RELIGIOUS EDUCATION AND THE PUBLIC SCHOOL

George U. Wenner

"THE Public School, by reason of the independence of Church and State, is unable to enforce the highest moral standards because it is unable to avail itself of the effective influence of religion.

"The lack of religious restraints, more than that, the lack of religious inspiration in the pursuit of high ideals, is generally acknowledged to be a serious defect in the American system of public education."

From Report of the Special Committee of the Federal Council.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

and the

PUBLIC SCHOOL

An American Problem

By George U. Wenner
NEW YORK

NEW EDITION

Revised and enlarged, giving the action of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America in 1912

AMERICAN TRACT SOCIETY
PARK AVE. and 40th ST., NEW YORK

First Edition, 1907
Second Edition, 1913
Third Edition, 1915

To

My First Teacher In Religion

My Revered Mother

CONTENTS

FOREWORD

AT the meeting of the Inter-Church Conference in Carnegie Hall, New York, in November, 1905, at which twenty-nine Protestant Churches of America were represented, one of the papers treated the question of Week-day Religious Instruction. Its main proposition was favorably received, and the following resolution was adopted by the Conference:

Resolved, That in the need of more systematic education in religion, we recommend for the favorable consideration of the Public School authorities of the country the proposal to allow the children to absent themselves without detriment from the public schools on Wednesday or on some other afternoon of the school week for the purpose of attending religious instruction in their own churches; and we urge upon the churches the advisability of availing themselves of the opportunity so granted to give such instruction in addition to that given on Sunday.

The further consideration of the subject was referred to the Executive Committee. By direction of this Committee a report on Week-day Instruction in Religion was presented at the First Meeting of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, held in Philadelphia in 1908.

After an earnest discussion, resolutions were adopted indicating the importance which the representatives of the churches of America attached to the general question. These resolutions may be found on page 190.

At the Second Meeting of the Federal Council, held in Chicago in December, 1912, the Special Committee of the Federal Council presented a report, the gist of which may be found on pages 184-190.

This report recognizes the difficulties confronting an adequate solution of the question and provides for a more thorough investigation and discussion of the entire subject.

In his report for 1909 (Vol. I, page 5), the United States Commissioner of Education, Dr. Elmer Ellsworth Brown, refers to this subject in the following words:

Those who would maintain that the moral life has other rootings than that in religion, would, for the most part, admit that it is deeply rooted in religion, and that for many of our people its strongest motives are to be found in their religious convictions; that many, in fact, would regard it as insufficiently grounded and nourished without such religious convictions. The teaching of religious systems is no longer under serious consideration as far as our public schools are concerned. Historical and social influences have drawn a definite line in this country between the public schools and the churches, leaving the rights and responsibilities of religious instruction to the latter. It would be futile, even if it were desir-

able, to attempt to revise this decision of the American people. There has been, however, within the past two or three years a wide-spread discussion of the proposal that arrangements be made between the educational authorities and ecclesiastical organizations, under which pupils should be excused from the schools for one half-day in the week—Wednesday afternoon has been suggested —in order that they may in that time receive religious and moral instruction in their several churches. This proposal has been set forth in detail by the Rev. George U. Wenner, D.D., in a volume entitled "Religious Education and the Public School" (see the list of references at the end of this chapter), and has been under consideration by a representative committee during the past two or three years.

A good deal of interest attaches to this proposal, which is closely related to the practice followed in the public schools of St. Louis many years ago during the superintendency of Dr. William T. Harris. Whether the plan is workable on a large scale or not, under American conditions, can only be determined by a fair trial in communities in which public sentiment clearly supports the experiment. It is not to be supposed that it will even be put upon its trial in the absence of such public sentiment. In any community which should provide for the withdrawal of pupils from the public schools, by their parents, for such hours of religious instruction, it is fair to expect that emphasis will be laid by the religious teachers upon those moral values which are the immediate concern of the State; and these hours, moreover, should be utilized by the school authorities for such serious and well-considered moral instruction

as may properly be given to those pupils who, by their parents' choice, should spend them in the public school under the care of their regular teachers.

In 1910 Mr. Frank F. Bunker, Superintendent of Schools in Berkeley, California, delivered an address to the representatives of the churches of that city, which with his kind permission is presented in the Appendix. (See page 167.)

This book is an attempt to present glimpses of the history, principles and methods of week-day instruction in Religion, and it advocates a plan which the author believes to be practicable and in harmony with the fundamental principles of both Church and State in America. That there are difficulties in the way, no one will deny, but the importance of the question, its relation not only to the well-being but the very existence of a Christian Church, will continue to give it a place on the program of every Christian council.

G. U. W.

FOREWORD TO THE THIRD EDITION

THE main contention of this book is that religion has the supreme place in the education of the child. A plea is made for week-day instruction in religion.

The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America has from its organization in 1908 supported this contention and at its successive conventions has earnestly urged upon the churches the consideration of this plea. So many practical difficulties, however, confront Protestant churches in their effort to recover a lost territory that to many it seemed a visionary scheme.

In an unexpected way the subject of religious education in its relation to the public school has recently been brought before the people by the introduction of the so-called Gary plan into the educational system of New York and other cities. This plan, as advocated by Superintendent William A. Wirt of Gary, Indiana, offers an opportunity for imparting instruction in religion to the children outside of school precincts during school hours without detriment to their standing.

It may help to solve some of the problems that have long confronted us, altho it remains to be seen whether it will stand the test of all the demands that will be made upon it. But in some way time will have to be found for giving to the children that systematic instruction in religion without which there can be no true education.

It is objected to the Gary method that it involves interference on the part of the State in the province of religion. This objection doubtless rests upon a misapprehension. The teachers of the public school have nothing to do with the assignment of the children to various religious denominations. This would be contrary to the American conception of the function of the public school and would not be tolerated by public opinion.

Two difficulties, however, confront churches desirous of reaping benefits of the Gary system. It will cost an effort to provide accommodations and effective teaching ; and an addition will have to be made to the annual budget. This however would only be the long delayed payment of a debt which we owe to the children. And it might prove to be a good investment in the end.

G. U. W.

December, 1915.

"RELIGIOUS EDUCATION AND THE PUBLIC SCHOOL"

I

THE PROBLEM

TWO questions are settled in the minds of American Christians. One is that there can be no true education without religion. The other is that we must have a public school, open to all children without regard to creed. These two propositions appear to contradict one another. The problem is how to reconcile them.

Contradictory Propositions

When our country was young, and Protestantism was the prevailing type of religion, these two ideas dwelt peaceably together. The founders of the Republic had no theory of education from which religion was divorced. But the influx of millions of people of other faiths compels us to revise our methods and to test them by our principles, the principles of a free Church within a free State. Roman Catholics and Jews object to

our traditions and charge us with inconsistency. If temporarily we are able to withstand their objections, we feel that a great victory has been won for religion when a psalm is read and the Lord's Prayer said at the opening of the daily session of school. We still have "religion" in the public school.

But the problem remains. On the one hand, those who doubt the propriety of introducing any religious instruction, however attenuated, into the public school, are not satisfied with the compromise. There are judicial decisions which place even the reading of the Bible under the head of sectarian instruction.

On the other hand, those who believe that religion has a supreme place in the education of a child, and that provision should therefore be made for it in its school life, realize the inadequacy of the present methods.

Aim of Education

As Herbert Spencer says: "To prepare us for complete living is the function which education has to discharge." Character rather than

acquirement is the chief aim of education. Hence we cannot ignore the place of religion in education without doing violence to the ultimate purpose of education.

The importance of the question is admitted on all sides. But it remains a complex and difficult problem. Thus far, at least, with all our talent for practical measures, we have not succeeded in reaching a solution.

The question of religious instruction, however, is by no means new. It is as old as Christianity. It may therefore be well to inquire in what way other ages have treated it. On this subject each of the great periods of Christian history has given an answer.

II

HISTORICAL REVIEW

IN the early ages, Christian nurture was a family duty. In his letter to the Ephesians, Paul urges fathers to nurture their children "in the chastening and admonition of the Lord." In his letter "unto the elect lady and her children," John expresses his joy at finding "certain of thy children walking in truth." When Paul reminded Timothy of the "unfeigned faith which dwelt first in thy grandmother Lois and thy mother Eunice," we are justified in inferring a Christian training. Christ's own words, (Mark 10), not only included a caution to the disciples, but were a direct command to the parents.

Family Training

The obligation of Christian nurture thus imposed by Christ and His Apostles was gladly accepted by the members of the early church, especially by the mothers.

The names of Emmelia the mother of Basil, Arethusa the mother of Chrysostom, and Monica the mother of Augustine, are eminent in the history of Christian family nurture.

In the writings of the Fathers we have occasional glimpses of the character and effect of this family training.* Polycarp writes: "Teach your women to bring up the children in the fear of the Lord." Hermas is blamed because he had not rightly instructed his children. The martyrs Paeon and Euelpistus were brought before a heathen judge, Rusticus, who asked them from whom they had learned Christianity. They replied, "From the women have we received this beautiful doctrine." Origen was instructed in the Scriptures from childhood by his father Leonidas. Every day he had to learn certain doctrines and a Bible story. Tertullian speaks of the children of Christians as holy not only by the privilege of birth but also by the discipline of their training. Clement of Alexandria

* See Sachsse, Lehre von der Kirchlichen Erziehung, p. 100.

demands that children should be trained by means of Bible examples and by fear. The Apostolical Constitutions prescribe to parents the duty of instructing their children in the Old and New Testaments, and of bringing them up in the fear of God. Chrysostom frequently admonishes his hearers to tell the Bible stories to their children. Basil the Great was instructed from childhood in the Christian faith by his father, his mother and his grandmother Macrina.

From these illustrations it seems clear that family training was the signature of the religious education of the early church.

The Christian School

In the Middle Ages the Christian school took the place of family training. The migrations of the nations disorganized social and family life, and made it necessary to find other means of reaching the children. The earliest schools were in connection with the monasteries. In 813 Charlemagne procured the passage of a resolution by the Council of Mainz that parents should be admonished to send their

children to school, either to the monastery or to their own pastors. Other synods followed in these recommendations and enlarged the scope of the training. But the indolence and the ignorance of the ministers were the chief obstacles in the way of realizing the ideals of that enlightened and truly great emperor, Charlemagne. He was great as a military conqueror, but he was still greater as a Christian educator.

Four centuries later another step was taken, when the Synod of Besier, in 1246, established a sort of Sunday-school, by ordering that all children seven years old and upward, should be brought to church by their parents to be instructed in the Christian faith. Incidentally the parents were also reached by this method.

Twenty-four years later Bishop Engelbert of Köln published the scheme of a well-organized school in his "Rules for Sextons and Schoolmasters." Instruction was to be given for five hours daily, principally in religion and morals, but also in all kinds of worldly subjects.

A century later John Gerson marked an epoch in the history of the instruction of children in religion. He was born in 1363, was brought up by pious parents, and received his education in Paris. He was not only a very learned man, but also a man of courage, contending bravely against existing evils in the church. He was the Spener of his day, not only in his zeal for practical Christianity, but also in his methods. His chief delight was to teach the children. His tract, "On Bringing the Little Ones to Christ," has helped to perpetuate his memory. In his old age he often gathered the children about him in the monastery of Lyons, and when he saw his end approaching, he sent once more for the children in order that he might pray with them. He died on the 12th of July, 1429.

The larger life that followed the Crusades led to the establishment of Latin schools in the cities all over Europe. These were secular, and were under the control of the city authorities. But their existence, together with the general en-

largement of intellectual life, emphasized the necessity of better systems of religious instruction. Numerous efforts were made in this direction, but the constant complaint was that the ministers were too indolent and were unwilling to undertake the work.

The invention of printing popularized a number of catechetical treatises, such as "The Road to Heaven," "Mirror for Christians" and "Threefold Cord," explanations of the Creed, the Lord's Prayer and the Ten Commandments. These booklets produced a wide-spread interest in the subject during the period immediately preceding the Reformation. John Frederick, subsequently the staunch and pious Elector of Saxony, got his father's permission to attend the catechetical classes in Torgau on Sunday afternoons in 1511, and Luther taught the catechism in public before he ever thought of a Reformation. Matthesius relates that Luther as a child at school had learned the Commandments, the Creed and the

Catechisms

Lord's Prayer, as well as grammar and some Christian hymns.

Sponsors in baptism also played an important part in the work of Christian instruction. The office was not nominal. It had its distinct duties, and where its original ideas were carried out, proved a helpful agency. In sporadic cases family training was restored toward the end of the Middle Ages, especially among the Waldensians, the Wiclifites and the Hussites.

The Reformation

The Reformation was a spiritual rather than an intellectual movement. But in order to a right faith, it was necessary that there should be a right knowledge of God. Hence religious education early received a leading place in the program of the Reformation. The Pre-Reformation period had indeed recognized the importance of the subject. Here and there its greatest teachers had emphasized its importance and had pointed out the way. There were not lacking synodical resolutions for the direction of the churches. But the

problem was not solved by the church of the Middle Ages.

The Reformers early devised systematic methods of imparting religious instruction to the young. The agents for this work were first, the pastors, and secondly, the schools.

In 1527 Melanchthon prescribed for ministers the preaching of sermons on the Creed, the Lord's Prayer and the Commandments. A regular portion of the catechism was to be explained in the form of a sermon. This sermon was delivered sometimes after the regular sermon, sometimes before. In the course of time, Sunday afternoon was set apart for the sermon on the catechism. The usual order of the service was: Recitation, Questions and Explanations, and the Sermon. To a certain extent the household-training of the early church was restored, inasmuch as parents were expected to teach their children the text of the catechism. But the work of explanation was left to the pastor.

Very soon it was found that Sunday

was not enough for this work, and one or more week-days were set apart on which religious instruction was to be given to the children. An examination was held four times a year.

Week-Day Classes

This method was generally adopted by the churches, and in most places it was in full operation prior to 1534. What Charlemagne had longed for in the ninth century was carried out by Luther seven hundred years later.

