of Rhode Island. Jan., 1877, pp. 110, 111.] The Commissioner says, "A second instrumentality employed in some of our schools is a text-book entitled 'Morals and Manners,' which seems to me to cover the ground quite fully, and to be adapted to the needs of both teacher and pupil."

Writing under date of November 23d, 1898, Mr. Stockwell, who made the report quoted from above, and who still fills the same office, says of the report, "Though it was over twenty years ago, I doubt, if I were to be called on now to report on the same subject, whether I should want to amend it in any essential particular. The situation has changed but very little."

UTAH.

The Constitution of Utah says "The Legislature shall provide for the establishment and maintenance of a uniform system of public schools, which shall be open to all the children of the State, and free from sectarian control." [Art. X., Sec. 1.] The Utah School Law contains the following clause: "No atheistic, infidel, sectarian, religious, or denominational doctrine shall be taught in any of the district schools of this State. Moral instruction tending to impress upon the minds of the pupils the importance of good manners, truthfulness, temperance, purity, patriotism and industry, shall be given in every district school, and all such schools shall be free from sectarian control." [Chap. 7, Sec. 12.] In her book entitled "The Nation's Book in the Nation's Schools," Mrs. Elizabeth B. Cook gives a letter from Hon. John R. Park, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, in which he says: "While morality is taught and inculcated in all the public schools of this State, the Bible is not read in any of them. The belief seems to be quite wide spread here that moral instruction in the public schools should be wholly non-sectarian and many believe it to be impossible to introduce the Bible in the schools without at the same time removing one of the strongest guards against sectarianism." [Pp. 73, 74.] A communication from Mr. Park, received recently, states that the Bible, without comment, is read.

VERMONT.

The Constitution of Vermont declares that "Laws for the encouragement of virtue and prevention of vice and immorality ought to be constantly kept in force and duly executed; and a competent number of

schools ought to be maintained in each town, for the convenient instruction of youth; and one or more grammar schools shall be incorporated and properly supported in each county in this State. And all religious societies, or bodies of men, that may be hereafter united or incorporated for the advancement of religion and learning, or for other pious and charitable purposes, shall be encouraged and protected in the enjoyment of the privileges, immunities, and estates, which they in justice ought to enjoy, under such regulations as the General Assembly of this State shall direct." [Chap. II, Sec. 41.]

The school law of Vermont provides that "In every town there shall be kept for at least twenty-eight weeks in each year, at the expense of said town, by a teacher or teachers of competent ability and of good morals, a sufficient number of schools for the instruction of all the children who may legally attend the public schools therein; and all pupils shall be instructed in good behavior, reading, writing, etc." [Sec. 683.]

Hon. Mason S. Stone, State Superintendent of Education, says that "The Bible is read in nearly every school. The Lord's prayer and Bible verses are quite generally recited." In speaking of the common school studies, Mr. Stone, in his report for 1896, says, "Each subject enumerated is focussed to accomplish a certain work and to have a definite effect upon the child. Arithmetic and geography are for business purposes, reading and grammar for social relations, history and constitution for civil duties, physiology for personal care, and all for good behavior.

"Intellectual products mature earlier, and are most manifest, and are more easily secured than moral products. Because this is so, there is a dangerous tendency to direct the forces of the school room to the cultivation of the mental forces alone. Character is the end and should be pre-empted in childhood; hence the need of positive moral instruction,—not by a number of precepts given nor by moral conclusions drawn by the teacher, but by positive example, with inferences made and judgments formed by the children. A complete substantial education can be secured only by the expansion of the moral nature commensurate with the intellectual faculties. Character is as necessary and vital to success and happiness in life as intellectual attainment; it is as necessary that a man feel right, choose right and act right as to know right. All the subjects of our school curriculum have a bearing upon the betterment of the child, although we are accustomed to consider them only in their intellectual bias and worth." [Pp. 123, 124.] He closes his report with these words: "The educational idea of the past was the communication of knowledge; to-day it is rather

the acquisition of power and building of character, the training of the child so that it may grow consciously toward the Divine. This is the State's highest duty; doing it, Vermont will still continue to challenge the admiration and win recognition by the products of her public schools."

The course of study for the elementary schools of Vermont contains the following: "Our law requires that instruction in good behavior be given in the public schools, and very properly places it in the list of school subjects. Good behavior includes manners and morals. Instruction in *morals* has reference to the cultivation of the various virtues; the school virtues—punctuality and regularity in attendance, industry and silence in work, neatness and honesty in character of work, prompt and cheerful obedience in all things right; certain virtues of a personal nature, as purity in thought, word and deed, thoughtfulness with self, manliness; . . . temperance, charity, justice, patriotism, love of truth."

Mr. Stone favors the reading of the Bible in the Vermont schools.

WEST VIRGINIA.

The Constitution of West Virginia makes it the duty of the Legislature to "foster and encourage, by a system of free schools, moral, intellectual, scientific and agricultural improvement." [Article XII., Sec. 12.]

The West Virginia School Journal of May, 1898, contains the following concerning the decision of the Supreme Court of that State, rendered April 6, 1898, as to the Bible in the schools. In this case the decision was not written: "The Supreme Court has decided that the reading of the King James version of the Bible in the public schools can not be prohibited. In the case of *Kennedy vs. the Board of Education of Grant District, in Marion county*, on an application for a writ of mandamus to compel the Board of Education to discontinue the reading of the Bible in the public schools, the Court refused to award the writ and dismissed the rule. The court was evenly divided, Judges English and Brannon being for awarding the writ, and Judges Dent and McWhorter being against it. The former held that the Bible was not an authorized text-book, and therefore could not be read in the public schools, while the latter held that there was no law upon the subject, and that the Supreme Court could not by any rule or decision make a law. It could neither compel the reading of the Bible nor prohibit it."

III.

There is a third list of States in which there are none of the legal safeguards mentioned above, but in which the custom of Bible reading prevails, being supported by

long established usage and public sentiment. Clauses from the Constitutions and school laws of these States are quoted when considered of sufficient importance. The States here included are Alabama, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Kentucky, Maryland, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Wyoming, besides the Territory of Oklahoma.

ALABAMA.

The Alabama Constitution has the following clause: "No money raised for the support of the public schools of the State shall be appropriated to or used for the support of any sectarian or denominational school." [Art. XIII., Sec. 8.] The reading of the Bible is practiced in part of the schools of the State.

COLORADO.

The Constitution of Colorado, [Article IX, Section 8], declares that "Neither the General Assembly, nor any city, town, township, school district or other public corporation, shall ever make any appropriation, or pay from any public fund or moneys whatever, anything in aid of any church or sectarian society, or for any sectarian purpose, or to help support or sustain any school, academy, seminary, college, university or other literary or scientific institution, controlled by any church or sectarian denomination whatever; nor shall any grant or donation of land, money, or other personal property, ever be made by the State, or any such public corporation, to any church, or for any sectarian purpose."

Section 51 of the school law enumerates the "Powers of School Boards." The eleventh of these is "to exclude from schools and school libraries all books, tracts, papers and other publications of an immoral or pernicious tendency."

The Superintendent of Public Instruction, says that "Moral instruction forms an important part of the course in the public schools of Colorado. In some schools the Bible is read, but not if any objections are made. In some schools the Lord's prayer is repeated, if there is no objection offered to such exercises."

CONNECTICUT.

Neither the Constitution nor the laws of Connecticut contain anything specific on the reading of the Bible or moral instruction in the schools of the State. The unwritten Constitution, however, favors and supports the practice. Hon. Charles D. Hine says that "In most schools the Bible is read." "In most schools the Lord's prayer is repeated." "In many schools religious songs are sung." There are no judicial decisions on the question. But little opposition has ever been manifested to the custom. The following extracts from Mr. Hine's report for 1898 will throw light on the attitude of Connecticut

concerning this question : "At a meeting of the Connecticut State Teachers' Association, held October 16, 1896, it was voted that the Secretary of the State Board of Education be requested to appoint a committee to arrange for the celebration of the eighty-seventh birthday of Dr. Henry Barnard. Under the provision of this vote a committee was appointed, and "a programme was finally adopted which was carried out on the 27th of January, 1897." Wm G. Sumner of Yale University was one of the speakers. In his address he said : "We warn ourselves, and we are warned by all our critics, that education is something far different from schooling. The faith in book-learning is one of the superstitions of the nineteenth century, and it enters for a large part into the bequest which the nineteenth century is about to hand over to the twentieth. On the walls of our schoolroom our teacher had pasted up in large letters, 'Knowledge is power.' Yes, that is what knowledge is. It is power and nothing more. As a power it is like wealth, talent or any power ; that is, it is without any moral element whatever. The moral question always comes in when we ask, in respect to the man who has power, What will he do with it? It is so of wealth. . . . The same is true of talent. The same is true of any other power. It is true of Knowledge. The man who has it is equipped for action both with tools and weapons. What will he do with it? He may simply be a far more efficient and harmful rascal than he would be without it. If he chooses he may be by virtue of it, far more useful to himself, his children and his country than he would be without it."

Francis W. Parker, President of the Cook County Normal School, Chicago, at the same meeting said, "The common school is divine, because it is the only place where religion, pure and undefiled, where the spirit of the Master can be fully exercised."

DELAWARE.

The Delaware State Constitution in providing for an educational system says, "No portion of any fund now existing, or which may hereafter be appropriated, or raised by tax, for educational purposes, shall be appropriated to or used by, or in aid of any sectarian, church, or denominational school." [Art. X., Sec. 3.]

The Superintendent of the schools of Wilmington says : "The Bible is read daily in all the schools of this city, and so far as I know in all the schools of the State ; it is read without note or comment ; in all of the schools hymns and sacred songs are sung, and in most of them the Lord's prayer is repeated." At the present time there is no State Superintendent. But a former Superintendent said : "I think I am

safe in saying that Bible reading, at opening of school, is well-nigh or quite universal in Delaware schools."

FLORIDA.

The State of Florida has the following clause in its Constitution : "No law shall be enacted authorizing the diversion or the lending of any county or district school funds, or the appropriation of any part of the permanent or available school fund to any other than school purposes ; nor shall the same, or any part thereof, be appropriated to or used for the support of any sectarian school." [Art. XII., Sec. 13].

The eleventh of the duties and powers of county boards of public instruction is, "To prescribe, in consultation with prominent teachers, a course of study for the schools of the county and grade them properly; and to require to be taught in every public school in the county over which they preside, elementary physiology, especially as it relates to the effects of alcoholic stimulants and narcotics, morally, mentally and physically," etc. :

The State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Hon. Wm. N. Sheats, says that "Most Christian teachers read short lessons from the Bible, and open their schools with prayer daily."

KENTUCKY.

Section 189 of the Constitution of Kentucky is as follows : "No portion of any fund or tax now existing, or that may hereafter be raised or levied for educational purposes, shall be appropriated to, or used by, or in aid of, any church, sectarian, or denominational school." Section 6 of the school law says, "No books or other publications of a sectarian, infidel, or immoral character, shall be used or distributed in any public school, nor shall any sectarian, infidel, or immoral doctrine be taught therein." Section 151 is part of the chapter relating to school libraries, and declares that no books of a sectarian, infidel, or immoral character shall be placed in the library.

Hon. W. J. Davidson, Superintendent of Public Instruction, says : "As we construe our law, the teacher is left free to choose his literature from which to give lessons in morals." The Bible is read in many of the schools of the State.

The Superintendent of the public schools of Louisville writes that morals are taught constantly and that "the reading of the Bible is compulsory and must be read at the opening exercises in the morning, but without comment. In many schools the Lord's prayer is repeated."

MARYLAND.

The public school law of Maryland declares that "School books shall contain nothing of a sectarian or partisan character." [Chap. X., 58.]

Hon. E. B. Prettyman, State Superintendent of Schools, says that the Bible is read almost universally in the schools of Maryland.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

The Constitution of New Hampshire in providing for the "Encouragement of literature, etc." [Art. 82], declares, among other things, that it shall be the duty of the legislators and magistrates, in all future periods of this government, to cherish the interest of literature, and the sciences, and all seminaries and public schools; . . . to countenance and inculcate the principles of humanity and general benevolence, public and private charity, industry and economy, honesty and punctuality, sincerity, sobriety, and all social affections, and generous sentiments among the people; *provided, nevertheless*, that no money raised by taxation shall ever be granted or applied for the use of the schools or institutions of any religious sect or denomination."

Section 8, Chapter 92, of the school law declares that "No book shall be introduced into the public schools calculated to favor any particular religious sect or party."

Hon. Fred Gowing, Superintendent of Public Instruction in New Hampshire, in an address which is given as an appendix to his report for 1895-6; says: "Some things need much emphasis. Right living is the end sought by a study of physiology and hygiene in the lower schools. To inculcate and form right habits that shall be a permanent possession of the child is the function of the teacher. Morality is involved to a considerable extent in this subject." [P. xxiii.] The Bible is read in nearly all the schools of the State. Some of the cities have laws requiring the reading of the Scriptures and the repeating of the Lord's prayer.

NORTH CAROLINA.

North Carolina, in making provision for a system of education, placed this clause in the Constitution: "Religion, morality and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged." [Art. IX., Sec. 1.]

The school law, in authorizing county boards to adopt text books, says that "no sectarian or political book shall be used in the public schools." [Sec. 2539.] In defining the duties of teachers, Section 2585 says, "It shall be the duty of all teachers of free public schools to maintain good order and discipline in their respective schools, to encourage morality," etc. In the schools of North Carolina the Bible is generally read.

OHIO.

The following clause from the Constitution of Ohio shows the

relation between education, religion, morality and good government, as understood in that State : "No person shall be compelled to attend, erect, or support any place of worship, or maintain any place of worship, against his consent." "Religion, morality, and knowledge, however, being essential to good government, it shall be the duty of the General Assembly to pass suitable laws to protect every religious denomination in the peaceable enjoyment of its own mode of public worship, and to encourage schools and the means of public instruction." [Art.I.,Sec.7.]

Article VI., Section 2, makes it the duty of the General Assembly to make such provision as "will secure a thorough and efficient system of common schools throughout the State ; but no religious or other sect or sects shall ever have any exclusive right to, or control of any part of the school funds of this State."

On the first day of November, 1869, the Board of education of Cincinnati passed the following resolutions : "*Resolved*, That religious instruction, and the reading of religious books, including the Holy Bible, are prohibited in the common schools of Cincinnati, it being the true object and intent of this rule to allow the children of the parents of all sects and opinions, in matters of faith and worship, to enjoy alike the benefit of the common school fund.

"*Resolved*, That so much of the regulations on the course of study and text books in the intermediate and district schools [p. 213 Annual Report] as reads as follows — 'The opening exercises in every department shall commence by reading a portion of the Bible by or under the direction of the teacher, and appropriate singing by the pupils,' be repealed."

John D. Minor, et. al., applied to the Superior Court of Cincinnati for a restraining order against the school board. The case was argued before a full bench on November 30th. On February 15th, 1870, the decision of the Court was rendered granting the petition of the plaintiffs, Judge Taft dissenting. In its "judgment," dated February 18th, the Court declares that the resolutions adopted by the board "are in violation of the provisions of the seventh section in the first article of the Bill of Rights in the Constitution of this State, and are an abuse of the powers of said board, and are, therefore, declared to be null and void."

The defendants appealed this case to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio. This Court decided that "The Constitution of the State does not enjoin or require religious instruction or the reading of religious books in the public schools of the State. 2. The Legislature having placed the management of the public schools under the exclusive control of directors, trustees and boards of education, the courts had

no rightful authority to interfere by directing what instruction shall be given, or what books shall be read therein." The judgment of the Superior Court was reversed. The Bible is not read in the schools of Cincinnati, Cleveland and some smaller cities, but its use is quite general in the schools of the State.

OREGON.

Oregon has a law that makes it the duty of the State board to prescribe rules for the government of the schools of that State. Rule XXXVI. is: "Teachers in the public schools shall, to the utmost of their ability, inculcate in the minds of their pupils correct principles of morality, and a proper regard for the laws of society, and for the government under which they live."

Among the text books adopted for use in the public schools of Oregon is Gow's "Good Morals and Good Manners." Hon. G. M. Irwin, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, says with reference to the reading of the Bible, "This is a matter upon which we have no direct law. It is left with the board of directors of each school district, who give permission or impose restraint on the teacher as they see best."

OKLAHOMA.

Hon. S. N. Hopkins, Superintendent of the schools of Oklahoma, writes that in the schools of that territory moral instruction is given, the Bible is read, the Lord's prayer is repeated, and religious songs are sung.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

The school law of South Carolina, in defining the duties of the State Superintendent of Education, says, "He shall secure, by and with the advice of the State Board of Education, uniformity in the use of text books throughout the free public schools of the State, and shall forbid the use of sectarian or partisan books and instruction in said schools." [Sec. 2.]

Hon. W. D. Mayfield, State Superintendent of Education, writes that as a rule the Bible is read in the schools of South Carolina, though not required by law. "The law," he says, "requires morals and good manners to be taught."

TENNESSEE.

In Tennessee moral instruction is given in the public schools, but the reading of the Bible is optional with the teacher. The Constitution and law are both silent on these matters.

TEXAS.

The Texas Constitution declares that "No law shall be enacted appropriating any part of the permanent or available school fund to any other purpose whatever, nor shall the same or any part thereof

ever be appropriated to or used for the support of any sectarian school." [Art. 7, Sec. 5.] Chapter VI. of the Texas School laws is the text book law. After enumerating the branches to be taught it provides "that any of said text books shall not contain anything of a partisan or sectarian character."

The State Superintendent of Public Instruction, the Hon. James M. Carlisle, says in his report for 1897: "Look to your teachers. See that they are taught themselves and apt to teach; men that fear God and love their country." [P. xi.]

In a communication from Mr. Carlisle dated November 23, 1898, he says, "The laws of this State neither require nor prohibit the teaching of morals in the public schools, but I suppose there is not a school in this State that does not from time to time embrace the opportunities that arise for teaching lessons in morals. The Constitution and laws of this State prohibit the teaching of sectarian religion in the public schools, but neither one prohibits the reading of the Bible." "There is no uniformity as to the reading of the Bible and the offering of prayer or the repeating of the Ten Commandments or singing of religious songs, in this State. The custom differs in different localities and we are having at this time practically no trouble on the question of sectarian religion in the public schools."

VIRGINIA.

The Virginia State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Hon. J. W. Southall, says, "There is no law in this State governing the matters of moral instruction, Bible reading, etc., in the public schools. So far as I am informed, brief selections from the Bible constitute a part of the opening exercises of the schools in this State."

WYOMING.

The Wyoming Constitution contains the following clause: "No sectarian instruction, qualifications or tests shall be imparted, exacted, applied, or in any manner tolerated in the schools of any grade or character controlled by the State, nor shall attendance be required at any religious service therein, nor shall any sectarian tenets or doctrines be taught or favored in any public school or institution that may be established under this Constitution." The Bible holds its place in the schools of Wyoming. Hon. C. H. Parmlee, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, states that "An attempt was made in the State Legislature to pass a law against Bible reading, etc., but failed."

IV.

There are three States, California, Louisiana and Nevada, and one territory, New Mexico, in which State and territorial school superintendents say the Bible is not read, although there are no legal provisions or official opinions or decisions for or

against the custom. Public sentiment does not seem in most of these cases to be awake to the importance of the matter. As to the exact state of the case in the States contained in this class, something will be said after the examination of all the States is completed.

CALIFORNIA.

The Constitution of California says : "A general diffusion of knowledge and intelligence being essential to the preservation of the rights and liberties of the people, the Legislature shall encourage by all suitable means the promotion of intellectual, scientific, moral, and agricultural improvement." [Art. IX., Sec. 1.] Section 8 of this Article declares that "No public money shall ever be appropriated for the support of any sectarian or denominational school, or any school not under the exclusive control of the officers of the public schools, nor shall any sectarian or denominational doctrine be taught, or instruction therein be permitted directly or indirectly, in any of the common schools of this State."

The California school law declares that "Instruction must be given in all grades of school, and in all classes during the entire school course, in manners and morals, and upon the nature of alcoholic drinks and narcotics and their effects upon the human system." [Sec. 1667.] "No publication of a sectarian, partisan, or denominational character must be used or distributed in any school, or be made a part of any school library; nor must any sectarian or denominational doctrine be taught therein." [Sec. 1672.] The penalty for violation of this law is the forfeiture of all right to State and county apportionment of money. The twelfth rule prescribing the duties of trustees is "To exclude from schools and school libraries all books, publications or papers of a sectarian, partisan or denominational character."

Hon. Charles T. Meredith, State School Superintendent, says that instruction is given in manners and morals, but that the Bible is not read.

LOUISIANA.

The Louisiana Constitution declares that "No funds raised for the support of the public schools of the State shall be appropriated to or used for the support of any private or sectarian school." [Art. 253.]