But the pastors alone were not equal to the work. They needed help. In the cities this was easily secured by reorganizing the existing schools. In 1520 Luther demanded that the chief subject in the schools should be the Holy Scriptures. In 1524 he made an appeal to the Councils of all the German cities to establish and maintain Christian schools. As the princes had no time for this work—they had to go sleigh-riding and attend to their sports—the city authorities should meet this crying need. In 1530 he made another appeal, this time to the parents.

They should not be satisfied with having their children learn arithmetic and reading, so as to become merchants and get rich. If that was the way it was going to be done in Germany, he would feel sorry that he was born a German.

Many cities responded to this appeal and established schools in which religion became the chief subject of instruction. In 1528 Melanchthon published for the use of these schools his "Instructions for Inspectors and Pastors." These instructions were revised and approved by Bugenhagen and Luther.

In the villages the task was more difficult. The need was recognized, but many years passed before the plans were effectively carried out. In the country districts around Wittenberg, it was prescribed as early as 1528 that the sexton in every village should be required to give instruction on week-days on the Commandments, the Creed and the Lord's Prayer, and also in the singing of hymns.

Parents were required to send their children to this instruction. The sexton

thus came into prominence as the pastor's assistant in the villages. In 1533 all Saxony followed the example of Wittenberg, in 1535 Pomerania, in 1543 Brunswick, in 1573 Brandenburg, in 1559 Württemberg.

This was the rule on paper at least. In point of fact, prior to the Thirty Years' War there were but few village schools. After the war, pious princes made renewed efforts to establish them. In this they were supported by the Pietistic movement. But it was reserved for a later period to realize the hopes and expectations of the Reformers.

A Bohemian Bishop

It was Francke's genial spirit that gave practical direction to the new ideas of the Christian school, and his name will always be associated with the history of modern education. But the real author of its principles was John Amos Comenius, the last Bishop of the Bohemian Brethren. He was born in 1592 and died in 1670. One of the most learned men of his times, he excelled in many directions, but his chief claim to

enduring fame is the contribution which he made to the science of teaching. His views on education had been committed to paper while he and his churches were exiles. They were called forth by the desire to give to his people, in the training of Christian children, something that could not be taken away when they should again be restored to their homes. That time never came. For decades the manuscripts lay unused and forgotten in their hiding place, and their author died, having apparently planned and lived in vain.

A quarter of a century after his death, the seed which he had sown began to grow. Francke, Rousseau and Pestalozzi in all probability got their ideas from Comenius, and what had seemed a failure became the permanent possession of the modern world.

Revolution in Methods

As a result of these principles, educational methods underwent a complete revolution in the eighteenth century. This first became apparent in the period of Illuminism,

(*Aufklaerung*), the forerunner of Rationalism. The chief exponent was Basedow, with an elementary work in 1770, and four volumes in 1774. Acting upon a suggestion of Rousseau, he laid down the principle that education must accord with nature. He condemned mechanical memorization of uncomprehended sentences. Instruction must lead to the knowledge of things. The mind must be strengthened by observation and discrimination. Memory is to be subordinated to the understanding. In religion, the doctrines common to all nations are to be distinguished from those of Revelation. The former are to be taught in school, the latter in church. The common doctrines of religion are three: 1. There is a Providence. 2. There is a future life. 3. This future life is obtained by being good in this life. Hence children should early be taught to be good.

The application of Basedow's principles to religious instruction was made by Salzmann (1780). Religion is a state of mind which appreciates things at their

real worth. It must not be based on the events that took place eighteen hundred years ago. Teach children to study nature, and then they will appreciate the teachings of the Bible. Tell them of God's love and then of His commandments. Learning texts and studying books makes them hate religion. Tell them stories in the way that Jesus did. Bible stories are not suitable because of their orientalism. Robinson Crusoe is better. Connect religious sentiments with his adventures. Finally, lead to faith in the Divine revelation in Christ, not by dogmatic statements but by telling of His life and works. Faith in Christ is one thing, acceptance of dogmatic statements is another thing.

These methods were a mixture of truth and error. On the one hand, Christianity is not an unintelligible ecclesiasticism. The reason must be cultivated. Christ is to be known as a Person and not as a dogma. On the other hand, the conception of Christianity as a mere doctrine was incomplete.

In this connection mention must also be made of Baron von Rochow, who established a village school on his estates, in which the merits but not the faults of Illuminism were seen; and of Pestalozzi, whose practical efforts were such complete failures, but who gave seed-thoughts that are still bringing forth fruit.

The changes produced by the combined influences of the eighteenth century were very great. Thoro training was required of teachers. Normal schools were established. Attendance at school, formerly optional, became obligatory. Mechanical memorization was condemned. School used to be a purgatory for children, it was turned into a paradise. Above all, there was a definite aim. In religion, the aim was development of character. In secular training, the aim was to fit for the practical duties of life.

Francke's Schools

The year 1695 marks a new step in the history of religious education. In this year August Hermann Francke established his School for the Poor in Glaucha. To this

he soon added a Public School, a Latin High School and a Normal School with a postgraduate annex. For these schools and for his Orphans' House he required teachers. He trained them himself, and within three years he had fifty-six teachers at work in his institutions.

Francke was a master teacher. His aim was the development of character. Instruction was only the means to this end. His system included the study of nature, and provided for manual training, for girls as well as boys. He is the founder of the Christian public school. In 1763 Frederick the Great adopted his system for Prussia.

It must be evident that these two centuries, from Luther to Pestalozzi, witnessed great progress in the matter of religious education. Luther had simply continued the method of the Middle Ages. While he appreciated the value of the Bible Story, and as we shall see later, commended its use, he put the emphasis of his instruction where the church for a thousand years before him had placed

it, on the Commandments, the Creed and the Lord's Prayer.

The seventeenth century was the era of catechisms with Questions and Answers. In definitions, and definitions of definitions, the pages multiplied to an almost interminable extent. Some catechisms had literally thousands of questions and answers. Even Spener, otherwise a good teacher, contributed little toward a better method.

But with Francke and the later Pietists, in the eighteenth century, under the influence of the principles to which we have referred, came new suggestions as to the aim and the method of catechisation. Rationalism, it is true, was a coworker in the reformation of methods, but it failed to reach the conceded aim, the development of character, because it departed from historical Christianity.

The nineteenth century clarified and put into practice the ideas which the eighteenth century suggested. The emphasis was no longer placed on memorizing doctrinal statements. Bible History,

the objective facts of Christianity, became the starting point, the foundation of Christian instruction.

Our own times are witnessing an intense interest in both the theory and practice of teaching. But the strangest feature in the history of this movement is that while it originated in the church, and was developed by its ministers for the purpose of building up the church, and for the promotion of religious life, the church of to-day seems to be the last to derive any benefit from it. We have not a few churches where the method of teaching the catechism is that of the seventeenth century. We have theological seminaries from which candidates for the ministry are graduated who are unable to teach a class of children in accordance with approved pedagogical principles. We cannot conceal from ourselves the fact that in America at least, Religious Education, as compared with secular instruction, does not occupy the queenly position to which its origin and history, as well as its exalted aims, entitle it.

III

IN OTHER LANDS

IN the matter of education the position of *preceptor mundi* has for centuries been conceded to Germany. For information as to the present condition of religious education in that empire I am indebted to Dr. Sachsse, Professor in the University of Bonn.

Germany

In Germany religious instruction is a part of the regular curriculum of the public school. It is either Evangelical, (Protestant), or Catholic, in the sense in which these churches understand it, denominationally dogmatic therefore, and not humanistic. In elementary schools there are from thirty to thirty-two hours of instruction during the week. From four to six of these hours are devoted to religion, usually the first hours of the forenoon. In the high schools, (gymnasiums, colleges), there are also thirty-two

hours of instruction. In the lower classes, three of these hours are devoted to religion; in the higher classes, two. For home work, the pupil is expected to devote about half an hour to each lesson. In addition to the religious instruction given at school, the minister devotes two hours a week to advanced classes for a year or two prior to confirmation.

England

In England the question at the present time is in a state of flux. Hitherto, thru a system of National and Board schools, religious education was provided for every child. Whatever the outcome may be of the present discussion, there will be no diminution of religious instruction for the children of England.

France

In France the state of equilibrium has also not yet been found. Professor Ménégoz of the University of Paris has kindly sent me an account of the present situation. Religious instruction is not given in the public school. But, besides Sundays, *Thursdays* are given to the churches for the

purpose of imparting religious instruction in their own buildings. On these days the children do not attend the public school.

There are also denominational private schools,—*ecoles libres*—, where religious as well as secular instruction is given, but these are declining in number and influence. It has been found impossible to compete with the large resources of the public school.

In the secondary schools, (*Colleges* and *Lycées*), religious instruction is given by ministers, usually the *pastores loci*, who receive a small salary from the government. But this is regarded only as an unavoidable expedient.

As for the universities, recent developments have led to the exclusion of religion from them, but there is a "*Section des sciences religieuses*" in the "*Ecole des Hautes-Etudes*", which maintains lectureships on religion in the Sorbonne.

Sweden

For an account of the conditions in Sweden, I am indebted to Dr. von Scheele, the Bishop of Gothland.

Religious instruction is given during the eight months of the school year. The average number of hours per week is five. The subjects are: the Catechism, Bible Story, Bible Reading with oral explanations, and Church Song. In the higher schools, and in the upper classes of the other schools, Church History is also a part of the curriculum.

The proportion of time allotted to religious instruction is one-sixth, that is, over sixteen per cent. For home study, the children usually require an hour a day for their lessons in religion.

IV

THE CHURCH'S RESPONSIBILITY

IN America religious instruction has by judicial decision been excluded from the public school. Roman Catholics, Moravians and some Lutherans maintain parochial schools.

Other churches have to a great extent delegated the work of instruction to the Sunday-school. This is a voluntary organization, connected with the church, but to a large degree independent of it. Its hour of instruction, or rather its fraction of an hour, is confined to the first day of the week. So great is its influence and relative efficiency, that if one were asked what is the American system of religious instruction, the answer in most cases would be: "The Sunday-school."

The American System

In shifting this task to the Sunday-school, the church has transferred its own

burden to weaker shoulders, and to an institution that was not established for this purpose.

The work of religious instruction properly belongs to the family. It was there that we found it in early Christian history. There it belongs in the nature of the case. No plan of religious education can be permanently successful that does not emphasize the obligation of the family, and that does not aim at the maintenance of family religion.

Duty of the Family

But next to the family stands the church with its function as a teacher of religion. We make no claims for special rights and privileges of the church as an institution. Protestantism views the church rather as a fellowship of believers, a "communion of saints." But from this very standpoint it is especially incumbent upon the church to care for the children. It is true, this function has been temporarily ignored among us, or thru a mistaken policy committed to other hands, to the public

The Church

school in its "religious exercises," and to the Sunday-school in its heroic effort to accomplish the task in an hour of voluntary work on Sunday. Nevertheless the principles of Protestantism have never repudiated the responsibility of the church to care for the Christian training of her children.

If education means the formation and development of character, how short-sighted the policy that regards art, science, literature, morality, as the chief factors in education, to which may be added, as an eclectic, a little religion on Sundays. Religion, as distinguished from all other forces, brings us into relation with the life of God. The church is the organ and agency thru which this life is proclaimed and communicated. The church has the word, the ordinances, the fellowship of believers. To the church has been committed by Divine hands the responsibility of leading men to the highest life.

This is a responsibility that cannot be delegated to any other agency. Such a

fundamental thing as religious education should therefore be under the care of the church and its ministry, and should be so conducted as to hold in view the principles and the aims of the church life, and its final purpose should be to lead the children into the church and to make them participants in its privileges and obligations.

The church has always recognized more or less distinctly her mission in this respect. But there have been times also when she has failed to do so. From the history of education it is clear that the contributions of the church, thru such men as Luther, Melanchthon, Comenius, Francke and Pestalozzi made the modern educational system possible.* The Protestant Church is the mother of the public school. But in the eighteenth century the church was not equal to her opportunity, and she proved unfaithful to her stewardship. The dominant influence in education passed over into the hands of those who emphasized

When the Church Failed

*See Encyclopedia Britannica, article on Education.

the development of natural powers, of those who were not friends of Christ. Thru her own negligence the church lost her opportunity and was pushed aside. The methods and material which her spirit had created, and which her ministers had formed into effective tools, were handed over to secular agencies, and she herself took a subordinate place in the work of education.

Crowded Out

At the beginning of the twentieth century we find the curriculum of the school life filled to overflowing with secular studies. It requires almost the strength of an athlete to handle all the books which the children carry home under their arms. The Superintendent of Schools has felt it necessary to give special instructions as to the best way to carry books so as to prevent physical injury. When here and there a pastor tries to get a little study in religion from his children, he is met with the plea: "We have so many school lessons, we cannot learn the lessons you give us." If he insists, he realizes that

his children have a double task to learn, and the church has to suffer. The church seems to have no rights which the school is bound to respect.

In saying this I do not blame the school authorities. They simply came into an unoccupied field. The church failed to recognize her obligation, relinquished her week-day opportunities, made no pedagogical demands on her ministry, and was content to play at education on Sundays.

Roman Catholics recognize their obligation in the matter of Christian education, and with great sacrifices are endeavoring to meet it thru their system of parochial schools. All honor to them for their consistency and perseverance.

Parochial Schools

Adherents of this communion claim that the state ought to contribute a portion of the school funds for the support of the church school. Moravians also maintain parochial schools, and so does a portion of the Lutheran Church. The Missouri Synod reports over a thousand teachers and a hundred thousand scholars. But

neither Moravians nor Lutherans ask for public money. They maintain the obligation of the state to provide general education, and the duty of the church to provide religious instruction for its members.

But Protestants generally are not prepared to accept the parochial school as the solution.

Religion in the Public Schools

On the other hand, from ministers, conferences and church papers there comes perennially the plea for "Religion in the public schools." If by this is meant no more than the reading of a psalm and the recitation of the Lord's Prayer, perhaps the plea may be granted, and for an indefinite number of years, without straining the constitution, we may retain "Religion in the public schools."

But there are two objections. Are they not vital? One is denominational. Even if Protestants could agree on some ground, which is improbable, what kind of a conglomerate would that be which would be acceptable alike to Roman

Catholics, Protestants, Jews and Agnostics? The thing is inconceivable. But there is another objection. The method of secular instruction differs from that of religious instruction. Secular knowledge is acquired by intellectual and critical powers. Religion is a matter of the heart and life. The holy mysteries of our faith cannot be taught in the atmosphere of mathematics and biology.