Hon. J. V. Calhoun, State Superintendent of Education, says the Bible is not read in the schools of Louisiana. He says, "We require strict adherence to moral principles and honorable conduct, but avoid anything denominational."

In his report for 1896-7 he says : "We build magnificent churches and fine meeting houses to exhibit our respect for the doctrines and precepts of religion; we erect handsome court houses to signify our

reverence for justice and to facilitate the execution of its laws ; . . . and shall we neglect the school houses, those noble agencies in which the religion, justice and industry of the present age are deposited in the hearts and minds of our children to be by them transmitted to ages yet to come?" [P. 11.]

NEVADA.

The Constitution of Nevada in providing for a system of education, says that "The Legislature shall encourage by all suitable means the promotion of intellectual, literary, scientific, mining, mechanical, agricultural and moral improvements," etc. "The Legislature shall provide for a uniform system of public schools, by which a school shall be established and maintained in each school district at least six months in every year ; and any school district neglecting to establish and maintain such a school, or which shall allow instruction of a sectarian character therein, may be deprived of its proportion of the interest of the public school fund during such neglect or infraction." "No sectarian instruction shall be imparted or tolerated in any school or university that may be established under this Constitution." [Art. XI., Sections 1, 2, 9.]

Article XIII, Section 5, of the Nevada school law says that "No books, tracts or papers of a sectarian or denominational character shall be used or introduced in any school established under the provisions of this Act ; nor shall any sectarian or denominational doctrines be taught therein," etc.

The State Superintendent of Public Instruction says the Bible is not read in any of the schools of Nevada. There is a Supreme Court decision in the State the substance of which is herewith given, since it has sometimes been quoted in opposition to Bible reading in the schools.

The Legislature of Nevada had passed an act granting aid to orphan asylums. The Nevada Orphan Asylum at Virginia City asked for an appropriation under this Act. The State controller refused to draw his warrant for this purpose on the ground that the Nevada Orphan Asylum was a sectarian institution, being founded and controlled by Roman Catholics. The evidence in the case shows that Catholic prayers were repeated, the Roman Catholic catechism was recited, but the Bible was not read. The application for mandamus to compel the State controller to draw his warrant in favor of this institution was denied. [State of Nevada *vs.* Hallock, 16 Nev. 373.]

NEW MEXICO.

The statutes of New Mexico make the Bishop of the territory a member of the territorial school board, forbid sectarian instruction in the schools, declare that "no creed or system of religion shall be taught,

practiced or exercised," in the Normal School at Las Vegas, and authorize the licensing of gambling, the fees to be paid into the school fund.

Hon. Manuel C. DeBaca, Superintendent of Public Instruction of New Mexico writes that "No religious instruction whatever is given in the common schools of this territory."

V.

There is a fifth class in which the decisions of courts, attorneys general, and school superintendents are adverse to the reading of the Bible. In most of these moral instruction is required by law. In none of them, with one possible exception, is the Bible excluded specifically by law. Its exclusion rests in every other case on an interpretation of law. In this class are the Territory of Arizona, and the States of Missouri, Minnesota, Montana, Washington and Wisconsin.

ARIZONA.

The following sections from the Arizona school law bear upon the question :

Chapter VI., Section 50, states the powers and duties of Boards of Trustees of school districts. The thirteenth of these is : "To exclude from schools and school libraries all books, publications or papers of a sectarian, partisan or denominational character."

Chapter twelve relates to teachers, and declares [Sec. 112] : "Any teacher who shall use any sectarian or denominational books or teach any sectarian doctrine, or conduct any religious exercises in his school . . . shall be deemed guilty of unprofessional conduct, and it shall be the duty of the proper authority to revoke his or her certificate or diploma."

Section 113 : "It shall be the duty of all teachers to endeavor to impress on the minds of the pupils the principles of morality, truth, justice and patriotism ; to teach them to avoid idleness, profanity and falsehood, and to instruct them in the principles of a free government, and to train them up to a true comprehension of the rights, duties and dignity of American citizenship."

If Section 113 stood alone a fair interpretation would require the use of the Bible as the standard in impressing on the minds of the pupils the principles of morality, truth, justice and patriotism, and in teaching them to avoid idleness, profanity and falsehood. No better text book could be used to instruct them in the principles of a free government and to train them to a true comprehension of the rights, duties and dignity of American citizenship. But Sections 50 and 112 are understood throughout the Territory as forbidding any use whatever of the Bible in the schools. The county superintendents invariably report that the Bible is not read, and that the law forbids it. In some parts

of the Territory the school readers used contain a few selections from the Bible. But it seems that even this in other parts is looked upon as inconsistent with the law. Since this is the general understanding of the law ; since this view of it is the one that is invariably carried out ; and since this is done without any judicial decisions or opinions of school superintendents, it may be safely concluded that this was the intention of the Arizona legislature. No teacher it seems has ever dared use the Bible and hence there has never been any occasion for a judicial decision or official opinion.

MISSOURI.

Neither the Constitution nor the school laws of the State of Missouri contain anything specific as to Bible reading and moral instruction in the public schools. The following communication from Hon. John R. Kirk, State Superintendent of Public Schools, shows the practical attitude of the people of that State on this question :

"Moral instruction is given in the schools of Missouri. This is unavoidable in the daily lessons, in teaching literature, history and such subjects. In some schools it is given as dogmatic and formal instruction." "The Bible is read in some schools." "I believe we have no distinct decision on Bible reading in the public schools of this State. There is no constitutional or legal provision or judicial opinion preventing the use of the Bible in public schools for literary and historical purposes. Our Attorney General has interpreted our Constitution and law to prohibit any religious ceremonies in public schools, and expresses the opinion that the reading of the Bible or recital of anything whatever for the purpose of religious instruction, or the doing of anything else for religious instruction can be enjoined and prohibited in the public schools of this State. You may be anxious to know by what agitation an opinion has been obtained from the Attorney General. In the period of four years in this office I have never known an objection to be filed against Bible reading or any religious exercises in public schools by any person in the State of atheistic, agnostic or non-religious pretensions. The agitation has been brought about by the people of various religious denominations, some Protestant and some Catholic. Some Protestants protest against allowing any Catholic to do anything in the nature of worship in the public schools, and many Catholics are equally zealous in attempting to prevent any kind of religious ceremony, instruction or worship by Protestants, and there you have it. The sentiment of the teachers of the State is that the Bible is one of the richest treasures for literary and ethical purposes accessible to scholars. Many teachers among the best in teaching literature draw largely from the Bible for literary and ethical concep-

tions, and I take it that the tendency of this State is toward unity of sentiment regarding the use of the Bible as a dear old treasure, a veritable storehouse of the richest and truest and most elevating of all the gems in the literature of the world. We shall keep right on drawing from the Bible as we have done in the past, but the probabilities are that formalism, the teaching of religion as religion, will neither be absolutely prohibited in the public schools of our State (unless some crank or zealot step in), nor will there be any abatement of the zeal of our teachers in the use of the Bible as they have been using it."

The Superintendent of the schools of St. Louis writes that the Bible is not used in the schools of that city, but that the readers contain extracts from the Bible. The course of study gives a prominent place to ethics.

MINNESOTA.

The Constitution of Minnesota in Article VIII., entitled "School Funds, Education and Science," says: "Section 1. The stability of a republican form of government depending mainly upon the intelligence of the people, it shall be the duty of the Legislature to establish a general and uniform system of public schools."

"Section 3. The Legislature shall make such provisions by taxation or otherwise, etc. . . . But in no case shall the moneys derived as aforesaid, or any portion thereof, or any public moneys or property, be appropriated or used for the support of schools wherein the distinctive doctrines, creeds or tenets of any particular Christian or other religious sect are promulgated or taught."

Hon. W. W. Pendergast, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, says that moral instruction is given by precept and example, that the Bible is not generally read nor the Lord's prayer repeated, because such exercises are "contrary to the State Constitution." The Attorney General of Minnesota rules that "the decision of the Wisconsin Supreme Court applies also to Minnesota. In both States the Constitution says no one shall be taxed to support any place of worship. Schools are supported by taxation, hence cannot be made places of worship."

It should be observed in passing that the Constitutions of Iowa, South Dakota, and a number of other States contain similar provisions in terms just as specific, and yet it is contrary to the law in these States to exclude the Bible from the schools.

MONTANA.

Montana has the following clause in her Constitution: "No religious or partisan test or qualification shall ever be required of any person as a condition of admission into any public educational institution of the

State, either as teacher or student ; nor shall attendance be required, at any religious service whatever, nor shall any sectarian tenets be taught in any public or educational institution of the State ; nor shall any person be debarred admission to any of the collegiate departments of the University on account of sex." [Art. XI., Sec. 9.]

Section 1845 of the general school law of Montana says : "It shall be the duty of all school teachers to endeavor to impress on the minds of their pupils the principles of morality, truth, justice and patriotism, to teach them to avoid idleness, profanity and falsehood, and to instruct them in the principles of a free government, and to train them up to a true comprehension of the rights, duties and dignity of American citizenship."

Section 1863 provides that "No publication of a sectarian, partisan or denominational character must be used or distributed in any school, or be made any part of any school library ; nor must any sectarian or denominational doctrine be taught therein."

Notwithstanding these explicit provisions for instruction in morals, the Superintendent of Public Instruction says that the law forbids the reading of the Bible. He says however that "it is impossible to teach without teaching morals."

WASHINGTON.

The Washington State Constitution provides that "All schools maintained or supported wholly or in part by the public funds shall be forever free from sectarian control or influence." [Art. IX., Sec. 3.] The school law contains the same provision in the same words.[Sec.110.]

Article I, Section 11, contains this clause : "No public money or property shall be appropriated for or applied to any religious worship, exercise or instruction, or the support of any religious establishment." The Attorney General of Washington has ruled that "The stated reading of the Bible in the public schools of this State is a religious exercise within the meaning of the Constitution, and as such is thereby prohibited in Section 11, Article I., of that document. [School Laws of the State of Washington, p. 155.]

Hon. Frank J. Brown, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, writes, "We have no report referring to moral instruction in our schools. It is required by law."

WISCONSIN.

The Constitution of Wisconsin, in its Declaration of Rights, says, "The right of every man to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of his own conscience shall never be infringed, nor shall any man be compelled to attend, erect or support any place of worship, or to maintain any ministry, against his consent. Nor shall any control

of, or interference with, the rights of conscience be permitted, or any preference be given by law to any religious establishments or modes of worship. Nor shall any money be drawn from the treasury for the benefit of religious societies or religious or theological seminaries. [Art. I., Sec. 18.]

Article X., Section 3, says, "The Legislature shall provide by law for the establishment of district schools, which shall be as nearly uniform as practicable, and such schools shall be free and without charge for tuition to all children between the ages of four and twenty years, and no sectarian instruction shall be allowed therein." The school law of Wisconsin says: "No text books shall be permitted in any free public schools which would have a tendency to inculcate sectarian ideas." [Sec. 514.]

The Supreme Court of Wisconsin, in the case of "The State of Wisconsin ex. Rel., Frederick Weiss, W. H. Morrissey, Thomas Mooney, James McBride, J. C. Burns and John Corbett, appellants, vs. District Board of School District No. 8, of the City of Edgerton," decided against the reading of the Bible in the schools of that State.

Under the text book law of Wisconsin school boards are empowered to prescribe the text books to be used in the schools. The school board of Edgerton had placed the Bible in the list and selections from it were read daily, the version used being King James' Version. Roman Catholics objected and petitioned the school board to discontinue the practice. The board refused the request of the petitioners, and they then filed a petition to the circuit court of Rock county, praying that a writ of mandamus issue to the district board of school district No. 8, of the city of Edgerton, commanding them to cause the practice to cease. The writ of mandamus was issued and served, but the school board made return to the writ, maintaining the legality of the practice and refusing its discontinuance. The petitioners demurred to the answer of the school board. The circuit court overruled the demurrer, and the petitioners appealed to the Supreme Court. Justice Lyon, in delivering his opinion, said, "The term 'sectarian instruction' in the Constitution manifestly refers exclusively to instruction in religious doctrines, and the prohibition is only aimed at such instruction as is sectarian. That is to say, instruction in religious doctrines which are believed by some religious sects and rejected by others. Hence, to teach the existence of a Supreme Being, of infinite wisdom, power and goodness, and that it is the highest duty of all men to adore, obey and love him, is not sectarian, because all religious sects so believe and teach. The instruction becomes sectarian when it goes further, and inculcates doctrine or dogma concerning which the religious sects are

in conflict. This we understand to be the meaning of the constitutional prohibition." "It should be observed that some of the portions so read seem to inculcate the doctrine of the divinity of Jesus Christ, and the punishment of the wicked after death, which doctrines are not accepted by some religious sects." "For the reasons above stated, we cannot doubt that the use of the Bible as a text book in the public schools, and the stated reading thereof in such schools, without restriction, 'has a tendency to inculcate sectarian ideas,' and is sectarian instruction, within the meaning and intention of the Constitution and the statute." In delivering his opinion Justice Lyon said, "It should be observed in this connection that the views do not, as counsel seemed to think they may, banish from the district schools such text books as are founded upon the fundamental teachings of the Bible, or which contain extracts therefrom. Such teachings and extracts pervade and ornament our secular literature, and are important elements in its value and usefulness. Such text books are in the schools for secular instruction, and rightly so, and the Constitutional prohibition of sectarian instruction does not include them, even though they may contain passages from which some inference of sectarian doctrine might possibly be drawn.

"Furthermore, there is much in the Bible which cannot justly be characterized as sectarian. There can be no valid objection to the use of such matter in the secular instruction of the pupils. Much of it has great historical and literary value which may be thus utilized without violating the Constitutional prohibition. It may also be used to inculcate good morals—that is, our duties to each other—which may and ought to be inculcated by the district schools. No more complete code of morals exists than is contained in the New Testament, which re-affirms and emphasizes the moral obligations laid down in the Ten Commandments."

Justice Cassidy, in delivering his opinion, cited the case of "The Board of Education of Cincinnati *vs.* Minor, 23 Ohio, Sp. 211," and said that it is one of the cases "which seem to be in harmony with the conclusions we have reached." The incorrectness of this statement is clear when it is remembered that in this latter case the decision was that the courts have no rightful authority to interfere with school boards.

VI.

Letters of inquiry were addressed to the principals of State normal schools, and to the presidents of State universities, for the purpose of ascertaining their attitude toward the Bible as a text book on morals and religion. There is an impression abroad that these State institu-

tions are secular in a high degree, and that their influence upon the young men and young women who attend them is hostile to Christianity. Replies have been received from thirty-six principals of State normals. In every case except two the testimony is that religious exercises are held daily, and in nearly every case instruction is given in Christian ethics. Flourishing branches of the Y. M. C. A. and of the Y. W. C. A. or other similar societies exist in all these schools.

Richard G. Boone, Principal of the Michigan State Normal School at Ypsilanti, says: "The moral tone of the institution is excellent, a fact not a little due to the work of the Students' Christian Association, and to the mature and earnest class of students attracted to the school."

Prof. Homer H. Seerley, President of the Iowa State Normal School at Cedar Falls, writes that "Chapel exercises are held daily, and that all the students attend without opposition—even those non-Protestant." He states that this school has the largest Bible work of the kind in the United States. On Sabbath there is a public service in the chapel at 2.30 p. m., a union prayer meeting attended by 500 to 600 at 6 p. m., prayer meeting Wednesday at 6 p. m., for both young men and young women, and section prayer services Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday at 6.30 p. m. Besides all this there are weekly missionary society meetings, and meetings of other religious organizations. Notwithstanding all this, President Seerley writes that "there is rarely a conference, association, synod, etc., held by the different churches throughout the State, but this school needs somebody to defend it from the assumed unchristian type of its influence and character."

Prof. R. S. Rives, Principal of the Colored Normal School, Goldsboro, North Carolina, in his report to the State Board of Education for 1894-5, says, "In performing our duties as teachers we have endeavored to keep our eyes on and aim at what we thought the great State of North Carolina would define as true Christian education." "We emphasize the idea, Christian education, for we believe that any effort made toward the mental development of the colored people without the formation of right character and the cultivation of personal virtue and Christian integrity is so much time lost and money spent in vain." "We are of the opinion that the sum total of all education is moral excellence, and to this end we have bent all our energies. It is very gratifying to observe that our young people are making improvements morally commensurate with their mental strides. The Bible has been read daily, with such comments as we felt needful from time to time, requiring the students to subscribe to every precept of God's holy word."

Prof. S. G. Atkins, Principal of the State Normal School at Winston, N. C., says in his report to the local board of managers for 1895-6: "The work of the school in the moral training is very emphatic, the Bible being the basis of this instruction."

Replies have been received from State universities which contain information almost as gratifying as that received from the principals of the State normal schools. In almost every case chapel exercises including Bible reading and prayer are conducted daily. Instruction in ethics is given in all these schools, and in nearly all there are flourishing Y. M. C. A. and Y. W. C. A. or other similar societies. A private letter from Madison, Wis., states that there are no chapel exercises in Wisconsin University. But the letter states that "about \$1,500 have been secured by private subscriptions for prizes in Hebrew and the Greek Testament. This is designed to encourage the study of the literature, not the religious teachings of these books. The Professor said to me, 'Of course the State does not permit us to teach religion.' At the same time the Professor, who is an excellent Christian gentleman, teaches it all the same."

The President of the University of Tennessee has furnished the following information as to the attitude of that institution toward Christianity: "The University, being undenominational, cannot depend for its religious instruction upon the pastor of any particular church; and as there is no chapel on the grounds all work in this direction falls upon the Y. M. C. A. The Association holds prayer meetings every Sabbath afternoon and Thursday night, to which all students are invited whether members of the Association or not. Besides these services there is much systematic study of the Bible carried on. Three or four classes are mentioned which take up Bible study systematically."

In the year 1897 "The American Institute of Sacred Literature," through its "Council of Seventy" carried on an investigation for the purpose of finding out to what extent the Bible has a place in the regular curriculum of the colleges of our country. To find a place in the list of colleges having Bible study it is not enough that the Bible be read in chapel exercises, or that a Bible class be conducted on the Sabbath, but that the study of the Bible be required of all the students or be regularly elective, so that it becomes a part of the curriculum. A letter of inquiry was sent to 583 colleges. Of these 422 were either for men exclusively or for both sexes, and 161 for women exclusively. Of the first class 243 responded, and 40 of the second. The investigation of the committee has special reference to the colleges for men and for both sexes. There are 197 of these reporting that the Bible has a

place in the college curriculum. In the number reporting are thirty State institutions. Thirteen of these state that there are regular classes in the Bible. It is interesting to note some of the replies from State institutions reporting no Bible study. The University of Arizona says that it is prohibited by law. The University of California says: "In State institutions distinctive Bible study is not favored." The University of North Dakota declares that it is "forbidden by law," and then quotes this clause from the school law: "No instruction either sectarian in religion or partisan in politics shall be allowed in any department of the university." But it seems to be overlooked that the North Dakota law also declares that "The Bible shall not be deemed a sectarian book. It shall not be excluded from any public school." This inconsistency on the part of North Dakota University is matched by one of the opposite character in the University of Wisconsin. As stated above the Supreme Court of this State has declared the Bible to be a sectarian book and must therefore be excluded from the public schools, and yet the State University reports a number of courses in Bible study.

A few years ago a movement was begun by the Christian Women's Board of Missions for establishing Bible Chairs contiguous to State universities for the purpose of giving religious instruction to students attending these institutions. These chairs have no organic relation to the universities. This experiment was first tried at Ann Arbor, Michigan. Success there led to the establishment of similar chairs in the Universities of Virginia, Georgia, California, Missouri, Oregon, and it may be in some others. This is not a movement however to bring the State to the true ground as to the necessity of teaching morals and religion, but rather a movement to supply by the church a defect in the State university curriculum.

VII.

To make this investigation complete it is necessary to show the attitude of the United States government as to the question of Christian education.

Hon. Estelle Reel, Superintendent of Indian Schools, in her report for 1898, devotes several pages to the topic, "Morality the Basis of Progress." She says, "The consensus of information upon the subject induces the belief that with education a better moral and physical condition for the Indian must inevitably result. Mental and moral training, as given in our well conducted Indian schools, will enable our Indians to fill a respectable place in American citizenship." [Pp. 18, 19.] At the Indian School Service Institute in Colorado Springs, held in July, 1898, a prominent place is given to the discussion of morals in

the development of the character of Indians. Miss Reel informs the writer that the Bible is read in the Indian schools.

The following law governs the matter of Bible reading and moral instruction in the District of Columbia : "They (the teachers) shall practice such discipline in their schools as would be exercised by a kind and judicious parent in the family, always firm and vigilant, but prudent. They shall endeavor on all proper occasions, to inculcate in their pupils truthfulness, self-control, temperance, frugality, industry, obedience to parents, reverence for the aged, forbearance toward the weak, 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 influence 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."