No; the Church and the State are distinct spheres. The alliance between the two in the past has not produced such results as would encourage us to renew or to continue the partnership for the future.

There are those who think that ethical teaching in the public schools on weekdays, with religious teaching in the churches on Sundays, will meet the want. No one will object to ethical teaching in the public school. If all that we read in the newspapers is true, such a course might properly be described as a felt need. But it cannot take the place of religion. The Christian religion is a

revelation in history, resting upon certain facts that have to be learned and communicated to others. It has certain principles which have to be applied to the daily life. It is a matter for all days and all places, and not merely for Sundays and for the sanctuary. Its relation to the whole life places it in the foremost place in the training and development of the young in order that its highest ideals may be attained. Hence, it will be difficult for us to conceive of a substitute for religious instruction, or to find any agency other than the Christian church thru which it can properly and effectively be imparted.

Neither is it practicable to make such an adjustment of denominational differences, a composite photograph as it were of all religions, an American religion, to be taught in the public school, as would satisfy any of the churches. The churches are entitled to teach their children religion in strict accord with their own convictions.

Is the parochial school then, after all,

the solution of the question? Must we retire from the public school, separate ourselves from the moral and educational problems of society and the State, and thus be untrue to our entire history? For, as we have seen, the public school is the child of the Christian school. After spending four hundred years in developing a system of education for the people, and handing it over to the State for the benefit of all, are we to be deprived of the privileges of our own system? We have no thought of doing so, of retiring from a school which the State would never have had but for the untiring efforts of Protestant ministers and Protestant churches. The teachers and directors of the public school are, to a great extent, the members of our churches. Its principles are those which have been inculcated by our pulpits. Its most loyal and efficient supporters are our Protestant churches. There are, it is true, things of highest importance which the secular school does not supply. In order that we may not lose these, must we go back to

the private or parochial school and build up anew our system of education?

We do not ask for the teaching of religion in the public school. On the contrary, we object to a State religion. Of the three churches that are supposed to favor Christian education in the day school, Roman Catholics, Episcopalians and Lutherans, the last named certainly would not favor it for the public school. Even in Europe the tendency is distinctly in the direction of separating religious education from State control.

In this city the public schools are overcrowded. There might be more room if the friends of the Christian school were to withdraw. But this would not benefit the public school. It increases the commonwealth to mingle the classes. A system of separate schools is beneficial neither to the State nor the church. If Christians are to be the salt and the light of the world, they must be in the world and not out of it. The parochial school is not the solution.

Does the Sunday-school meet the re-

quirements of religious instruction? It is an institution that has endeared itself to the hearts of millions. Originally intended for the half-fed waifs of an English manufacturing town, it has become among English-speaking people an important agency of religion. Apart from the instruction which it gives, we could not dispense with it as a field for the cultivation of lay activity, and a practical demonstration of the priesthood of all believers. Nevertheless, its best friends concede its limitations. From a pedagogical standpoint, no one thinks of comparing it with the secular school. With but half an hour a week for instruction, even the best of teachers could not expect very important results. Its chief value lies in the personal influence of the teacher. But instruction in religion involves more than this.

The Sunday-School

Nor does the Sunday-school reach all the children. Attendance is voluntary, and hence there is no guarantee that all the children of school age will obtain any instruction, to say nothing of graded and

systematic instruction, taking account of the entire school life, and holding in mind the ultimate object of instruction, the preparation of children for full membership in the church. But this is one of the first duties of the churches, to look after all their children with this end in view. Pedobaptists are under this obligation because their children have been baptized, and Baptists owe it to their children in order that they may be baptized.

Let us make the most of the Sunday-school which has providentially grown up among us. As a supplement and an aid it has untold possibilities of usefulness. But all its merits and advantages cannot close our eyes to the fact that it does not and cannot meet the chief requirement of the Christian school, the systematic preparation of all the children for the duties of church membership.

The church cannot shirk her responsibility. Her very existence depends upon it.

V

"A WEEK-DAY SUNDAY-SCHOOL"

WHAT solution then can be found by those who are seeking relief from the present unsatisfactory, shall we not say intolerable, conditions? Germany with her State church cannot give us the clue. England is herself at the present moment in the throes of a revolution on this question and cannot help us. France is more likely to offer a practical suggestion.

If "infidel" France is able to give Thursdays to the churches, what can America do? Can she not give at least one afternoon, say Wednesday afternoon?

Two hours of grammar or geography would have to be sacrificed, but it would give the churches an invaluable opportunity of establishing schools in their own buildings in which systematic instruction in religion could be given. This is asking for 8% of the

Wednesday Afternoon

school hours for religion. Germany gives from four to six hours, or from 12 to 16%. Does America owe so little to the religious life of the nation that she cannot afford to surrender two hours for its perpetuation? We ought not to say surrender, we ought to say restore. For, viewed historically, it is only a partial restoration of the time which originally belonged to the churches, but which under conditions that have been indicated, has been taken away from her.

I venture to advocate the value of such week-day instruction from a practical trial of its advantages. In my ministry on the East Side I made use for thirty years of the traditional agency for the instruction of children, the Sunday-school, with additional week-day classes in the catechism, for the older children from twelve to fourteen years of age. But so far as a permanent religious influence upon the great majority of the children is concerned, the results were not satisfactory.

About ten years ago, after several years

of experiment on a smaller scale, I established week-day classes for all the children of the congregation, from five or six years upward. Attendance was made obligatory, and after a few years of patient insistence, the rule was generally observed.

The hours are at four P. M. from Mondays to Fridays, and nine A. M. on Saturdays. The younger grades have but one hour each week. The older scholars, catechumens, from two to three hours.

The subjects are Bible Story, Bible Study, (geography, history, books, etc.) the church catechism, hymns, prayers, the church liturgy or service, and oral or written reports of the sermon. The object of this course is not simply education, but also training in the church life, so as to make the children intelligent participants in the church services, and to prepare them for the privileges of church membership.

But some one will say: "Does this not solve your problem without encroaching at all on the time of the public school?

Why should you ask for an afternoon when you can take all the time there is left after school hours?"

For two reasons:

First, we get the children when they have already done their day's work at school, and are too tired to do their best in the Religion Hour. To learn well, the mind must be fresh and vigorous. Is it fair to the churches to give them the fag end of the day for religion, the crumbs that fall from the rich man's table? The church is not a Lazarus.

Home Study

But there is another reason. Home study is needed for proper preparation of the lessons in religion no less than for those of the secular school. For this demand on the child's time, the present curriculum of the school makes no provision.

For example, from the older children, from thirteen years upward, the following weekly tasks are required:

1. A written report of last Sunday's sermon.

2. A written catechetical exercise.

3. Memory work in Bible, catechism and hymn book, for two recitations.

4. Written and oral report on a Bible story.

5. Report on Daily Bible Readings.

6. Miscellaneous recitations on related subjects.

The younger classes have similar tasks, adapted to their age and capacity.

Is this asking too much of the children? What is there in this scheme that can be omitted, with any pretence of giving instruction in religion?

But so long as the public school is not required to take note of the educational work which the church has to do, it exacts home study to the utmost capacity of the pupil. With the bogy of examination and promotion constantly before the child's mind, the pastor finds it difficult to get from it the work which he has a right to expect. "We have so many school lessons," is the excuse which is offered and on the strength of this plea he reluctantly curtails his own requirements.

Surely any loss which the children sustain in secular studies is more than compensated by their gain in religious knowledge. As one of our School Superintendents well said: "Even if the method of teaching should be inferior to that of the public school, the material is so much more valuable, that the child would not suffer any loss."

Closing Public School?

There is one misconception of the plan which we find it hard to correct. The plan does not involve the closing of the public school on Wednesday afternoons, and turning the non-church children into the street. It simply asks that all children, who by consent of their parents attend the church school and bring a certificate of attendance, shall be excused for their absence from the public school. It also asks that the curriculum of the public school shall be so arranged that the absentees have nothing to make up, and shall not suffer an irreparable loss in their educational progress. Music, etiquette, ethics, cord work, raffia, sewing

or electives might be given to those who remain.

On the part of the churches we can safely promise that our children will not fall behind the others in general attainments because of this change of atmosphere in the middle of the week.

VI

"LIONS IN THE WAY"

THE object of this little book is to bring before American Christians a question that must sooner or later be decided. The more thoroly the question is discussed, the more likely shall we be to reach a reasonable conclusion. Doubtless there are difficulties. But they are not to be compared with the difficulties in which we shall continue to be involved so long as we do not make adequate preparation for the systematic religious education of our children. Let us consider some of the objections that are made to the proposition.

Public School Needs all the Time

1. On the part of the school it is claimed that it needs all the time it now has. We freely grant this. It is doing Titanic work. It is constantly improving its methods, and its magnificent attainments compel

our admiration. But if all this must be purchased at the cost of religion, the price is too high.

The following schedule gives the course of study in the public schools of New York:

TIME SCHEDULE ON THE BASIS OF 1500 MINUTES PER WEEK

YEARS	I.	II.	III.	IV.	V.	VI.	VII.	VIII.
Opening Exercises	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
Physical Training, Physiology and Hygiene, Recesses and Organized Games	450	165	165	150	90	90	90	90
English	450	510	450	375	375	375	360	320
Penmanship	100	125	125	75	75	75	....	....
Electives (German, French, Spanish)	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	200
Geography	....	....	....	135	120	120	80	....
History	....	....	....	....	90	120	120	120
Mathematics	125	150	150	150	150	200	200	200
Nature Study	90	90	90	90	75	....	....	....
Science	....	....	....	....	....	....	80	80
Drawing and Constructive Work	120	120	120	120	120	120	80	80
Cord and Raffia	30	30	30	....	....	....	....	....
Sewing	....	....	30	60	60	60	....	....
Shop Work, Cooking or Advanced Sewing	....	....	....	....	....	....	80	80
Music	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60
Study and Unassigned Time	....	175	205	210	210	205	275	195
	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500

All of these are important. But some are of relatively less importance than others, and in view of a greater need, it is conceivable that certain branches might be taught on Wednesdays, and the lessons given in the church school accepted

as an adequate substitute, so far as intellectual training is concerned. For example:

Public School.	*Church School.*
Music.	Music.
Geography.	Bible Geography
Penmanship.	Written Lessons.
English Composition	Reports of Sermons.
Hygiene.	Way of Salvation.
Memory Work	Memory Work

But if the school cannot spare these two hours, not even from its three or four hours of unassigned time, and if the foregoing church lessons are not an adequate substitute for school lessons, we have another proposition. The two lost hours may be recovered by adding a half hour to each of the other four school days. Only let the churches have a fair proportion of the best school hours for exercising their legitimate function in education.

2. "There is no imperative demand for it on the part of the public."

The demand may not have taken just

this form. And there doubtless are multitudes of people who believe that the Sunday-school and the "religious exercises" of the public school furnish a sufficient amount and quality of religious education.

But, it may confidently be asserted that, in America as in England, there are few subjects which at the present time more deeply engage the interest of thoughtful men than that of religious education. As soon as an opportunity can be given for the American public to express itself on this subject, the demand for it will be emphatic, and the interest not less manifest than in England, where on a recent occasion in Parliament forty men were on their feet prepared to discuss the question as soon as a speaker had finished.

3. "The churches now have abundant opportunities on Saturdays and Sundays, and hours after school on other days." (Why not also "all the hours from midnight till 6 A. M.?")

Answer: Sunday is a day of rest and

worship. Saturday is a day of recreation. If recreation is not needed, the public school is welcome to all of Saturday to make up for its losses on Wednesday afternoon.

4. "Sunday services could be made to subserve the purposes of instruction."

Answer: They are used for that purpose now. But instruction implies an amount of intellectual labor for which neither ministers nor scholars should be compelled to use their rest day. Sunday services have a character of their own and should not be confused with the curriculum of an educational institution.

5. "Christian parents should be awakened to their duty."

Answer: How can they be, when the soporific of superabounding secular studies makes them insensible to the primary importance of religion?

6. "The proposition implies that the public school is in some respects radically deficient."

Yes, this we concede.

7. "The church calls upon the arm

of the State, (the vagrant officer), to enforce attendance at the church school."

Nonsense. The church needs no help from the State to enforce attendance. Membership in the church is voluntary. But the church, like any other society, asks its members to fulfil their obligations.

The proposition is that scholars attending church schools shall be excused from attending public school. Only enrolled children, or children bringing a certificate of attendance, are excused. There is no compulsion, and no vagrant officer is needed by the church.

8. "The public school now teaches the things that make for righteousness." So it does, and so it should. So ought every other institution.

But our plan aims at something more than morals, something which the school admittedly cannot teach to its promiscuous charge, but which the church is in duty bound to teach to the members of its flock.

But the greatest difficulties are those which are suggested by ministers them-

selves. It was the ministers who failed to respond to the plans of Charlemagne, and thus frustrated the purpose of that enlightened ruler. It was the ministers who in the eighteenth century surrendered into secular hands the inestimable heritage which belonged to them, and it is the ministers to-day who, in the matter of primary education at least, are content to follow rather than to lead.

1. "Ministers are not trained teachers and are not equal to the task."

It is alas too true that our Theological Seminaries have neglected this part of a minister's preparation for his work. We heard very little about Herbart, and the doctrine of apperception is not very clear to us even now. But a better day is coming. Seminaries are beginning to teach teaching. The time is coming when candidates for the ministry will be required to demonstrate their attainments in the theory and practice of this art. In the meantime, let us use our ordinary common sense and do the best we can with such gifts as we possess.

Those who come after us will do better work, we hope.

2. "Ministers are already taxed to the limit of their powers, and cannot possibly shoulder this new responsibility."

And yet the church is the mother of education. Is it conceivable that the Christian minister will definitely repudiate his obligation to feed Christ's lambs? He *must* find time for this work, no matter what else he surrenders.