There are no daily chapel exercises held in the Military Academy at West Point, but such exercises are held at the Naval Academy at Annapolis. The cadets in each of these schools are required to attend church once each Sabbath. In each of these institutions there is a Y. M. C. A. which includes the greater part of the members of the corps of cadets.

The decision in the case of *Vidal et. al. vs. Girard's Executors* throws light on the attitude of the American people on the question of moral instruction in the schools. This case came up by appeal from the Circuit Court of the United States sitting as a court of equity for the eastern district of Pennsylvania, and was argued and adjudged in the Supreme Court of the United States during the January term of 1844. Mr. Justice Storey delivered the opinion of the Court. The following extracts bear directly on the question of Bible reading and moral instruction in the schools :

"It is also said, and truly said, that the Christian religion is a part of the common law of Pennsylvania. But this proposition is to be received with its appropriate qualifications, and in connection with the bill of rights of that State, as found in its Constitution of government. The Constitution of 1790 (and the like provision will, in substance, be found in the Constitution of 1776, and in the existing Constitution of 1838), expressly declares, "That all men have a natural and indefeasible right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own conscience ; no man can be compelled to attend, erect or support any place of worship, or maintain any ministry against his consent ; no human authority can, in any case whatever, control or interfere with the rights of conscience ; and no preference shall ever be given by law to any religious establishments or modes of worship." Language more comprehensive for the complete protection of every variety of religious opinion could scarcely

be used; and it must have been intended to extend equally to all sects, whether they believed in Christianity or not. So that we are compelled to admit that although Christianity be a part of the common law of the State, yet it is so in this qualified sense, that its divine origin and truth are admitted and therefore it is not to be maliciously and openly reviled and blasphemed against, to the annoyance of believers or the injury of the public. Such was the doctrine of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania in *Updegraff vs. the Commonwealth*, 11 Serg. and Rawle, 394.

It is unnecessary for us, however, to consider what would be the legal effect of a devise in Pennsylvania for the establishment of a school or college for the propagation of Judaism, or Deism, or any other form of infidelity. Such a case is not to be presumed to exist in a Christian country; and therefore it must be made out by clear and indisputable proof. Remote inferences, or possible results, or speculative tendencies, are not to be drawn or adopted for such purposes. There must be plain, positive, and express provisions, demonstrating not only that Christianity is not to be taught, but that it is to be impugned or repudiated.

“Now, in the present case, there is no pretence to say that any such positive or express provisions exist, or are even shadowed forth in the will. The testator does not say that Christianity shall not be taught in the college. But only that no ecclesiastics of any sect shall hold or exercise any station or duty in the college. Suppose, instead of this, he had said that no person but a layman shall be an instructor, or officer, or visitor in the college, what legal objection could have been made to such a restriction? And yet the actual prohibition is in effect the same in substance. But it is asked, Why are ecclesiastics excluded, if it is not because they are the stated and appropriate preachers of Christianity? The answer may be given in the very words of the testator: ‘In making this restriction,’ says he, ‘I do not mean to cast any reflection on any sect or person whatever. But as there is such a multitude of sects and such a diversity of opinions amongst them, I desire to keep the tender minds of the orphans, who are to derive advantage from this bequest, free from the excitement which clashing doctrines and sectarian controversy are so apt to produce.’ Here, then, we have the reason given; and the question is not, whether it is satisfactory to us or not, nor whether the history of religion does or does not justify such a sweeping statement; but the question is whether the exclusion is such as the testator had a right, consistently with the laws of Pennsylvania, to maintain, upon his own notions of religious instruction. Suppose the testator had excluded all religious instructors but Catholics, or Quakers, or Swedenborgians; or, to put a stronger case, he had excluded all religious instructors but Jews, would the bequest be void on that account? Suppose he had excluded all lawyers, or all physicians, or all merchants from being instructors or visitors, would the prohibition have been fatal to the bequest? The truth is, that in cases of this sort, it is extremely difficult to draw any just and satisfactory line of distinction in a free country as to the qualifications and disqualifications which may be insisted upon by the donor of a charity as to those who shall administer or partake of his bounty.

“But the objection itself assumes the proposition that Christianity is not to be taught, because ecclesiastics are not to be instructors or officers. But this is by no means a necessary or legitimate inference from the premises. Why may not laymen instruct in the general principles of Christianity as well as

ecclesiastics? There is no restriction as to the religious opinions of the instructors and officers. They may be, and doubtless under the auspices of the city government, they always will be, men, not only distinguished for learning and talent, but for piety and elevated virtue, and holy lives and characters. And we cannot overlook the blessings which such men by their conduct, as well as their instructions, may, nay, must impart to their youthful pupils. Why may not the Bible, and especially the New Testament, without note or comment, be read and taught, as divine revelation in the college—its general precepts expounded, its evidences explained, and its glorious principles of morality inculcated? What is there to prevent a work, not sectarian, upon the general evidences of Christianity, from being read and taught in the college by lay-teachers? Certainly there is nothing in the will that proscribes such studies. Above all, the testator positively enjoins ‘that all the instructors and teachers in the college shall take pains to instil into the minds of the scholars the purest principles of morality, so that on their entrance into active life they may from inclination and habit, evince benevolence toward their fellow creatures, and a love of truth, sobriety, and industry, adopting at the same time such religious tenets as their matured reason may enable them to prefer.’ Now, it may well be asked, what is there in all this, which is positively enjoined, inconsistent with the spirit or truths of Christianity? Are not these truths taught by Christianity although it teaches much more? Where can the purest principles of morality be learned so clearly or so perfectly as from the New Testament? Where are benevolence, the love of truth, sobriety, and industry, so powerfully and irresistibly inculcated as in the sacred volume? The testator does not say how these great principles are to be taught, or by whom, except it be by laymen, nor what books are to be used to explain or enforce them. All that can be gathered from his language is that he desired to exclude sectarians and sectarianism from the college, leaving the instructors and officers free to teach the purest morality, the love of truth, sobriety, and industry, by all appropriate means, and of course including the best, the surest and the most impressive.” (2 Howard, U. S. Supreme Court Reports, pp. 198-200.)

VIII.

From the foregoing discussion it is clear that the legal status of the Bible in its relation to our public school system can be determined with precision. It is not so easy however to determine to what extent the Bible holds its place in daily practice in our schools. Some of the difficulties here are the following: the necessity of obtaining accurate reports from every city and county if not from every school district in the United States; the neglect of many school officers to reply to inquiries sent them; the frequent changes of custom in some localities, owing to a change of teachers, of superintendents, or in the character of school boards. An effort has been made however to obtain facts wherever available as to the practice in our schools. Special efforts have been made in the case of those States whose superintendents report that the Bible is not read. Scores of letters of inquiry were sent into all sections about which there was any doubt. It will be best in

this part of the discussion to follow the same classification of States as is given above.

In the first class of nine States in which the exclusion of the Bible would be a violation of law, there are few schools in which the Bible is not read. In many cities school boards have adopted rules requiring the reading of some portion of the Scriptures as a daily opening exercise.

Almost as good a showing is made by the second class consisting of twelve States in which decisions of courts and school superintendents favor the custom. In Pennsylvania the Bible is read in eighty-six per cent. of the schools. In Rhode Island the custom is almost universal. It is not so general in such States as Arkansas, Idaho, Illinois and Utah, but in some of these it is to be remembered that until recently official opinion and influence were against it. In such States the custom is growing more prevalent.

In the third class where the custom has nothing but public sentiment and custom to support it, as might be expected, the reports show less uniformity than in the first and second classes. In Connecticut, Delaware and New Hampshire there are scarcely any schools in which the Bible is not read. It is generally read in the schools of Kentucky, Maryland, Nebraska, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Tennessee and Virginia. It is read in a majority of the schools of Colorado, Florida, Ohio, South Carolina and Texas. Its use is not general in the schools of Oregon. What proportion of the Alabama schools use it, reports are too meagre to determine. There are city boards in some of these States that have excluded the Bible out of deference to the wishes of Roman Catholics, Jews and Freethinkers. Yet the reports indicate that the custom is becoming more rather than less common.

In the fourth class, which happily is very small, the Bible is found in but few schools. The State Superintendents in fact report that it is found in none. Inquiry of a careful and thorough character has failed thus far to find a single school in Nevada and New Mexico in which the Bible has a place. A few localities in California and Louisiana report that it is read in some schools.

The fifth class, consisting of five States and one territory, from the schools of which the Bible is supposed to be excluded on legal grounds, is in much the same condition as the fourth. It is read in many of the schools of Missouri, in some of those of Minnesota, in a few of those of Montana and Wisconsin, but the information at hand indicates that it is excluded from all schools of Arizona and Washington.

The school readers used in those States where the Bible is put under the ban by public school officials, have been carefully examined. In

nearly every case they are found to contain selections from the Bible, and in all cases they contain moral instruction based upon the Scriptures.

The Hon. W. T. Harris, Commissioner of Education, in his report for 1896-7, gives statistical tables as to the reading of the Bible in 808 cities having a population of 4,000 or more, situated in various parts of the country. The table on page 2191 of volume II. shows the following facts: Of the 808 cities reporting, 651 report that the Bible is read, and 157 report that it is not read. Of this latter class, 77 report that Bible reading is prohibited. In addition to Bible reading 536 report that prayer is offered. An analysis of the table shows that of the 77 that report the reading of the Bible to be prohibited, 24, or nearly one-third, are in the State of Wisconsin, the one State in the Union whose Supreme Court expels the Bible from the schools as a sectarian book. Minnesota, whose Attorney General decides that the Wisconsin decision applies in that State, reports four cities that have ruled out the Bible. Montana reports three, Washington two, Missouri and Nevada each one.

Almost half the entire number of cities that report the Bible to be prohibited are found in the States in which decisions and opinions have been rendered against its use. Of the remainder, ten are in New York, nine in California, five in Texas, three in Michigan, two in Illinois, and one in each of the following States: Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Arkansas, Ohio, Indiana, Iowa, Missouri, Kansas, Wyoming, Colorado, Oregon, and one in the territory of Arizona. It is worthy of note that one city in Wisconsin reports that the Bible is read, and one city in each of the States of Indiana, Iowa and Kansas, whose laws declare that the reading of the Bible shall not be prohibited, reports that it is prohibited. Such violation of law by school boards should be looked into by the Christian citizens of those cities, and the offenders should either be required to reverse their action or give place to those who will obey the law.

IX.

The opinions of leading educators should have some weight in deciding what ought to be the character of our educational system, and in the long run will be a prominent factor in determining whether it is to be secular or Christian.