Roman Catholics say that if they have no schools they will have no churches. Protestants, perhaps, may retain *audiences* by present methods. But it will be a hard task to build up *churches*. All the evangelists in the country will not be able to head off the escaped sheep that might easily have been gathered into the fold while they were lambs. So long as we treat the teaching of children as a matter of indifference, or place it in irresponsible hands, we shall struggle in vain to secure a permanent influence upon the great body of those who properly belong to our flocks. Alas for the chil-

dren, alas for the churches where the pastor is unwilling or unable to teach.

3. "Where will you get the helpers?"

The writer serves a church of limited resources, but for ten years he has gathered nearly three hundred children into his week-day classes. The present corps of teachers consists of a trained teacher, a deaconess and several volunteers from the congregation. The pastor's contribution is about five hours per week.

Some congregations may be able to secure salaried teachers. Volunteers are available in many cases. It must be remembered that in such a week-day school one teacher can, if necessary, take charge of thirty or forty pupils.

4. Another difficulty is the want of a scheme of instruction that will make the course equal in value to that given in the public school. This is a matter which each congregation will have to arrange for itself. But no one would for a moment concede the permanent impotence or inferiority of the church in this respect.

In following pages a scheme is offered,

not as a model but only as a suggestion.

5. "But suppose the children will not come."

They will come, if we make it worth coming. Nevertheless, one of the features of this system is that attendance on the part of the children should be obligatory. That is, they are expected to come, and absence must be accounted for. Most parents appreciate such aid on the part of the church. After two or three years of disciplinary insistence, almost all will be convinced of its importance. Those who are not, would probably find a more congenial home in some other congregation.

A certain amount of discipline would not be unwholesome in our Protestant churches. In this case it would be a way in which people could show their loyalty to that for which their church stands. People appreciate most the things that cost something. The lessons of authority, of obligation, of duty are not the least of those which our generation would do well to learn.

VII

THE CHILD CATECHUMENATE

THE earliest catechumenate was that of the proselytes. It was based on Christ's command, "Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations,.... teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you." The church was a missionary organization, and its aim was to convert people to the Christian view of life. Instruction was thought of as an implantation of the word: "Receive with meekness the implanted word which is able to save your souls." (James 1: 21.) It preceded baptism and was continued afterward under various grades of teachers.

One object was to establish Christian usages and to accustom people to them.

Proselytes

In later periods, when it became popular to join the church, the term of probation was exten-

ded to several years and a rich liturgical ceremony was prescribed. This was done, partly for the purpose of substituting Christian rites in place of the heathen mysteries, and partly because of the mystagogical or educational value of the forms. There were grades and classes of catechumens, chiefly the *audientes* and the *competentes*. At successive stages of their instruction they were admitted to new glimpses of the Christian doctrine and service. For example, the exact wording of the Creed and the Lord's Prayer was not entrusted to them until the close of their probation. Much of it was an ornate ritualism, but the underlying purpose was that the participants might be brought to a personal and heartfelt confession of the Christian faith.

Lessons for Children

After the middle of the third century, when infant baptism became the rule, the child catechumenate gradually superseded that of the proselytes, and under Gregory the Great it became the rule of the church. A

systematic training of the baptized children was aimed at and to some extent secured through the sponsors, whose duty it was to provide the godchildren with religious instruction until they reached years of discretion and were able to come to their first confession. Among the prescribed subjects were the Creed, the Lord's Prayer and the Gloria. In the ninth century parochial schools were established to assist in the systematic Christian training of the young. The Bible history was largely given in the form of poems, and the plastic representations of the churches of those days aided in giving the people a definite idea of the story of the Bible.

But not only Christian teaching, Christian *training* also played an important part in the work of the church at that time. Rules of living and the services of the church accustomed the people to the Christian view of life. Of special importance was the practice of private confession which began to be transferred from the convent life to the pastoral care

of children. It consisted in the recitation of certain church forms, and in instruction on moral distinctions on the basis of Scripture passages. It aimed also to obtain a pastoral view of the state of mind and heart of the child. For the purpose of individualization the Ten Commandments were used as a *speculum peccatorum*. The imposition of penances accustomed the people to the practice of obedience to the church's demands. The age produced a number of treatises on the method of training catechumens. The most important of them is Gerson's, "On Bringing the Little Ones to Christ," a work in which the aim of the catechumenate is set forth in a substantially evangelical manner.

These times are sometimes called "the Dark Ages." But let us not forget that they were periods when nations were converted and brought under the quickening power of Christianity.

The Reformation gave new significance and character to the ancient catechumenate. At first it was not a cate-

chumenate for children, but rather for the whole people. Entire congregations had to be instructed in the fundamentals of religion. As a ripe fruit of his experience in preaching, teaching and the care of souls, Luther published in 1529 his Small Catechism, a book which still holds its place as the fairest fruit of the catechetical literature of all ages. Its arrangement is Decalogue, Creed and Lord's Prayer, that is Law, Gospel, and the New Life, with supplemental chapters on Baptism and the Lord's Supper. In its form and arrangement, and even in some of its expressions, it reproduced the best results of the preceding ages. The occasion for its publication was the lamentable condition of the religious instruction of children as he found it during a visitation of the churches in Electoral Saxony. The book at once became exceedingly popular and produced a complete transformation in the religious training of the people.

Reformation Catechisms

The example set by Luther was fol-

lowed by the Reformed, who published their Heidelberg Catechism in 1563, and even by the Roman Catholics who published their Trent Catechism in 1566.

In Spener's time, and that of the Pietists, the religious and pedagogic importance of Bible History came to be understood, and since then this form of imparting religious knowledge has taken the first place.

Catechization sympathized with the spirit of the subsequent intellectual and religious movements. Thus in the days of Rationalism the chief aim was usefulness, not so much the formation of Christian character as the training of useful citizens. Under Pestalozzi the new pedagogical methods were introduced, and the great changes produced a century ago by the leaders in philosophy, art and literature, left their permanent impression upon catechetics as well.

Two questions are incidentally involved in my subject. The first is the relation of the children to the church. There are those who believe that the

Spirit of God is incapable of influencing the undeveloped spiritual life of a child, and that years of discretion must be attained before we can speak of regenerating influence. Just what the relation of the children to the church in such a system is, it is hard to tell. They are not Christian, neither are they heathen. They must be in some kind of a *limbus infantum.* Many retain the practice of infant baptism, who if questioned closely, will admit that they mean nothing by it.

Relation of Children to Church

There are those on the other hand who believe that baptism is more than a mere symbol, a suggestive form, inherited from the past, or a dedication of the child to God on the part of the parents. They believe, in the words of the Westminster Confession, that "by the right use of this ordinance, the grace promised is not only offered, but really exhibited and conferred by the Holy Ghost." Those who thus believe in infant baptism hold, or should hold, that as the church has baptized the

children she is in duty bound to teach them. In Christ's command teaching is correlated with baptism, and the church is bound to recognize the connection between them.

"Making Christians"

The second question relates to the best method of making Christians. That it is a question, such paragraphs as the following prove:

A Chicago correspondent writes to a certain paper: "A very prominent divine told me a few days ago: 'I am compelled to leave my flock, much against my wishes, not because of lack of appreciation or sympathy on their part, but because of the extreme difficulty I find in interesting outsiders.'"

Henry Drummond speaks of the restlessness that characterizes our modern congregations. "Like the Athenians of old, they are ever seeking after some new thing. There is a hunger and thirst among the people for some new sensation. Yet withal there is an impotence in the pulpit so far as the legitimate results of preaching are concerned."

In our own city pulpits are vacant, because the congregations are anxious to find some great preacher, one who can fill the pews and assure the church treasurer a large and steady income. For every vacant pulpit in a prominent church there are scores of applicants who are willing to sacrifice themselves. And very often they do sacrifice themselves. A few years later, with broken spirit, they retire to some quiet place where they may rest from the unequal struggle.

Our present-day forces for the conversion of the world and the edification of the church are:

First, the regular preacher. It is his business to be an attractive writer and speaker so as to be able to hold his audience. The *Tribune* recently brought the following notice:

"Next Sunday will be the Rev. Dr. ———'s last appearance(!) for some time in the pulpit of the ——— Church."

While it is true that a reporter of a daily paper does not always appear to the

best advantage in his use of ecclesiastical phraseology, it must be admitted that he is quick to catch the popular conception of a situation.

Secondly, the evangelist, for special seasons and for meetings at Carnegie Hall and other places untainted by the flavor of church associations.

Thirdly, Sunday - school teachers, upon whom a large part of the responsibility of the religious education of the young rests.

Would that family training might be added to these as an important factor.

Supplemental to these forces are Young People's Societies, King's Daughters and the like, the great success of which demonstrates a widespread need.

Each of these forces and all combined undoubtedly have a most important place in the economy of the church, but they cannot take the place of the catechumenate.

What then is the child catechumenate? What is there in it which differentiates it from allied institutions and methods?

Definition

It is that institution of Christ and the church by which children are systematically taught and trained in such a way as to prepare them for a personal participation in the life and privileges of the Christian church.

That it is an institution of Christ, is argued from the word τηρεῖν, "to observe," in Christ's last command.

Its place in the New Testament is seen from numerous passages, such as Galatians 6:6, "Let the catechumen communicate to him who catechises in all good things." (Literal translation.)

It involves two distinct functions, that of *teaching* and that of *training*.

It has a definite end, that of making mature Christians out of incipient believers.

It pursues a systematic method, leading step by step to the comprehension of that which has been revealed.

And finally, it is an institution *of the church;* that is, the Christian church itself supplies the organ and ministry by which the work is carried on.

My plea for the restoration of the Child Catechumenate I shall endeavor to enforce by a brief reference, 1, to its principles, and 2, to its practice.

1. PRINCIPLES. The importance of this institution rests chiefly upon the duty which the church owes to the children who have been entrusted to its care. We acknowledge the claims of the heathen whom we have never seen. But here are the little ones crowding our doors and asking for admission into the kingdom. Then again the trustful nature of the child makes it an unspeakable privilege to guide and an easy task to convert it. While we recognize in them, too, the impress of the fallen nature, there is also that which has been called the *anima naturaliter Christiana*. They respond almost intuitively to the idea of God and immortality. The five-year-old brother of Klopstock was found in the open field during a terrific thunder storm, and when asked what he was doing, he replied, "I am praying to the great God."

The church is the mother of education. But what a humiliating position we take when we allow secular instruction to be given in the most scientific and effective manner, while the subjects of highest import are entrusted almost wholly to inexpert hands.

Again, is it wise to postpone the making of special religious impressions to a time when the mind and heart have become preoccupied, and are past the time when the germinal purposes of life are formed?

These statements are trite and almost self-evident, and yet to most ministers everything else seems to be of greater importance than that which is of supreme importance in their pastoral relation, the teaching and training of the young.

2. THE PRACTICE. It has been well said that if you wish to train a child properly, you must begin with the grandparents. But, it is added, you must begin with the grandparents when they are children. The importance of this principle is apparent from the fact that

during the first five years, the most important of all in the development of the child, the church can influence the child but very little except through its parents. And yet it is of this age that the Roman Catholic bishop said: "Give us the children for the first six years, and we care not who gets them afterward."

With the sixth year, the child begins to enter into public relation with the church and its services, and the minister must be prepared to meet this new relation.

It is evident that in order to do this work properly, the minister must be a pedagogue; that is, the instruction should be such as to be intellectually stimulating. But its chief charm and power is derived from the pastoral relation which the instructor holds, and which should make it spiritually quickening. It is true that not every minister is a pedagogue. But he ought to be, and in the future, as in the past, pedagogical skill and training will be considered a part of the necessary outfit of every minister.

But the principal value of the catechumenate is in the opportunity it affords to *train* the child; that is, to accustom it to the duties and practice of the Christian life. Thus it should early be taught to go to church—at first to the children's services, but as soon as possible to the great congregation. It should be taught the words of the silent prayer when entering the house of God, and the significance of the various parts of the service. For the purpose of bringing up attentive hearers, a report of the sermon should be required. The habit of so listening to a sermon as to fix its chief points and thoughts in the mind, is one that must be cultivated. If you do not believe this, ask some of your children next week to tell you about the sermon which they last heard.

Training

But how shall we get the children to come to church? Some ministers invite the voluntary attendants of the Sunday-school to exercise a little more voluntariness and come to church. It is very gratifying

Church Attendance

when at least some of them respond. Others offer a reward with cheering results in some cases. It sometimes pays to be good. Nevertheless, apart from these sporadic results, church attendance on the part of children is not as common as it should be.

Are not we Protestants a little too easy-going in our conceptions of discipline? Why should we concede everything of this character to the Roman Catholics? Might not a little wholesome coercion be exercised by us as well as by them? Is not the law our pedagogue to lead us to Christ? In explaining the law of the Sabbath, even so good a Protestant as Martin Luther said:

"We should so fear and love God as not to despise His word and the preaching of the Gospel, but deem it holy and willingly hear and learn it."

The scope of the Child Catechumenate includes church attendance. It takes this for granted and does not ask whether the children wish to go or not.

But while children of all ages are wel-

come, it is a question at what age attendance should be expected or made obligatory. Without attempting to repeat the psychological reasons, I venture to indicate the age of nine as that at which children may follow a sermon with intelligence, and take part in the service to their own edification.

Sermons for Children

If children are expected to come to church, another question forces itself upon us. What should be the character of the sermon? Some ministers preach a five-minute sermon for children as a prelude to the regular sermon. A similar course was recommended by Melanchthon in the sixteenth century. Or the ordinary sermon may bear the children in mind, and state the truth in such a way that the future congregation may get some benefit from it. It is not necessary that they should understand the whole of it, to make it effective in their lives. A sermon is not simply for instruction, it is for inspiration. It conveys a spiritual message, and for receiving this mes-

sage the difference between the little child and the learned professor is one only of degree and not of kind.

In Luther's discourses on preaching, he earnestly insisted that the message of the pulpit should be directed to the great mass of plain people and of children rather than to the few learned people who might be present. A Governor of Connecticut once came to his pastor and asked him to tell him what he must do to be a Christian, but, "tell me just as plainly as you would explain it to a little child," was his request.

Besides, it must not be forgotten that there are acts of worship in the church, besides the sermon, in which a child can participate just as truly as an adult person.

A means of emphasizing and carrying out the principles of Christian training is the personal interview with the catechumen. They called it private confession in the olden time, but you may call it by any other name if it will smell sweeter. The essential

Under Four Eyes

thing about it is to accustom the child to a confidential and trusting relation to its pastor in spiritual matters. The subjects to be treated are the habit of private prayer, the questions of Christian conduct in its relations to parents, brothers and sisters and other children, and especially in the matter of penitence for sin, faith in a personal Saviour and of the right steps in the new life of obedience.

Those of you who have never tried this method would be amazed at the absence, in many cases, of the most fundamental Christian conceptions, and that, too, among those where one took the Christian view of life for granted. The theology of most of them is, "You must be good if you want to get to heaven." And, "you must keep the commandments if you want to be saved." But when in such pastoral intercourse it becomes your privilege to unlock the heart to the gifts of the Gospel, what hearers you will have for the pulpit message! You look down into eyes that respond

with grateful eagerness to every word you say.

The objection will be raised that one cannot find time for so much additional work.

A wise pastor will be able to modify the system in such a way as to distribute the work among many, and make it easy and profitable for all. We need to get rid of many of our hierarchical notions and to introduce a larger diaconate into our church work. Some of us have school teachers and teaching deaconesses who can be entrusted with part of this work. But in all of our churches there are men and women with gifts and graces that would make them helpers in this churchly work of bringing the little ones to Christ and training them up for His service. Chief among these are the parents of the children, especially so far as home life and home duties are concerned. But even for the week-day hours at the church, there is much undeveloped material which could be utilized for such work.

Helpers

And what better opportunity than this could be found for bringing into practice those duties which many liturgies prescribe for the sponsors, when they direct the minister to exhort those who have presented the child for baptism in the following words: "I now admonish you who have done so charitable a work to this child in its baptism, that ye diligently and faithfully teach it the Ten Commandments, that thereby it may learn to know the will of God; also the Christian faith, set forth in the Creed, whereby we obtain grace, the forgiveness of sins, and the Holy Ghost; and likewise the Lord's Prayer, that it may call upon God, and find help to withstand the devil, and lead a Christian life, till God shall perfect that which He hath now begun in it, and bring it to life everlasting."

Duties of Sponsors

The point to emphasize is that it is a systematic work, conducted by the church, proceeding from certain acknowledged premises and advancing by approved methods to a certain end. Or, to

return to the definition, "*It is an institution of Christ and the church, by which children are systematically taught and trained in such a way as to prepare them for a personal participation in the life and the privileges of the Christian church.*"

With the restoration of this institution in a practical way in our churches, the Sunday-school itself would assume a more natural and more important relation to the life of the church. The Sunday-school would become a Children's Service in which the knowledge gained during the week would be fused into sweet experience under the influence of warm-hearted Christian teachers and superintendents.

A new meaning would also be given to the instruction for admission to the communion. It would be a simple review of subjects with which the children have long since been made acquainted. The nature of the instruction would therefore be a warm, spiritual presentation of the truths of the catechism, would cover

a comparatively brief period of time, and would have the sole purpose of preparing the children for a proper participation in the privileges of the Lord's Supper. It would be a revival season in which others than the children would be glad to take part because of the stimulating and quickening influences that accompany such a course of instruction.

It would prepare the way for "Decision Day" and would lay a good foundation for the development of sterling character.

VIII

A COURSE OF STUDY

THE conditions of churches are so varied that no attempt can be made to offer a plan that would be suitable for all. The scheme presented on page 80 is merely a suggestion. It indicates some of the studies that may profitably be pursued.

Our classes are divided as follows: Infants, 5 to 7 years of age; Primarians, 8; Juniors, 9 to 10; Intermediates, 11; Preparatorians, 12; Catechumens, 13 and over.

All the children are invited to attend the regular church service. When they are nine years old, they are required to do so. A report of last Sunday's sermon is given, oral by the younger children, written by the older ones. This is a very important part of their work. The plan has proved effective in training up

SCHEME OF INSTRUCTION FOR CLASSES IN RELIGION

	Catechumens	Preparatorians	Intermediates	Juniors	Primarians	Infants
Bible Story	Review. New Lesson. Bible Readings. Texts.	Review. New Lesson. Bible Readings. Texts.	Review. New Lesson. Bible Readings. Texts.	Review New Lesson. Bible Readings. Texts.	Review. New Lesson. Texts.	Review. New Lesson. Texts.
Catechism	The Creed and Means of Grace explained.	The Commandments and the Lord's Prayer explained	The Lord's Prayer explained	The Commandments Part 1 explained.	The Ten Commandments	The Lord's Prayer
Church Service	Morning Service. Evening Service.	Morning Service. Evening Service.	Morning Service. Evening Service.	Morning Service. Evening Service.	Select parts.	Select parts.
Hymns	10 chief hymns	10 chief hymns	First verses of 10 chief hymns	First verses of 10 chief hymns	10 Children's Hymns	10 Children's Hymns
Prayers	Morning. Evening. Table. On entering church. On leaving church.	Morning. Evening. Table. On entering church. On leaving church.	Morning. Evening. Table. On entering church. On leaving church.	Morning. Evening. Table. On entering church. On leaving church.	Children'sPrayer	Children'sPrayer
Sermons	Written Report.	Written Report	Oral Report	Oral Report		
Bible Study	Books. Geography Antiquities.	Books. Geography. Antiquities.	Books of N. T. Geography	Geography		

attentive and appreciative listeners. The habit once formed is not easily lost.

The children also learn the parts and the significance of the Church Service, and are thus prepared to take part in the worship in an intelligent manner.

To this scheme might well be added a very simple course in Church History, Christian Biography or Missions. There are not lacking "hero stories" in such a course which would appeal mightily to the boys in the older classes.

A system of marking and giving credit for lessons learned, and tasks accomplished, may also be found desirable in some cases.

The course here suggested is meagre indeed, but it involves constant progression, along definite lines, for nine years, and includes subjects of such "interest" that neither teacher nor pupil can ever grow weary, if work is done in the right spirit.

IX

THE BIBLE STORY

APOSTOLICAL Christianity was built upon the Bible story, and long before there was a Christian canon, the narration of the facts of revelation brought men into vital relation with Christ and the church. In the second century, beginning with A. D. 180, the Alexandrian school of catechists, in a long line of eminent teachers, faithfully followed the Apostolical method. Two hundred years later there appeared the most important contribution to the subject in Augustine's tract "On the way in which ignorant people should be catechized," *de catechizandis rudibus*. The Bible story, he declared, from the creation to the consummation, must be the material in catechization. But through some strange perversity of history, this principle was lost sight of for a thousand years. Although the Middle Ages produced emi-

nent pedagogues, scholastics, and the Brethren of the Common Life, and in later years Gerson, who wrote the treatise "On bringing the little ones to Christ," Christian training was secured by other means than Bible study. The plastic representations of the Bible story as given in the church buildings, and the poetical reproductions of the story of salvation, left the people not altogether ignorant of Scripture. But repentance, faith and the Christian life were developed and maintained largely by other methods than the use of the Bible. The Apostolical and Augustinian principle was restored to the church as one of the results of the Reformation. Luther's Small Catechism, which marks an epoch in catechetical literature, is, indeed, a dogmatic treatise. But Luther also gave an impulse to the popularization of the Bible by his collection of Bible stories called the Passional. He also expressed the hope that some one would arouse the interest of the people by making pictures for the collected stories of the Bible. The suggestion was

followed by Fischart, who published Bible pictures and verses, a valuable work of art. In the middle of the sixteenth century Hartmann Beyer, the Reformer of Frankfurt, published the first real Bible story book with pictures, an undertaking which the Brunswick theologian, Justus Gesenius imitated on a larger scale a century later. It had special reference to instruction in schools. For high schools, Melanchthon's pupil, Neander, had designed his *Historia populi Dei*, 1582, which aroused great interest. Felicitous creations, with the same end in view, appeared in the latter part of the seventeenth century in the Sacred Histories of Sagittarius, Castellio and Fabricius.

In France, Fénelon used Bible stories occasionally as an aid in teaching the catechism.

In the middle of the seventeenth century Cocceius, one of the most eminent theologians of the Reformed Church, gave a great impulse to the Bible story by his doctrine that Revelation has a history which is to be taught. This doctrine was

the earliest foundation of Biblical Theology. His idea was taken up by the Pietists and thru them came to be generally adopted by the Lutherans. Spener and Francke got their pupils to use the Bible itself, and in the institutions at Halle, Bible History was a distinct subject in the course of study.

Huebner's Bible Stories appeared in 1714, and attained such widespread popularity that he has often been regarded as the founder of the Bible story method of teaching. But his way of telling the story, in a popular version rather than in the language of Scriptures, came to be recognized as faulty. In 1830 Zahn's Bible Stories appeared in close conformity with the language of the Bible, and it has been the norm for the numerous books that have followed on this field. The use of the Bible story book is not intended to supplant the use of the Bible itself, although for many years it did so, before the Bible Societies made it possible for every one to have a copy. It is intended as a means of helping the child to grasp

the Bible narrative in its entirety. The principle is that the Bible itself is the Divine Revelation which must lie at the basis of Christian instruction.

And yet this principle has not always been recognized. In churches where the true pedagogical view has not obtained, a brief period of dogmatic instruction still takes the place of systematic and comprehensive Bible study.

In non-catechetical circles, that is, where the churches are built up by means other than the instruction and training of the baptized children, this principle is likewise in danger of being neglected. They object to the entire system as appealing too largely to the intellectual nature and not to the heart, and it is sometimes regarded as a mechanical method of making Christians. Occasion has indeed been given for this criticism. But it is not inherent in the system. It must not be forgotten that Spener, the father of modern Pietism, found in it the most potent means for the revival of the churches.

Another repudiation of this principle is found in those rationalistic systems which substitute natural religion for Revelation and which direct their questions to the innate ideas of morality and religion. But wherever a supernatural revelation is conceded, the method of instruction in its fundamental principles must be *an authoritative presentation of the facts from the sources.*

Recognizing the importance of this principle, the Christian teachers of Germany have during the last half century provided a literature of preëminent value in the field of Bible catechetics. Philosophy, History and Art have contributed their aid, so that their catechetical apparatus is rich and stimulating. In this country there are encouraging signs of a growing interest in the subject. The value of Bible study as a means to a definite end, and therefore conducted in a scientific and systematic manner, is appreciated and understood as never before.

The first principle of the catechetical

use of the Bible is that the foundation of Christian instruction is laid by *telling* the Bible story. From the pedagogical standpoint this is enforced by the importance assigned to object lessons in the development of ideas, a fact that was first popularized by Pestalozzi, but had already been shown by Amos Comenius, a century earlier. Children love to hear stories, and by this means the food for their thought can best be supplied.

Tell the Story

But the Christian teacher has a deeper reason for recognizing this principle. Christianity entered the world as a fact and not as a dogma. It was the facts of the Gospel, and the Acts of the Apostles that St. Luke related to his friend Theophilus. It was in the proclamation of the great facts of redemption that the Apostles gained the trophies of their missionary journeys.

In the statement of this principle there is contained also the first rule of the method which the teacher of the Bible story must observe. He must *tell*

the story. He produces his first impression by means of an oral narration. One reason for this is that the younger children are not yet able to read. But there is also a psychological reason. The first impression which the child receives of the Divine Revelation must come with the authority of a prophet's utterance.

It is not necessary in the earlier classes to devote much attention to moralization or making the application. The sacred story opens the mind of the child to a wonderful land where God is, and the holy angels, and in this realm it is almost an impertinence for men to intrude with their explanatory remarks and their paranetic exhortations. In the older classes there is room for homiletic application, but not so much in the younger grades. Here the chief object is to impress the fact, and to make it the permanent possession of the soul-life of the child. The story will teach its own truth and will produce its effect in the life and character.

The stories have a primary importance of their own, and are not given for the sake of the dogmatic or ethical lessons which they contain. Christ did not die on the cross to teach us courage or loyalty to truth, but his death is itself the great fact upon which our redemption depends. He did not rise from the dead in order that we might learn lessons of immortality, but his resurrection is itself the great act through which he has become our living Lord and Redeemer.

The material for this instruction consists of a selection of the stories of the Old and New Testaments, sufficient in number to be mastered in the course of a year. Whether the Old Testament or the New precedes is a mooted point. But in view of the fact that in Christian homes the main facts of the New Testament are already known, and because the Old Testament is a preparation for the New Testament, many teachers favor the Old Testament.

The teacher tells the story as simply as he can, not monotonously, or as if it

were a recitation, but as a real story, and as nearly as possible in the language and forms of the Bible. Only such explanations are made as are necessary for a clear understanding of the facts. The story is then repeated without any explanations, and the children are given an opportunity to reproduce the story. Or this part of the lesson may be required at the next hour. But it is important to tell the story in such a way that it may be reproduced by the children.

Pictures

Luther's suggestion that pictures should be drawn to accompany the stories, a suggestion that was promptly accepted in his own day, has been universally endorsed in our times. Christian artists have vied with each other in supplying the Bible story with illustrations.

The next stage of instruction is reached when the child is able to read. In three different forms is the instruction given: Reading, Explanation and Application, Committing to Memory.

Reading

In the Roman Catholic system it is not necessary for the people to read the Bible. The priest is the mediator and source of authority. But in the Protestant system it is necessary to lead the believer to the sources of religion, from which he may draw with independent judgment the teachings that are to control his life. Where there are parochial schools it is easy to read the Bible in course. Where these do not exist, the class instruction must be supplemented by means of a course of home readings.

Explanation and Application

While in one sense it is true that the Scripture is its own interpreter, and the Apostles did not find it necessary to send commentaries along with their epistles, the question is still in order: "Understandest thou what thou readest?" And the answer is still: "How can I, except some man guide me?" It is an art that must be learned, to read the Bible understandingly. The object of catechisation is not merely to study the Bible, but to show how it

should be studied, and to accustom the mind to the proper method.