Hon. Thomas B. Stockwell, Commissioner of Public schools of Rhode Island, says: "While the spirit of American institutions forbids the disbursement of public money for the support of sectarian schools, it is by no means antagonistic to a high moral instruction, which, though the basis of all, need not be the superstructure of any religion or creed, and it is believed that, though the schools should have a mixed

attendance, so far as religious denominations are concerned, such kind and method of moral instruction may be adopted as shall be acquiesced in by all forms of belief. Surely no reasonable person could object to the employment of such parts of the Bible, or other books, as teach moral history, inculcate moral truths, the principles of reverence, justice, integrity, patriotism, humanity, benevolence, sobriety, industry, frugality, and all the virtues upon which depend the permanence of a government by the people." [Report of 1877, pp. 14, 15.]

President Eliot of Harvard University says, "Nobody knows how to teach morality effectually without religion. Exclude religion from education and you will leave no foundation upon which to build a moral character."

The National Teachers' Association, at a meeting in Chicago a few years ago passed the following resolutions: "1st, 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. 2d, 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."

Homer H. Seerley, President of Iowa State Normal School says: "The American public school is the organized attempt of democracy to educate and train a people for the responsible and peculiar duties of citizenship in a republic."

Hon. J. M. Carlisle, Superintendent of Public Instruction in Texas says: "It is now too late to question the civic necessity of school systems maintained at public expense, controlled by public authority, and designed to secure the universal education of the people. The fundamental proposition is simply that the education of the people is indispensable to the preservation of free institutions, and that it is, therefore, the duty of every State to provide for the education of her children. It is not a matter of choice or pleasure; it is a matter of necessity. It is a duty the State owes itself—the prime duty of self-preservation."

Hon. W. W. Stetson, State Superintendent of Public Instruction in Maine says: "Our public schools as such have as their primary function the promotion of good citizenship. If they fail to perform their primary function, they fail of the purpose for which they are maintained."

After stating what a school house needs, to be fully equipped, Superintendent Stetson says: "When a school, housed, equipped, taught and supported as indicated above has been in operation for a

series of years, it should graduate boys and girls who have that moral quality which makes it easy for them to distinguish between right and wrong, and gives them the strength which enables them to do the right and shun the wrong."

At the celebration of the eighty-seventh birthday of Dr. Henry Barnard, held in the hall of the House of Representatives, Hartford, Conn., January 25, 1897, many testimonials were given to the importance of moral instruction. Francis W. Parker, President of Cook County Normal School, Chicago, Ill., said: "*The school is society shaping itself.* Whatever should be in society must be put in the schools." "The ideal of the common school is to shape society for its upward and onward movements, for a higher and still higher development of personal freedom, for genuine growth in State and Nation." "No one can measure the immeasurable good that the common school has already done, but in all education the social factor is the highest, and this bringing together the children of the people in one school, this living together, and working together, and sharing each other's joys and sorrows, has been and always will be the great advantage of the common school. Citizenship, community of life, ideal society, under our national idea, is the true end and aim of the common school." "Knowledge and discipline, scholarship and culture, although absolute necessities, must be in a high sense subservient to this idea. Character must be read in the habits and acts of the child who is trained in this little community, the school, to love his neighbors as he loves himself."

In his report for 1896, G. R. Glenn, State School Commissioner of Georgia, in a discussion of "Education and Crime," says: "Everyone will admit that mere ability to read and write will not save a man from becoming a criminal. A school or a school system that does not get beyond the training of the intellect would have small claims on the public for support. Our public school system is intended to develop, normally and naturally, every part of the child's being—its intellect, sensibility and will; its moral and spiritual nature. A system of education, therefore, that has for its object the development of the child's entire being is bound to be a preventive to crime. If this assumption is not correct, then there is absolutely nothing to justify the maintenance of the public school system."

At the Georgia State Teacher's Association, of 1897, the President, Joseph S. Stewart, Superintendent of the schools of Marietta, said: "All the great educational thinkers of recent times, in Germany, England and America, agree that the chief function or duty of the schools is the development of good character." "I believe that when

teachers more fully recognize the duty of forming character and the great value of appealing to the highest ideals, they will find some means of introducing Bible readings and prayer as a part of the school exercises."

Dr. A. P. Peabody of Harvard University in an address on the Bible in the schools said: "We are asked to exclude from our schools the Bible, and, by parity of reasoning, all instruction drawn from or to the Bible. What is this, in the first place, but garbling and truncating history? There are important, momentous portions of the world's history of which the Bible is the only manual. The Jewish people have exercised an influence upon mankind far exceeding that of all other ancient nations, and outside of the Bible how scanty and fragmentary is all that can be known or taught concerning this people! Christianity is the most important factor in the history of mankind. It has been the inspiration and the mold of modern civilization and has supplied all the elements that distinguish it from the culture of the ancient world. It has modified all political and social institutions." "Shall our children be forbidden to learn what Christianity is in its own universally acknowledged manual? Jesus Christ, whatever be his actual character—whether he be or not, as I believe him to be, all that his biographers claim for him—is so far the most influential personage that has ever appeared in the history of the world. To exclude his life and character from the narrative of human existence for the last nineteen centuries is an immeasurably more gross, foolish, and stupid mutilation of history than it would be to omit the names and doings of Washington, Franklin, and Adams from American history. Shall not our children be permitted to learn what he was from the only authentic record of his person, words, and works? If history is to be one of our school studies, I know not how it is to be taught if the Bible and its contents are to be excluded." "If moral philosophy is to be taught at all, I suppose that none would deny that it is distinctively Christian ethics in which our children are to be trained. But if Christian ethics be taught, shall they be taught as they are interpreted—and it may be distorted and misrepresented—by modern theorists, or as they fell from the lips and are embodied in the life of the divine teacher?"

Dr. S. F. Scovel, of Wooster University, who deserves to rank as a prince among educators, in discussing "Moral character in civic relations," shows that the State demands morality of its citizens and that the world's legislative wisdom makes immorality the limit of liberty. In his address on "Realizing our final aim in Education," he maintains that "Education is itself so great that only character is a target large

enough for its final aim." "Every view of education which has made any thing less than character its final aim has proven seriously defective." "But character," he declares, "is peerless. It is the sum of our moral attributes."

X.

This investigation will help to answer the question, "Are our schools secular?" The answer will of course depend on the meaning of the word "secular." If it means free from sectarian control or influence, the answer will be in the affirmative. If it means freedom from all moral or Christian influence, the answer must be in the negative. If it means the banishment of what are usually called theological dogmas, the answer must be in the affirmative. If it means the banishment of those general Christian principles of morality which all Christians believe and teach and which have a place in every-day life, the answer must be in the negative. Our schools as they exist are a protest against the folly of the effort to divide human life into two parts, called the sacred and the secular, and to exclude religion from the latter.

These statements as to the moral and religious character of our public school system as a whole are confirmed by the foregoing record of facts. And yet it must be admitted that the secular idea of education as opposed to the moral and religious idea has so far prevailed in some of our States as to mar the harmony and symmetry of the system as a unit.

In every great interest common to the nation at large, local influence may be expected to produce a measure of diversity. In the case of multitudes of questions of policy and administration such diversity is but the evidence and outcome of healthful freedom of action. But there are other cases in which the welfare of the whole body politic is so fundamentally and vitally bound up, that diversity and inconsistency must work incalculable harm.

Such a public interest was involved in the question of slavery. And the sagacious Lincoln saw that inconsistency and diversity could not in this matter continue in the national life. He declared that as a "house divided against itself cannot stand," and "a kingdom divided against itself cannot stand," so we as a nation could not remain part slave and part free: that we must become wholly the one or wholly the other.

And no less profoundly related to our life as a nation is the character of our public education. No more are liberty and slavery antagonistic to each other than are the two theories of education, one of which banishes from its standards and processes all acknowledgment of the law and authority of God in the sphere of the State, and the other of

which appeals in devotional exercises in the school room and in all the moral issues concerned in public life to His authoritative Word. It does not require the sagacity of a Lincoln to see that these two conflicting theories of public education cannot for any great length of time remain side by side in our public school system. One or the other must prevail. Our system of public education will ultimately become wholly secularized or it will become consistently and harmoniously Christian without being in the proper sense sectarian. But the duty of true patriotism is to remove present inconsistencies as speedily as possible.

This document has been prepared and is being sent throughout our country, not only to meet the unfounded charge that our system of public education as a whole is secular ; but also to help restore to an unsectarian Christian basis whatever parts of that public system may have become by hostile influences in any measure really secular. A full knowledge of the facts as to this system, and a clear grasp of the moral and religious principles that must ever lie at its foundation in order to make it accomplish its aims for the nation's material, intellectual and moral advancement, will help to secure at an early day the assimilation of all parts of this system in town and country, in our Commonwealths and in our national institutions, into one complete and every way concordant whole. It is urged, therefore, that every friend of our public schools into whose hands this document may fall, should put forth every possible effort to make the facts and principles involved in this question more widely and fully known, especially in those portions of our country from the schools of which the Bible and appropriate religious ideas and exercises have been banished under the baleful influence of secularism.

It is important just here to note that if our system of public instruction generally should become as secular as some of our schools now are, the consequent development of, and increased attendance on ecclesiastical schools, under the imperative daily religious needs of the youth of our land, would imperil the very existence of our public schools. The strongest argument for parochial schools is the insufficient attention in public schools to the moral and religious needs of the children. Roman Catholics are not the only class of citizens who are not satisfied with the secular theory of education. They may be the only class who hold that all education should be under the direction and control of the church (and by the term church they mean the Roman Catholic Church), but there are many Protestants who hold that a system of public instruction may and ought to be Christian without being sectarian. Many who are deeply concerned about the

future of our country lament the secularizing forces at work not only in the common schools, but also in some of the State Universities and Normal Schools. Secularism in these higher institutions of learning furnishes a reason not only for denominational colleges, but also for urging attendance upon these in preference to State institutions. Some of our educators in State Universities and Normal schools find it necessary to defend these institutions against the charge of secularism. Letters at hand make the complaint that such charges are often made without sufficient warrant. This may be true, but it is a known fact that a few State Universities have been growing more and more secular in recent years, and Christian people cannot be blamed for taking alarm and urging young people to attend the denominational college in preference to the State University. Denominational colleges, however, have held and will hold their place. Parochial schools should be given no ground or reason for existence. To deliver over the children of this nation to daily instruction in schools under the supervision of conflicting ecclesiastical authorities and thus subvert our public school system, would be one of the worst conceivable national calamities. But just as surely as that our children have moral and religious natures, and our nation moral and religious needs in its own distinctive sphere of rights and duties under the divine Governor among the nations and His revealed law, so surely will the secularization of our system of public education lead to its overthrow. The only safe course between the Scylla of secularism and the Charybdis of ecclesiasticism is to recognize that the State has its own moral sphere and its own relations to God and Christ and the Divine Law; that in the definition of crime, the use of the oath as an appeal to God, the appointing of days of thanksgiving, and fasting and prayer, chaplains in the legislatures, the army and navy, and public institutions of different kinds, moral and religious ideas are involved which the nation itself is bound to teach its youth in order that they may grow up to be good and useful citizens. The moral and religious ideas of education involved in good citizenship must find their place in the State's own system of schools, and not in some other system or systems outside the control of the civil power. Churches and Sabbath Schools are wielding a mighty influence in molding the character of citizens and of the nation, and the report on Sabbath Schools by which Commissioner Harris supplements his report on public schools, furnishes much important information. But the State must not depend upon the church to impart that moral instruction which is essential to good citizenship and national welfare. Thousands of the children of the State are not found in Sabbath Schools. Their only chance for moral instruction is

in the public schools. Moreover for the State to confine itself wholly to secular instruction, while recognizing the need of and depending upon the church for instruction in morals, would require one of the worst forms of union of Church and State.