The study of the Bible is in two directions. First, we must understand the Scriptures themselves, in their objectivity, the facts, persons, lands, language and ideas. Secondly, we must understand them in relation to our own hearts. We must teach the children to experience the truth of the Bible story in their own lives. For this task—the catechisation of a class in such a way as to make the Bible story clear in its meaning, without and within—preparation is needed. It is harder than preaching. In preaching there is no one to interrupt, and the line of thought can be followed to the end. But in catechisation, the questions and answers of the children may at any moment throw the teacher off the track and hinder him from attaining the result at which he is aiming. For this reason it is well to have the questions written out, so that the teacher may maintain his theme and follow his aim in an undeviating course.

A valuable help in catechisation is the text-book, containing the seed-texts of the Bible, which must be committed to memory during the school curriculum. The Württemberg Text Book has the following divisions: Texts which teach: 1. What to believe. 2. How to live. 3. How to suffer. 4. How to die. My pastoral work sometimes brings me into contact with aged people who learned these texts in Germany when they were young, and who are now proving their value when all things else are taken away.

X

THE CATECHISM

A CATECHISM is popularly supposed to be a religious manual consisting of questions and answers. It is associated in many minds with some of the difficult and unwelcome tasks of childhood. But the form of question and answer is only an accident of modern times. In early Christian usage the catechism meant religious instruction to candidates for admission to the Christian church. It included preaching or any other method of imparting the doctrines of Christianity.

The foundation of Christian knowledge is the Bible. From the Bible the church has gleaned her doctrines and set them in order in doctrinal form for the instruction of her children. It is the duty of the church to see to it that her members are made acquainted with these teachings. Only it must always be borne

in mind that instruction is not merely for the intellect, but chiefly for the heart and the will.

As this is not a manual of Pastoral Theology, the purpose of this chapter will be met by a brief exposition of the *material* and the *form* of the catechism in its relation to the Christian school.

1. MATERIAL. An ancient name for the catechism was "The Threefold Cord." By this was meant the Law of God, the Gospel, and the New Life. The first was taught thru the Ten Commandments, the second thru the Apostles' Creed, the third thru the Lord's Prayer. These formed the great pillars, as it were, on which and around which the catechism was constructed, and the idea has been a controlling one in many of the leading churches.

In the younger classes, religious ideas are best communicated thru the Bible story. From this ever fresh and fruitful garden are gathered the fruits upon which the spiritual life must feed. But the older children, who are preparing for

the fuller obligations of church membership, need instruction also not only in the doctrines that are common to the whole church, but also in those which are peculiar to their own denomination.

For this purpose the churches have constructed their catechisms. Thus we have Luther's Catechism, the Heidelberg, the Westminster, the Tridentine, etc. Some of these have lived for centuries, and in spite of intellectual and moral revolutions continue to assert themselves as living forces in the world.

As books of reference, statements of doctrine, dictionaries of information, records of history, they have a permanent value. To what extent they are adapted for the instruction of children, is another question.

2. FORM. The catechisms with which most of us are familiar consist of questions and answers. They follow the synthetic method, starting from general principles. The answers are not necessarily contained in the question, but are a body of information which has to be

committed to memory in order to be recited by the child.

The following questions and answers, selected at random from the church catechisms of four denominations, illustrate their character:

Why must our Redeemer be both God and Man?

Our Redeemer must be man in order that, by His obedience and His suffering in our nature and in our stead, He might redeem us from sin; and He must be God in order that His redemption may be all-sufficient.

What is Justifying Faith?

Justifying faith is a saving grace, wrought in the heart of a sinner, by the Spirit and word of God; whereby he, being convinced of his sin and misery, and of the disability in himself and all other creatures to recover him out of his lost condition, not only assenteth to the truth of the promise of the gospel, but receiveth and resteth upon Christ and His righteousness therein held forth, for pardon of sin, and for the accepting and accounting of his person righteous in the sight of God for salvation.

What is required of those who come to the Lord's Supper?

To examine themselves whether they repent them truly of their former sins, steadfastly purposing to lead a new life; have a lively faith in God's mercy through Christ, with a thankful remembrance of His death; and be in charity with all men.

What do you desire of God in this Prayer?

1. That all things which tend to the glory of God may be promoted, and whatsoever is repugnant thereto,

or contrary to His will, may be prevensed. 2. That He may provide me with all things necessary for the body, and as to my soul, preserve me from all evil which might in any wise be detrimental to my salvation.

This method is an unnatural way of acquiring knowledge. We would not teach Chemistry or Mathematics, not even History or Biography by this method.

Again it has no religious quality. The child may believe the statement, or as much of it as it can remember, upon the authority of the teacher. Sometime or other, perhaps, the statement will be verified in its own experience. The catechism will then get the credit for it. But until then,and in many cases permanently, the information is "an undigested security"

The modern way of teaching the catechism follows the analytic method, a method pursued by both the great catechisms of the German Reformation, but which was subsequently set aside, only to be restored again as a result of the great educational revolution of the 18th century.

The following page from a modern

catechism* will illustrate my meaning better than a lengthy description:

The topic is the first article of the Creed. After a preliminary lesson the teacher proceeds to explain the words: I believe in God the Father Almighty.

"I believe in God." This does not mean, I believe that there is a God. If we have any religion at all, we believe that there is a God. But when I say I believe in God, I mean something more than that. What that is we may learn from the centurion of Capernaum. He was a man who believed in the Lord Jesus Christ. *With what words did Jesus commend his faith?* (Verily I say unto you, etc.) He was a humble-minded man. *How does that appear?* (He said: I am not worthy, etc.) But he had a high opinion of Jesus. *From what do we learn this?* (He said: "Only say the word" etc.) *What disposition did he show?* (He showed trust.) *How then did he show*

*Der kleine Katechismus Dr. M. Luthers in ausgeführten Katechesen, von Johannes Kolb, Breslau, 1892.

that he believed in Jesus? (By trusting in the Lord that he could heal his servant with a word.) But the centurion proved in another way that he had faith. *What did he say in conclusion to the centurion?* (Go thy way, etc.) Go thy way, said the Lord Jesus. *What did the centurion do then?* (He went his way.) Some might have hesitated and asked: "Is it certain that my servant is healed? Can I assuredly rely upon it?" *How did the centurion show that he believed?* (He showed it by going.) Yes, he was obedient to the Lord's command. *There were two things therefore which showed that the centurion believed. What were they?* (He had trust in the Lord, and he did what he was told to do.) *Can you give me the name of a man of faith in the Old Testament?* (Abraham.) *In what way did he show that he believed in God?* (He went out of his country and from his father's house. And he was ready to sacrifice his son Isaac.) He did therefore what God commanded. Neither of these things

was an easy task. *Why did he nevertheless obey the command although it must have been hard for him to do so?* (Because he trusted in God, that God would not tell him to do anything that was not good.) We see therefore that in Abraham also faith shows itself by trust and obedience.

"What is faith?" asked an unbelieving physician of his friend, a merchant, in whose comfortable parlor the two were engaged in friendly conversation. He asked the question in the same spirit in which Pilate said: "What is truth?" The merchant smiled and called to his eight year old son who was sitting at another table. He had been laboriously unpacking a box of tin soldiers and was making them march up and down and was having a fine time. "Karl," said the father to the child, who found it hard to separate himself from his soldiers, "my dear boy, pack up your soldiers as quickly as you can, and go to bed. I think it is better that you should do so. But do it quickly." The child gave his

father a long, beseeching look, but seeing that the father was determined, he pressed back a tear, said not a word, gave his father a long, warm kiss, and hurried away. "There Doctor, that is faith," said the merchant. Then he called the boy back and whispered into his ear: "And when you bring me another such good certificate from school as the last one was, when vacation comes, I will take you with me to visit your aunt in Hamburg." The boy shouted for joy, and for a long time they still heard from his bedroom his jubilant cries. But the father said to his friend: "There, Doctor, that was faith. That boy has the stuff in him to be a man of faith. If he acts toward God as he acted toward me, as trustfully and as obediently, he will have faith." The Doctor with a serious look replied: "I think I understand the matter better now than I would have done from a sermon."

How then can we show that we have faith in God? (By trusting in Him and by being obedient to Him.)

The principles which govern such catechisation are explained in the Introduction to Kolbe's excellent Catechisation, and are briefly as follows:

1. The catechism explains itself. Nothing has to be committed to memory except the text of Luther's Catechism and the proof texts of the Bible.

2. The instruction must be intuitive. Much instruction in the catechism is anything but intuitive. The children are tortured with unintelligible sentences, abstract ideas and long sentences that have to be committed to memory. Such teaching gives no pleasure to the teacher and bears no fruit in the scholar. Instruction is made intuitive by the free use of the Bible story. Illustrations from life and literature will occur to the teacher, and will help to illuminate the subject.

3. The children must do independent work. The questions must be of such a character that the child is compelled to think in order to give the answer.

4. Every lesson must produce a definite, comprehensible result. The ex-

amination at the close, and the review at the next hour must show that the children have mastered the lesson, not because they have committed it to memory, but because it has become their intellectual property. For example: The centurion showed in two ways that he believed in Jesus. What were they? Show that Abraham believed in God. How may we show that we believe in God?

This is the modern way of teaching the catechism. It is so simple, it teaches itself, but it is so effective that it will never be forgotten. It has become the intellectual and spiritual possession of the child. The painful acquisition of hundreds of unmeaning phrases is done away with. The catechism has become a beautiful garden instead of a wearisome desert. We call it the modern way but in reality it is a very old way. In following it, we are only returning to the methods of Francke and Comenius, and Luther and Gerson and Augustine, perhaps even, yes probably, to the methods of the Apostolic age.

XI

THE GOAL

IN Christian writings of the fourth century we find an expression that is foreign to our modern phraseology. They speak of "making Christians," (*Χριστιανοὺς ποιεῖν*). It contains a suggestion worth noting.

Some look upon children as Christians by right of inheritance; others, by right of baptism. But whatever our theories may be, the object of all of us is so to teach and bring up the children that they may become mature Christians, Christians by personal conviction and experience. Or, as has repeatedly been urged in these pages, our object is to prepare them for participation in the obligations and privileges of the Christian church.

If the church were merely an institution, into which our children are introduced through the family and the

Christian school by the methods that have been pointed out, our work would be finished when we had made them acquainted with certain facts and accustomed them to certain rites and practices observed in the church.

But the church is more than an institution, it is a society or fellowship, it is "the communion of saints." To bring the child into living relation with this communion must be the object of all our efforts. The family will be broken up. The school advances its pupils to the point of graduation. But the church abides forever. It is the only society of this world that continues into the life that lies beyond.

Even when we look upon the child as an incipient Christian, the object of our instruction must be to enable it, when it leaves school, to grow up independently in the Christian life.

The last year of the Christian school, the catechumenate proper, is therefore a time when our care of souls must include what in the early history of the

church was called the scrutiny. The personal relation between pastor and child has an increasing importance. It has in view that impressive period in life when the great decision is made.

Confirmation

Some churches observe Confirmation. The early Lutherans did not approve of it, but admitted candidates to the communion through "the catechism" at any convenient season. In spite of the many abuses which have attached themselves to the modern usage, it can still be made useful if proper instruction and scrutiny precede.

Decision Day

Other churches have introduced Decision Day. Whatever form or name may be chosen, it is well to recognize that this is a period when a definite choice of the Christian life may be made.

Faith

What then are the essential elements of the Christian life which a pastor will seek to discover in his pupils? First of all is the acceptance of Christ as the Saviour. Christ must be apprehended as the One "who has

redeemed me from all sins, from death, and from the power of the devil, not with gold or silver, but with His holy, precious blood, and with His innocent sufferings and death, in order that I might be His own, live under Him in His kingdom and serve Him in everlasting righteousness, innocence and blessedness."

Another element is prayer. Through Christ we may believe that God "is truly our Father, and we are truly His children, so that we may ask of Him with all cheerfulness and confidence, as dear children of their dear father." **Prayer**

Formal acts of prayer, on waking and rising in the morning, on retiring at night, at meals, on entering and leaving the house of God, all these have their uses in the development of the Christian life. But prayer is more than an act. It is a habit. It is the atmosphere in which the child of God continually lives.

A third element is obedience. The Christian necessarily conforms his life with the life which he has from Christ.

The Christ *for* us becomes the Christ *in* us. Some theologians call it "the mystical union." This involves on the one hand the daily contest against sin in its manifold forms, the daily "drowning of the old Adam in us." On the other hand, it calls forth the active service in the work of the King, the development of the life in which Christ is supreme.

The Mystical Union

In this new life the agent is the Holy Ghost; the means is the word of God; the relation is the Holy Church universal, the communion of saints; the final goal is the life everlasting.

XII

A SOLUTION

MY theme may seem to involve only a question of method, the use of a week-day hour in place of or in addition to a Sunday hour. But it means far more. It illustrates and enforces a principle. The church must recognize its relation to the child in all stages of its growing life, assume its proper function of religious instruction, and resist the ever-recurring temptation to delegate this function to any other agency.

The question is being discussed from many points of view. Teachers, ministers and the press are on the alert to find the way out of its difficulties. Three incontrovertible positions face us. Religion is a vital factor in education; the church cannot form an alliance with the state in the matter of religion; the church must exercise her

Three Incontrovertible Positions

legitimate function in religious education.

Three solutions of the question have been offered: Religion in the public school, the parochial school, the Sunday-school. None of these meet the requirements. In their place is presented a simple, practical proposition. Let the public school restore to the church a portion of the time which has been surrendered. Give us Wednesday afternoon for instructing the children who will avail themselves of the opportunity.

Give Us Wednesday Afternoon

In support of this plea we appeal to the public school. You owe your existence to the Christian week-day school. Your best friends and co-workers are to be found in our churches. All we ask is that you so arrange your course of studies as not to prevent us from giving, at our own expense, the instruction which we believe to be indispensable to all true education.

But we appeal also to the churches, and especially to the ministry. This scheme throws upon you a very great

task and a large responsibility. And you already have so many other things to do. But it is certain that nothing else that you can do will compare in permanence and value with your work in the Christian training of your children.

Roman Catholic bishops tell us that without schools they would soon be without churches. Protestants will not be without churches, but they will have stronger congregations, more appreciative people and more effective churches, when they take the same care of their children as do the Roman Catholics.

Commissioner Harris says: "The prerogative of religious instruction is in the church, and it must remain in the church, and in the nature of things it cannot be farmed out to the secular school without degenerating into mere deism bereft of a living Providence, or else changing the school into a parochial school and destroying the efficiency of secular instruction." —*Educational Magazine*, 1902.

Professor Coe says: "If we are to have common schools for the whole people

complete separation of church and state, and yet thoro religious education for Catholic and Protestant children alike, it follows that the religious function of the state schools should be permanently restricted to friendly recognition of the teaching function of the family and of the church, and sympathetic co-operation with them. * * * But this implies that these communions voluntarily furnish, at their own expense, definite and systematic religious training for their children and for all children who can be reached."—*Religion and Morals.*

Bishop Greer says: "The schools are doing their part, in their legitimate sphere, and are doing all they can do. Is the church doing her part in her legitimate sphere, and all that she can do? It seems to me she is not; and that with no other machinery or instruments or tools than what she now possesses she might do very much more than what she now is doing."—*Convention Address*, 1905.

To all of these significant utterances of representative men I make this one reply,

Give us Wednesday afternoon. Will not this simple concession on the part of the public school, and this one step forward on the part of the churches, once for all solve our problem? To the public school we shall then be able to give our unqualified support, and in return utilize its vast resources. And the work of the Sunday school, correlated with that of the week-day church school, will acquire a greater significance. With a nine years' course of systematic instruction for all the children of our churches, in many cases with expert helpers, we may hope to attain results that were impossible under the haphazard methods of the past.

VIEWS AND COMMENTS

VIEWS AND COMMENTS

ANOTHER "THREE R'S" IN SCHOOL.

It is a noteworthy coincidence that just as the dominant party in British politics is moving for the elimination of ecclesiasticism and the advance of secularism in the common schools of England a strong interdenominational movement should be developed here for the introduction of religious teaching into the public schools of New York. We cannot ignore the authority nor doubt the sincerity and benevolence of the company of clergymen who the other day discussed this subject, and expressed themselves strongly in favor of having, by state enactment, one afternoon a week set apart for religious instruction in the schools.* Those gentlemen were widely representative of Jew and Gentile, Catholic and Protestant, Episcopal and Independent, and we have

* These benevolent clergymen proposed nothing of the kind.

no doubt that they represent, too, a considerable and most respectable public sentiment. There are many thoughtful men and women who regard with apprehension the widely prevailing and, they fear, increasing irreverence, lawlessness and, indeed, actual viciousness among school children, and not a few of these are inclined to seek a remedy in the introduction of religious teaching. As one of the members of that conference neatly expressed it, there seems to them a need that the schools shall teach not only the old "three R's" of reading, 'riting and 'rithmetic, but also the other three of reverence, righteousness and responsibility.

There will be little dispute, we think, as to the desirability of that end. The question is one of the means by which it is to be attained. That the boys—and girls, too—of to-day are too often irreverent in speech and manner, regardless of the comforts and rights of others, and insubordinate against legitimate authority is painfully apparent. We do not refer

alone to such young Hooligans as were arrested last week and punished for criminal rowdyism in elevated railroad trains, though, indeed, they and many more like them are students in the public schools. But upon the better class residence streets and in the parks may be found boys belonging to well to do and cultivated families who in their games scream out all manner of profanities, exult in annoying passersby and exhibit defiance toward law and order. Granted that much of this is pure thoughtlessness. Thoughtless habit uncorrected often becomes fixed and incorrigible. It is not creditable that children should be permitted, even thoughtlessly, to commit such excesses. It is not possible to view without grave concern the possibility that such habits will endure in maturer life.

Home influences and parental discipline should no doubt correct the evil. But they do not, and we are forced to the conclusion that in many cases those are negligible factors, if not actually infinitesimal. Parents, for the sake of their own comfort,

object to their children playing the Hooligan in their own dooryards, but let them go down the street and annoy other people without hindrance or reproof, while for an outraged neighbor to undertake the work of correction or even to complain of the nuisance is imperiously resented in the tone of "My child can do no wrong!" Nor are there lacking those among otherwise intelligent and reasonable men and women who practically disclaim responsibility for their children's conduct. They send them, they say, to school five days a week and to Sunday-school on Sunday, and it is the business of those institutions to teach them everything. Why should they pay taxes for the support of the schools if the father must stay home from the races or the club and the mother from the matinee or the bridge party to teach their children themselves?

Despite the need, however, there will be a widespread doubt of the wisdom of seeking to supply it in the way these clergymen have suggested. The introduction of anything like ecclesiastical or

sectarian teaching into the public schools —even if the people should permit it, which we have no idea they would do— would bear with it a menace of mischief which these very men would be first to deplore: and the practicability of having religious instruction given in the schools without danger of sectarian propaganda is scarcely to be conceded.* Reverence for those things which the best general sentiment of mankind holds worthy of reverence, righteousness, in cleanliness of speech and thought and honesty of conduct, and responsibility, in regard for law and lawful authority, should be taught, we believe, in the schools as well as in the home. But we are also persuaded that they would best be taught, not by special teachers in special services, but by the regular teachers throughout all the ordinary exercises; and we are inclined to think that effort would most profitably be made toward that end by securing for all schools teachers who

*Very true. But our plan does not propose to introduce sectarian teaching into the public schools.

would exert such influences, and by arousing among parents a realization of the duty which rests upon them of at least actively co-operating with the schools in the right training of their children.—*New York Daily Tribune*, May 7, 1906.

SUNDAY-SCHOOLS ON WEDNESDAY

In the unanimous opinion of the eminent clergymen of many denominations, too often inharmonious, who met in the United Charities Building this week to consider the "problem" of religious instruction for the children in the public schools, something like a solution of that problem can be reached in a very simple way. The plan suggested, and apparently approved—though evidently with varying degrees of hope—by all of them is to establish what, for want of a better name, may be called Wednesday afternoon Sunday-schools in the various churches and synagogues, to which all the public school scholars are to be sent under the same sort of compulsion that forces their attendance at the secular schools. The im-

possibility of giving in the public schools any kind of religious instruction that would be acceptable to all the parents in such a mixed population as ours was frankly recognized, and this, it seems to us, marked a new and desirable appreciation of facts, but we cannot avoid the impression that the clergymen were unduly confident as to the practicability of the schools they had in mind. Would there not be the same, and just as much, difficulty in making the children go to Sunday-school on Wednesday as there is in making them do it on Sunday? The latter day, according to the admission of many of the clergymen, has become for thousands little more than a day of recreation, and why they thought Wednesday afternoon would be otherwise used if the public schools were closed then is far from obvious. The suggestion that the truant officers could force the children to the churches as well as to the schools ignores the circumstances that there is practically no difference of opinion as to the value of primary education of the

sort now given by the city. For that reason public sentiment supports the truant officers in the performance of their present duties. If they attempted to exercise the same authority in sending children to church for religious instruction they would not be likely to get much support from the parents who do not already see to it that their children attend the Sunday schools provided by all sects and denominations, and a large crop of assorted controversies and troubles would be almost sure to grow up. So, instead of agreeing with those at this meeting in holding the idea of a Wednesday afternoon Sunday-school to be a hopeful one, we are disposed to consider it almost hopeless. The clergy have the best of rights to advise the instruction of children in something more than the three R's of tradition, but it is a pity that they cannot give such advice without somehow always dragging in the public schools, the commendable purposes of which are as different as are those of grocery stores or sugar refineries.—*N. Y. Times*, May 2, 1906.

RELIGION IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

One of the most striking and suggestive incidents in connection with the recent Conference on Federation was the reception given to the paper read before it by the Rev. George U. Wenner, D. D., president of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of New York and New Jersey. Dr. Wenner wrote upon "Week-Day Religious Education." He strongly depicted the deficiencies of the present system of religious instruction, emphasized the importance of the principle of "unity" in education, and ended by urging that the church ask the public school, which surely owes to it a large unpaid debt, that it should restore to the church one afternoon a week —say Wednesday afternoon—for purposes of religious instruction. This proposition was received with great applause, and was subsequently embodied in a formal resolution, which passed without a word of opposition and by unanimous vote.

It is yet far too early to attempt to measure the significance of any action

taken by this Conference. It was nominally representative of some thirty denominational bodies, with over eighteen million adherents. If the adoption of this resolution were to be regarded as really the matured decision and determined purpose of the united evangelical churches of America, it would be impossible to see in this action anything else than the formal reopening of a question long supposed to be settled, the serious renewal of a strife supposed to be ended. It has been for some time obvious to the intelligent observer that strong forces were making in this direction. The experience of France, which abolished religion from the public schools only to find it necessary, for the very children's sake, to restore it, has not passed unheeded. The results of exclusion from our own schools have awakened serious misgivings. The educational system—religiously—is certainly far from satisfactory. But one would hardly have anticipated that so radical a proposition as this would have received so ready an endorsement in so high a place.

We seriously doubt if the action of the Conference can be taken as really representative of any matured purpose on the part of American Protestantism, or any large portion thereof. Nevertheless, the passing of such a resolution is a most significant sign of the times. It certainly indicates a grave discontent with the present system in religious education. There is good reason for that discontent. The neglect of religious training even in professedly Christian families; the fact that the Sunday-school, at best, includes but a fraction of the children needing instruction; and the further fact, according to the best authorities, that though the Sunday-school is often extolled as an "evangelizing agency," it yet graduates three students into the world to two into the church, creates a serious situation that it is quite impossible to ignore. Whether to "give us Wednesday afternoon," according to Dr. Wenner's impassioned plea, is the coming solution of our difficulties, may be gravely doubted. But it was well that the entire matter

should be brought before the attention of the Christian world in a form to arrest attention. If this proposal of the Conference shall provide a thorough discussion of the entire situation, it will—even though it should have done no more—quite pay for its existence.—*The Examiner*, November, 30, 1905.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION ON WEEK DAYS

We believe three things to be true: First, that in the public schools there is no religious teaching of any kind worth the name, and that there never will be any more than there is now. Second, that home teaching by Christians is much less than it was. If it be asked on what ground we hold this opinion we answer that it is the judgment of many pastors and many of the best Sunday-school-teachers, that it is the testimony of many children, and is the judgment of and is admitted by many parents when inquired of upon the subject, that the Sunday-schools are depended on for the religious instruction of the children. Parents who

were devout Christians were in the habit of instructing their children, and also of requiring the children to learn the Sunday-school lessons at home. The larger part of the instruction now given is that imparted to infants and little children by their mothers. This is the principal survival of the family teaching that was formerly very common in the Presbyterian and Baptist Churches, and generally in the more regular Methodists. The explanation of the expression "regular Methodists" is this, that there has always been a certain class of Methodists who depended exclusively on meetings and emotional appeals, but the bone and sinew of the denomination, while desiring to be moved upon by the Spirit and by the preaching of the Gospel, followed Mr. Wesley's plan and constantly read the Scriptures and religious books, observed family prayers, took their children to the regular worship of the House of God, and took great pains to endorse every good maxim and to intensify every appeal made by the pastors. The third

thing that we firmly believe is, that were the Sunday school absolutely perfect in government, in teaching force, in system, in punctuality, one hour a week would not suffice, without other means, to make a permanent impression upon any but a small minority of the scholars. What, then, can be expected when it is impossible to suppose that the Sunday schools answer the description here supposed? The evangelical churches have much to learn from Catholic methods in the teaching of children. Other denominations have very much to learn from the Lutherans. The Presbyterians and Baptists need to remember to put in practice their former methods; but circumstances have changed. Most people now live at long distances from their places of business, and the great majority, especially in cities, spend from a fourth to a third of their lives away from home, including in this the summer hegira. If the public authorities would consent to Dr. Wenner's proposition, it would give a great impetus to religious education of children. Such a

method could not be made popular by mere discussion. It would be necessary to have the plan tried in some school or some section of a large city. In case it succeeded it might then spread. At all events *something* should be done. We have a proposition which, after we have given it a little more thought, will be offered to pastors situated so as to make it feasible. Meanwhile we commend to them and to all parents, to Christian teachers of public schools, to public school superintendents and committees, to consider whether the plan could be tried in their section. Some communities are so homogeneous that there would be no difficulty in making the experiment.—*The Christian Advocate*, February 8, 1906.

RELIGION AND THE SCHOOLS

It is claimed by some that our common schools are irreligious, and while this assertion is largely urged in the interest of some particular form of religion, there is enough foundation for the assertion to make worth while an inquiry as to actual

conditions and as to how they may be improved.

It is not strictly true that our schools are irreligious. They hold the same relation to religion as the state to its citizens. By law and precedent the right of citizenship is accorded to all, irrespective of creed or religious conviction; yet we are a Christian nation, preserving the religious characteristics of the first settlers as has been uniformly recognized by the highest courts of the states and the nation, by the constitutions of most of the states, and by legislation for Sunday observance and the protection of Christian morals. So in our schools an education is provided for all without regard to creed, and the only restriction is against propagating any particular type of religion, not against religion itself, or the morality underlying our Christian civilization. In fact and practice prayer and reading of the Bible in nearly all the states and in most schools, continue a survival of what was universal in the formative period of the nation, when the

school was a recognized adjunct of the church.

Our cosmopolitan population and the entire passing over of primary and secondary schools into the hands of the state have minimized the recognition and teaching of religion in them, and while not irreligious, our schools have become non-religious to a far greater extent than is desirable for the future good of the nation.

Our people are firm in the conviction that education is fundamental in a free republic, and that public schools open to all must be maintained. Equally strong is the conviction that there can be no true education without religion. The reconciliation of these two ideas is the problem which confronts thoughtful minds. There is a growing persuasion that the great need of the schools is more religious instruction and a better grounding of our future citizens in Bible morality and Christian ethics.

How to secure this in a school where Jews, Romanists, Protestants, and infidels are expected to meet on common

ground is confessedly difficult. It is far more so with us, than in countries where the separation of church and state is more recent or less complete, and where the schools are under more direct government control. Other Christian countries have met the same problem and found a temporary, if not a final solution. In Germany religious instruction is given precedence and at least five hours a week in every school is given to it. In England, while the Non-Conformist Churches and adherents have protested against schools under the control of the established church, all expect and desire that in the national, as well as the board schools, religious instruction, of a non-sectarian type, should be provided for every child. In France, the separation of church and state has completely secularized the schools, yet provision is made for religious instruction, by setting apart Thursday of each week for such instruction as the churches may desire to give.