XI.

In the light of the facts presented in this investigation a correct judgment may be the more readily formed concerning the attitude of those cities and States in which the reading of the Bible in the schools has been prohibited. The overwhelming sentiment of the American people sustains the custom of Bible reading. The exclusion of the Bible from the schools is the exception and not the rule. But we are confronted with the questions, what ought to be and what will be, in the near future, the attitude of the American people on this matter? The Wisconsin Supreme Court decision has attracted general attention. It is often referred to as deserving careful study. School superintendents in other States mention it as though it is deserving of much consideration in the settlement of the question throughout the land. It gives great satisfaction however to be able to set over against this decision those of the Supreme Courts of Maine, Massachusetts, Illinois, Iowa, West Virginia, and that superb decision of the Supreme Court of Michigan. Which of these should be the model for the framing of future decisions? In determining this matter the following points deserve attention :

- [1] The Wisconsin decision is the only one of its kind.
- [2] It is in conflict with decisions in a number of States and the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States.
- [3] It is in conflict with the general custom of the schools in nearly all the States and territories and of the schools under the supervision of the general government.
- [4] It is in conflict with the former custom of the Wisconsin schools. The Bible was in those schools before it was excluded.
- [5] This decision pronounces the Bible to be a sectarian book and excludes it on this ground. It is declared to be sectarian because there are numerous sects that differ in their doctrinal beliefs, each claiming to base its beliefs on the Scriptures, "which may reasonably be understood as supporting the same." Those judges should be reminded, however, that these numerous sects do not accept merely the parts of the Bible "which may reasonably be understood as supporting" their peculiar views. Each sect accepts the whole Bible. There is perfect unanimity in this, whatever may be the differences as to its interpretation. It is not the Bible, then, that is sectarian, but different interpretations of the Bible. No sect in its attempts to

controvert the doctrinal beliefs of another sect is ever so foolish as to charge sectarianism upon the Bible texts used to support those beliefs. If this were the course pursued what havoc would be made of the Bible. Invariably the effort is made to show that the interpretations of the Scriptures, not the Scriptures themselves, have a sectarian bias. The argument therefore has weight in opposition to comments by the teacher, but none whatever against the Bible itself.

[6] This decision declares that it does not "banish from the district schools such text books as are founded upon the fundamental teaching of the Bible, or which contain extracts therefrom. Such text books are in the schools for secular instruction, and rightly so, and the Constitutional prohibition of sectarian instruction does not include them, even though they may contain passages from which some inferences of sectarian doctrine might possibly be drawn." The Supreme Court of Wisconsin has failed to inform us as to the reason for this remarkable statement. Why is it that a "sectarian" passage of Scripture is forbidden to be read from the Bible, but is perfectly proper if read from a school reader? Since sectarian beliefs are after all only "inferences" from Scripture, why is it that text books which contain such inferences may be used, while the Bible itself is excluded? Which is the more sectarian? When the Court says that "such text books are in the schools for secular instruction," they should be reminded that the Bible itself is largely for secular instruction, in the proper sense of that term; that is, it is not exclusively a devotional book, nor do its teachings relate wholly to another world.

[7] This decision says that "there is much in the Bible which cannot justly be characterized as sectarian. There can be no valid objection to the use of such matter in the secular instruction of the pupils." We are glad of this concession. But who is to decide what parts of the Bible are sectarian and what parts are not? Is this a case for civil or ecclesiastical courts? The Wisconsin Supreme Court lays down a rule by which the sectarian portions are to be recognized. That rule is that "doctrinal passages," such as those that relate to the divinity of Christ, the eternal punishment of the wicked, the authority of the priesthood, the binding force and efficacy of the sacraments, are sectarian; while such as relate to the existence of a Supreme Being of infinite wisdom, power and goodness, and teach that it is the highest duty of all men to adore, obey and love him, "are not sectarian, because all religious sects so believe and teach." What makes a Scripture text sectarian, therefore, is for a sect to spring up holding different views of that passage from those held by other sects. Such a passage therefore was not sectarian till human opinions about its meaning began to

differ. If this is true there is no part of the Bible that may not become sectarian. No better proof could be desired that it is not the Bible that is sectarian, but human interpretations of the Bible.

Stress has been laid on the fact that the Constitution of Wisconsin prohibits sectarian instruction and that the Bible must therefore be excluded. But there are a number of other States—more than twenty—whose constitutions or school laws prohibit sectarian instruction, and yet in most of them the Bible is not prohibited. Among them is Massachusetts, whose law in one section prohibits sectarian instruction and in another requires the reading of the Bible. In the same list is North Dakota, whose school law prohibits sectarian instruction, but at the same time declares the Bible not to be a sectarian book and that it shall not be excluded from the schools. This Wisconsin decision must therefore be regarded as an anomaly in American jurisprudence, and the people of that great State will do themselves credit if they strive to secure a supreme court that will reverse it, so that the blot upon the reputation of the State may be removed, and the injurious influence exerted by it counteracted.

XII.

The argument in support of the Bible and moral instruction in the schools gains clearness and force through this investigation.

[1] The custom is as old as the school system itself. Our educational institutions came into existence under the influence of the Bible and the religion it inculcates. Originally a school without the Bible was not thought of. The custom of Bible reading in the schools existed prior to the formation of any existing State constitution or code of laws. To mention a specific case, so as to be as pointed as possible, the custom prevailed in Wisconsin before the present Constitution and code of school laws were established. If the people therefore intended to expel the Bible from the schools of that State by the adoption of that Constitution, why was this fact, if it be a fact, not discovered until nearly fifty years after its adoption? The Supreme Court of Michigan says that such a document "should be construed in relation to the state of the law and custom as they existed at the time of its adoption." This is a sound principle. Its application would reverse the Wisconsin decision.

[2] The custom is wide-spread. It prevails in almost all parts of the land. It is supported by the general sentiment of the people, by numerous judicial decisions of State supreme courts, and by a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States.

[3] To teach thoroughly the various branches contained in the public school curriculum and omit the Bible and Christian morality is not

possible. Reading, of course, is to be taught. But reading is more than pronouncing the words on the printed or written page. The meaning of words must be taught and learned. In the schools of Wisconsin Webster's International Dictionary is a text book by authority of the State Legislature. That such an act is inconsistent with the decision excluding the Bible is clear. Consider the following definitions taken from this dictionary.

"Good: Possessing moral excellence or virtue."

"Right: Conformed to the constitution of man and the will of God."

"Holy Spirit: The Spirit of God or the third person of the Trinity."

"Spirit: The intelligent, immaterial and immortal part of man."

"Atonement: The expiation of sin made by the obedience, personal suffering and death of Christ."

"Regenerate: To cause to be spiritually born again."

There is a vast amount of theology in the dictionary, and if the dictionary may have a place in the schools, why not the Bible also?

History is another branch that must be taught in our public schools. Is history anything more than a list of dates, names and events? Even if it is not, what shall be said about the letters B. C. and A. D. as they stand connected with dates? Can the birth of our Lord, the church that he founded, the influence of Christianity be ignored in teaching history? Are such events as the reformation of the sixteenth century to be passed by silently? In teaching the history of our own country what shall be said about the Pilgrim Fathers, the Puritans and others who came to these shores that they might find freedom to worship God? Must the causes that drove them from Europe receive no consideration in the school room? What shall be said about the wars in which this country has engaged? Shall the right or the wrong of these wars be passed over in silence? What shall be said about slavery as connected with our political history? What about the recent war with Spain? And since the morality of such matters must be considered, by what standard is the question raised to be decided if not by the standard contained in the Bible?

Literature must receive attention in our public schools. The best there is ought to be placed in the hands of the pupils in these schools. Must our selections be expurgated until no vestige of Christianity remains? Some of the choicest gems in prose and poetry inculcate Christian ideas. Must these be excluded? Nowhere are there such pieces of literary perfection as those found in Moses, the Prophets, the Psalms, the Gospels and the Epistles, of the Bible. Are we to have selections

from Greek and Latin authors, Arabian tales, fairy stories, selections from Goethe, Hume, Shakespeare, Hawthorne, and a host of others, and nothing from Moses, David, Isaiah, Paul, John, or Jesus Christ?

[4] It is impossible to deal fairly and honestly with the pupils in our schools and ignore the claims of their moral nature. Let it be granted that the training of the intellect is the chief thing in our school system. Can the physical nature with its many and diversified wants be ignored in the school room? Would not those teachers be regarded as cruel and unfit to have the charge of children who would ignore the wants of the bodies and give no thought to the physical comfort of the boys and girls placed under their care on the plea that they have to do only with the intellect? Physical culture is given a prominent place to-day in schools of every grade. But it is no more possible for school children to leave their moral natures than it is to leave their physical natures outside the school room. The whole child with its physical, mental and moral nature goes to school. The whole child including this three-fold nature is undergoing a process of growth, development, training, for better or worse. If the moral influences of the school are not good they are bad. No one who has given the matter any consideration is ignorant of the fact that there are agencies constantly at work in secret to contaminate the morals of our boys and girls. This process is going on in the school room and on the playground. Are our schools at the mercy of these cancer planters? Have they no power or right to employ the most effective agencies to resist these Satanic influences? Why may not the morals of the Christian religion be taught to counteract the immoral influences of such agencies? Why may not the Bible be appealed to as the authoritative standard of morals? Why may not every possible Christian agency be employed so as to develop a manhood and womanhood as strong morally as they are intellectually? If our school system is to educate the brain while instead of educating the heart it only furnishes facilities for the more complete perversion of the moral nature, it will prove a curse instead of a blessing.

[5] The purpose for which our school system has been established makes it clear that the Bible and Christian morality should have a place in our school curriculum. What is the purpose of our public schools? Not to train men and women merely that they may do well for themselves. The school is a State institution and it has primary reference to the welfare of the State. Instruction is given to individuals that they may be upright, worthy, industrious, useful citizens. A government has the right to train citizens for whatever it may need them. The United States government needs an army and navy. It

therefore conducts a military and naval academy to furnish trained soldiers and sailors. Statesmen, men with a legal, linguistic, scientific training are needed. Nearly all our States have their State universities to supply the need. Teachers for our common schools are needed. Normal schools for the purpose of preparing teachers for their work are established. The great mass of scholars however follow none of these pursuits. But whatever may be the rank or calling of our citizens, morality is an essential characteristic. Every State in the Union has laws on some moral questions. Every State has a law on marriage and divorce. Blasphemy, the Sabbath, gambling, perjury and many other matters are subjects of legislation. Should there not be instruction in the schools on all such subjects, that our boys and girls may be trained for citizenship? Nearly the whole of the Decalogue enters into our legislation. Why then may the Decalogue not be taught? Any citizen may be called upon to bear witness in court. May not the schools teach that precept which declares, "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor?" Any citizen may be called on to take an oath, either as a witness, a juror, or in some other civil relation. May not our schools teach the nature and binding obligation of an oath? If not, why not? But an oath is an appeal to God. It is an act of worship. It is of the very essence of religion.

There are many other considerations which show that to accomplish the end of their being our schools must employ the Bible and its moral code, but these are sufficient to establish our position.

[6] No valid objection can be presented in opposition to the Bible and moral instruction in the schools. Every conceivable objection is fully met in the judicial decisions already quoted. If these decisions were duly considered they would doubtless exert a powerful influence in retaining the Bible in the schools where it is yet read, and in restoring it in those schools from which it has been excluded.

[7] The value of the Bible as a manual of Christian civil government should secure for it a place in our educational system. This book teaches the method of national as well as of individual salvation. A large part of it is the record of the rise, career, and downfall of political powers. Its writers are properly regarded

"As men divinely taught, and better teaching
The solid rules of civil government,
In their majestic unaffected style,
Than all the oratory of Greece and Rome.
In them is plainest taught, and easiest learnt,
What makes a nation happy, and keeps it so,
What ruins kingdoms, and lays cities flat."

—(Paradise Regained, Book IV.)

The Bible has never been estimated at its true worth as a manual of civil government even by the great body of Christians. There is not a single well established political principle that is not taught in the Scriptures. Students of political science as well as of practical politics should take this volume as their text book. Moreover all the intricate problems in sociology must be solved in the light of its teachings. For its own welfare the State should give the Bible a place in its school curriculum. This book teaches the fundamental principles of civil government. It teaches that God is the Creator of nations ; that all political power and authority come from God ; that Jesus Christ is the Ruler of nations ; that the revealed will of God is supreme law in the political sphere, both for the nation, the government, and the individual citizen. It prescribes the qualifications of civil rulers. It teaches the duties of both rulers and ruled.

The oath is administered to every officer of the government, and every citizen may be called upon to swear. The Bible teaches the religious character of the oath and declares that it must be administered in the name of the God of truth. This volume teaches the moral character and accountability of nations, and in some of the finest passages in all literature it sets forth the conditions on which nations may endure and prosper, and the conditions on which they will certainly be overthrown.

For its own sake therefore the nation cannot afford to keep its children in ignorance of the word of God. Too long this book has been looked upon as a church book exclusively. It has been generally thought that the State has no part in it. But it is the book for the regulation of political as well as of ecclesiastical life.

It is true that the State receives manifold blessings from the Bible through the teachings of the church and the Sabbath School. Under the influence of such teachings crime is vastly decreased. But there are multitudes who do not avail themselves of the privileges thus afforded. Much of the work done by church and Sabbath School is undone by the secularism and immorality that find shelter under State law. When the State regards the Bible as out of its place in the civil sphere, the church and the Sabbath School too often accept this decision as final, and make no effort to apply its principles to political life.

The favorite objection to the use of the Bible in the schools as a text book on morals is that this would be of the nature of the union of church and State. But the fact that it is as full of political as it is of ecclesiastical teachings should effectually dispose of this objection. Since this is true the Bible should be placed by the State in all public

schools so as to avoid union both of church and state and of infidelity and the state.

With respect to this whole matter there are only three possible positions. The first is the entire separation not only of church and state, but also of religion and the state, such separation involving the secularization of the schools. The second is some sort of an alliance between church and state whereby the state's moral and religious obligations will be looked after by the church. The third is separation of church and state, but not of religion and the state, so that the state recognizes her own moral obligation and seeks to train all her citizens to practice the principles of the moral law. None but those who believe that the state has no moral character and is under no moral or religious obligation can consistently occupy the first position. The experience of mankind teaches that the second is unwise. It is in conflict with Scripture and is discarded by the great body of the people of the United States. We must therefore occupy the third position. There is no other way of escape from the other two. As shown above the complete secularization of the state, which involves the secularization of the schools, is based upon a most pernicious theory of political science. It is political atheism. But atheism has never established and never can establish a civil society. Religion is necessary not only to the welfare but also to the very existence of such a society.

Atheism is anarchy. Government without God is impossible. How then shall the state escape from the dangerous position of secularism together with the manifold political evils that attend it? How shall it secure that moral and religious training of its citizens which is necessary for its own welfare? Shall the second position mentioned above be taken? Shall an alliance be formed with the church whereby the state agrees to attend to secular matters and the church agrees to attend to the religious concerns both of itself and the state? This theory has a variety of forms. Some kind of union of church and state has existed and still exists in nearly every country in Christendom except the United States. With these we have nothing now to do. We need only consider the forms of the theory that are advocated in our own country. Of these there are two. The first is that of the Roman Catholics. They rightly contend that religion is essential to the existence and welfare of the state. This being so there must be some institution charged with the duty of teaching religion. They also hold that there is no education except christian education; that the secular state cannot give it; that it can only be given by the church; and that the Roman Catholic Church is the only true church, and that therefore the Roman Catholic Church is the only proper institution for imparting

instruction. Acting upon this theory she is the foe of the public schools. She cannot be conciliated by the banishing of the Bible. Her hostility is if possible even more bitter when this is done. It is made the basis of a plea for her own parochial schools and for a division of the public school fund for their support. At a recent convention of Catholic colleges Monsignor Conaty made the following plea for such a division : "We are not here by sufferance, but we are here as American citizens demanding our rights. We are not asking for favor. All we want is justice. We want recognition as citizens and tax-payers in school affairs. We believe that no true education is possible without religious instruction, and we have a right to insist upon our demands." Of course if one church has this right all the rest have it. Carried out to its logical consequences it would result in the complete destruction of the public school system. But even if other churches should not make the demand, compliance with it in a single instance is of the very essence of union of church and state, and must not be allowed.

This theory however assumes another form in the hands of a class of Protestants who want to avoid the dangers of the secular theory on the one hand and of the Roman Catholic theory on the other. This class admit the political value of religion and therefore of the political necessity for a religious education. They hold however, for a variety of reasons, that the state may not give this education, but that public schools should be wholly secularized. Reliance must be placed upon the church for furnishing the necessary instruction. This theory however is beset with innumerable and insuperable difficulties. Why should the state lean upon the church for any part of that training of the youth found necessary in the political sphere? By what plan is the state to make sure that it is given? Must there not be an agreement entered into? Should the state not pay the church out of the public funds for the service thus rendered? Would not this be a real union of church and state? Does not the secularizing of the state and the public schools tend to diminish rather than to increase the amount of instruction given by the church on political morality? Such an important matter should not be left at loose ends. It should be agreed at the outset, if this theory is to be applied, that the state needs morality, that there is a moral standard, that the church must faithfully teach it to all citizens, that there shall be compulsory attendance by all the youth upon the church schools and that the state will abide by the teaching thus given. But this would lead to unutterable confusion, and is entirely impracticable. But what does the theory mean if it does not mean this? It savors too much of pure secularism on the one hand and of the union of church and state on the other. These are too

wide apart ever to be joined together. Secularism does not in fact mean that the church is to furnish the necessary moral training needed for political purposes, but that none whatever is needed, or if needed the moral law is not its standard. And when the church in a secularized state attempts to teach the application of the moral law in politics she is denounced for preaching politics. Morals and religion are first eliminated from state institutions on the ground that while they are a political necessity they are to be furnished by the church, and then the church is decried for teaching political morality. The deceptive character of the whole secular theory is hereby unmasked, and christian citizens should be done with it. They should with one consent occupy the third position mentioned above, not only that they may avoid the first and second, but also because it is the true position. This will require that all instruction given in public schools be devoted to the formation of character and that the Bible be used as the standard of morals.

An important practical question yet remains to be considered. What plan of work can be followed so that the desired practical results may be secured? The following suggestions are offered. In every community where character is not made the final aim in the instruction given, and where the Bible and christian morality have no place in the schools, an agitation should be begun in behalf of genuine christian education.

Where school boards have adopted rules excluding the Bible from the school room a united and persistent effort should be made to have it restored. Where opinions and decisions of school superintendents, attorneys general, or civil courts have been rendered adverse to the custom of Bible reading, an effort should be made to have such opinions and decisions reversed. Where statute laws do not furnish a sufficient safeguard for the use of the Bible and the teaching of its system of morals, there should be an effort to secure the revision of such laws.

In some States however the State constitutions have been interpreted as prohibiting this custom. Although moral training is declared to be a necessity, such declaration is not considered to be a warrant for the use of the Bible. Thus the very instrument that ought to safeguard the custom is made the weapon of its destruction, because sectarian instruction is forbidden, and the Bible is pronounced a sectarian book. Since the constitutions of Minnesota, Washington and Wisconsin have been so interpreted there is not a State constitution, with the single exception of that of Mississippi, that may not be interpreted in the same way. Neither is there any reason why the National Constitution may not receive the same secular construction. All that is necessary is to secure judges upon the Supreme bench who entertain views

like those of the Supreme Court of Wisconsin. Is there any reason why, on such a matter as this, constitutions should not be so explicit that judicial decisions would not be necessary? There ought therefore to be an effort by Christian citizens throughout the land to secure religious amendments to constitutions both State and National whereby the place of the Bible as the supreme standard in the teaching of morals in the public schools will be incontrovertibly established.