How is it with us? As has been said, in the vast majority of our schools there is

a recognition of religion in the opening exercises, but even this is often protested against, and inadequately meets the need. Religious instruction has to be otherwise provided. The Roman Catholic Church meets the problem by the parochial school, and agitates continually for help from the state in its support. Some Protestants, as the Moravians and a portion of the Lutheran Church, also maintain parochial schools, but with no demand or expectation of aid from the public treasury. Our own church experimented somewhat in this line, but with us, as with most Protestants, this solution has not met with favor.

The dependence for religious instruction of the children consequently has been on the Sunday-school, and the important sphere this has come to occupy has called special attention to its limitations, and the need of better methods. One hour a week, with teachers inadequately trained, and attendance voluntary and irregular, with no means of enforcing study—surely the religious training afforded by

the Sunday-school must be meagre and unsatisfactory. Where not reinforced by home teaching, its results are disappointing.

These considerations make pertinent the suggestion of Dr. Wenner, of this city, that a modification of the plan adopted in France be introduced in our American system. There, one whole day is surrendered to religious instruction under direction of the church. He suggests that surely here a half-day, *e. g.*, Wednesday afternoon, could be surrendered to the churches for such religious instruction as they may provide. Under this plan the school curriculum could be arranged so that the absentees should not suffer serious loss, and the non-church children need not be turned into the street. Under it the attendance on the instruction given by the church should be the basis of an excuse for absence, and be enforced as part of the regular school curriculum. When the importance of systematic religious instruction of the children is considered, this suggestion is worthy of care-

ful consideration. There are difficulties in working out such a scheme, but they are not insuperable, and the end to be attained is well worth the co-operation of school boards and the churches in securing for it a trial.—*The Christian Intelligencer*, February 28, 1906.

WEEK-DAY RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

At the recent meeting in New York of the Inter-Church Conference on Federation, Dr. G. U. Wenner read a paper on "Week-Day Religious Instruction," which made a deep impression on the Conference, and afterward received favorable notice from the religious press in general. The Conference unanimously adopted the following resolution prepared by him:

"*Resolved*, That in the need of more systematic education in religion, we recommend for the favorable consideration of the public school authorities of the country the proposal to allow the children to absent themselves, without detriment, from the public school on Wednesday, or

on some other afternoon of the school week, for the purpose of attending religious instruction in their own churches; and we urge upon the churches the advisability of availing themselves of the opportunity so granted to give such instruction in addition to that given on Sunday."

The resolution gives the gist of the paper, which, however, removes the objection that might be urged against turning upon the street a crowd of children who might not be required by their parents to attend religious instruction. Dr. Wenner says: "This does not involve the closing of the public school on Wednesday afternoon, and turning the non-church children into the street. It simply asks that the children attending the church school shall be excused for their absence. The course of study might be so arranged that absentees would not suffer an irreparable loss. Music, etiquette, or ethics, or some other substitute for religion, might be given to those who remain."

We do not intend to argue the subject in this article further than to state a few propositions, which may be readily defended, if not deemed almost self-evident:

1. No education is complete that lacks religious instruction.

2. This instruction is not given in the public school.

3. The public school, under present circumstances, cannot give it.

4. The home in most cases does not supply it.

5. The present Sunday-school is inadequate to give it in sufficient measure.

6. The parochial school, which might solve the problem, seems to many to be un-American, and certainly is not popular with Protestants.

Dr. Wenner's proposition seems to offer the best present solution of the problem. A plan somewhat similar is now in practical operation in France. Perhaps, by way of experiment, Saturday afternoon for a period of two hours might be chosen.

The practical application of Dr. Wen-

ner's idea is the matter that concerns us most in this article. It seems to us that in his resolution he puts the initiative at the wrong place. "The public school authorities" are not likely to make the start. The churches must do this in some way. The best way which occurs to us at this writing is to do this through the local ministerial society, which exists already or may be formed. The ministers ought to take the lead. It is their legitimate business to do so. Their efforts would receive the support of the Christian people; and the "school authorities" would fall into line.

In small communities a single religious school might do the required work. The pastors or competent day-school teachers could do the teaching. In larger towns the children of the same or allied denominations might be gathered into one school. Of course, the details would have to be worked out by committees and modified by experience. The matter of instruction must naturally be Biblical and Christian, but not confessional or sectarian.

The scheme will not be generally adopted at once, if at all. There must be an object-lesson first. It seems to us that one of our larger inland towns ought to give it. Lebanon, Pennsylvania, for example, the residence of the indefatigable Dr. Schmauk, who has done so much in preparing graded lessons, is an ideal place for the experiment. Easton, Carlisle, and York offer favorable conditions. And there are scores of other towns throughout the country which ought to take to the idea. The places mentioned are more particularly known to the writer. We most earnestly commend to the consideration of the Protestant clergy of these cities the matter of week-day religious education.—Prof. J. A. Singmaster, in *The Lutheran Observer*.

THE CHURCH AND THE SCHOOLS

A proposal is being seriously considered by representatives of many Churches, not all of them Christian, to secure the co-operation of the state and city educational authorities with the churches in a plan for

the religious education of school children. At a meeting, in New York, of which an account will be found in our news columns, representatives of our own church, of the Roman Catholics, Methodists, Presbyterians, Congregationalists and Jews, joined in more or less qualified commendation of the proposal of a committee appointed some months ago to consider the matter. The proposal was that public school children, who might desire it, or whose parents desired it for them, should be excused from the Wednesday afternoon session of the public schools that they might receive instruction in their respective churches. Of this plan Bishop Greer said: "If it does not succeed it will not be the fault of the schools—it will be the fault of the churches. At all events it is an experiment that is well worth trying."

We are not so sure of that. It seems to us an experiment of very doubtful expediency; one that we would much rather leave untried. With all that Bishop Greer said in commendation of the great

patriotic work of the public schools, with his indignant repudiation of the aspersion that they are "godless," we are in hearty accord. We agree with him entirely, too, that it is not the business of the public schools to give religious instruction. But neither is it their business to see that it is given. "It is for the churches to give religious training," said Bishop Greer, "that is what the churches are for." "What they ask," he continued, "is that they have the opportunity of doing what they exist to do." This "opportunity" of which Bishop Greer speaks would amount under this proposal to the opportunity to compel attendance at religious instruction by the use of the same system that the state has devised to ensure attendance at public schools. The churches apparently, to ensure their "opportunity," propose to invoke the aid of the truant officer. Moreover, they propose that one-tenth of the time which the state considers necessary for the child's instruction and for the full employment of which the tax-payers are paying, shall be taken

for use by instructors of whose pedagogical competence the state has no knowledge, and over whom it can exercise no control. The public schools need all the time they can get for their work. They have not an hour too much. The supposition that one session out of the ten in each week can be given to "relatively unimportant" studies shows a strange ignorance of the conditions under which the school curriculum is devised, and of the anxious care with which the various elements in education are balanced against one another, that every minute may be used to the utmost. We want no interference of the state in education by the church and no interference by the church in education by the state. The plan seems to us bad in itself, even if it were found practicable. It would prove even worse in the results to which it would inevitably lead. For surely the benefit of religious instruction would be a questionable quantity if children found it so uninteresting or their parents were so indifferent to its value that they must be

dragged to the church to receive it. The church must win her children; she cannot force them into allegiance.

We do not wish to create in this country conditions that are distracting the English Church and Parliament and injuring the efficiency of both. We cannot forget that the plan has the support of the traditional enemies of public education. To opponents of the American system we would say in challenge and to its friends in warning: Hands off the public schools.—*The Churchman*, May 12, 1906.

RELIGION AND THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

To the Editor of the CHURCHMAN:

As secretary of the Missionary Thank-Offering Committee I am enjoying an unusual opportunity to confer with laymen and clergymen all over the country, respecting the points of strength and weakness in the work of our church. I find a large number of intelligent people who share the opinion which I have ventured to form upon this subject. That opinion is that we are bringing annually

into vital relation with Christ a number of men, pitiably small, when regard is had to our great scheme of church organization and to the power of the message with which we are entrusted. In the great majority of parishes there is little vital religion among men. In the relatively small missionary work of the church the men have hitherto taken an insignificant part. I state what I believe to be facts, not at all in a spirit of hopelessness and depression, but as one who is awestricken in the presence of so great an opportunity for the work of Christian education. I believe it was Horace Bushnell who, in reply to the question, "Has not Christianity been a failure?" replied, "How can it have failed? It has never been tried." This was an exaggeration; but only an exaggeration; not a statement wholly false. In searching for the causes of weakness in the church, would it not be wise to consider whether this is not one of them—that we are not giving Christianity a fair trial?

I venture to affirm that what we need

is more direct and positive teaching, in the pulpit, at missionary conferences and in the columns of the church papers, respecting the essence of Christianity, which I take to be this—that it is absolute devotion to Jesus Christ as not only our Lord but our Friend. We have a simple message; but, if properly delivered, it will find a lodgment in every soul. As our Gospel is the good news of the redeeming love of our Friend, so our message is the proclamation of our duty to Him. That duty is twofold; first, to make ourselves fit to associate with Him and hold communion with Him; second, to co-operate with Him in bringing all men everywhere into the personal relation of friendship with Him. But "how shall they call on Him in whom they have not believed? And how shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a preacher? And how shall they preach except they be sent?"

It is not enough that we have a message. It is not even enough that we utter

it ourselves and send others to do likewise. We must devise means to bring within range of the message those for whom it is intended. I am not speaking at the moment of the heathen but of two classes of people who sustain a geographical or family relationship to our parish churches—the men and the children.

To reach the *men and the older boys*, the M. T. O. movement has been inaugurated and already God has blessed its progress. I do not refer to the money-raising aspect of the movement. Money giving, except as an expression of devotion, is of little or no subjective value. I speak of the anointing of blind eyes to see the vision of a world to be won for Christ and the unstopping of deaf ears to hear the cry of souls that must be saved. The working of these miracles is the primary purpose of the M. T. O.

But what about the *children?* It is plain that they cannot "believe in Him of whom they have not heard." The lack of insight into the heart of Christianity upon the part of this generation of

adults shows that they have been defectively taught. What about the rising generation? Here is a great opportunity and a solemn responsibility. Of course normal children do not want to be taught and will not come voluntarily. By the time we have trained the parents to compel them to hear our message the children will be parents themselves—and we shall have the work to do over again. As a matter of course, we compel children to receive secular instruction. We know that interest and even zeal will come with the recognition of ignorance and the vision of knowledge. Accordingly it is proposed in New York, as you explain in your issue of May 12th, to allow Christian instruction in a child's own church on Wednesday afternoons to count in lieu of an afternoon's attendance upon public school. Christianity must be imparted to the children of the church, not by preaching but by careful and systematic teaching. What place more appropriate than the parish church? What thought more important to the child than the

thought that to learn to know Christ—not to know *about* Him—is an essential part of education? Yet in your editorial you say: "Surely the benefit of religious instruction would be a questionable quantity if children found it so uninteresting or their parents were so indifferent to its value that they must be dragged to the church to receive it. The church must win her children; she cannot force them into allegiance." Am I manifesting an unchristian spirit if I ask whether these are the words of one who believes that the future of our nation and of our church depends upon bringing young children to Christ?

But you say: "The public schools need all the time they can get for their work. They have not an hour too much. The supposition that one session out of the ten in each week can be given to 'relatively unimportant' studies, shows a strange ignorance of the conditions under which the school curriculum is devised, and of the anxious care with which the various elements in education are balanced

against one another, that every minute may be used to the utmost." Not at all in a controversial spirit, may I ask the writer of these words this question: "What is the relative importance of secular education and of the knowledge of Christ?" Of course school hours are all too short for learning. Art is long and time is fleeting. But the real question is: Shall the little time for learning be devoted exclusively to other subjects than learning to know Christ?

It is proposed, you say, "that one-tenth of the time which the state considers necessary for the child's instruction and for the full employment of which the taxpayers are paying, shall be taken for use by instructors of whose pedagogical competence the state has no knowledge, and over whom it can exercise no control." "The state" means you and the rest of us. As far as we churchmen and our children are concerned, it is proposed that the teaching shall be done in our own churches and under the direction of our own clergy. Whose fault is it if we have

no knowledge of their "pedagogical competency," and if we exercise no control over them?

Finally you observe: "We want no interference of the state in education by the church, and no interference by the church in education by the state," and you close by a reference to the conditions that are distracting the English Church and Parliament. Is it your opinion that the separation of church and state should be so complete that our people as a whole are to be indifferent whether or not the children receive religious instruction from the church of their parents' choice? If you do not mean this, what do you mean? In England they are at least distracted over the effort to solve this difficult problem. Because of its difficulty shall we give it up in advance? The plan proposed in New York avoids the chief difficulties which have caused trouble in England, yet your language seems to imply that we proposed to try an experiment which has failed. May those of us who believe that Christian education alone can

appease the hunger of the age call upon you for some constructive suggestion? If you have a better plan than this, we solemnly adjure you to make it public. Do not tell us: "The churches are open; the children ought to go voluntarily and be taught there." We have tried this experiment and it has failed. Do not say: "This matter of Christian instruction is the business of the parents." Perhaps so; but the parents are not attending to their business. Do not point to voluntary attendance upon Sunday-school as the solution of the difficulty. The Sunday-school is a blessed institution, but it reaches only a corner of the field. *The point is, Mr. Editor, that multitudes of the children of the Church are dying or growing up without being brought to the knowledge of Christ.* This is your fault and mine. What are we going to do about it? Your only reply so far is, "Hands off the public schools." Nobody has suggested laying hands on the public schools. The proposition is to lay hands upon your children and mine, and to

bring them within reach of the voice of Jesus Christ. Instead of opposing, will you not help?

G. W. PEPPER.

Philadelphia—(*The Churchman*, May 26, 1906.)

RELIGION AND THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

To the Editor of the CHURCHMAN:

Your editorial of May 12th concerning the proposition to have the public school authorities excuse the children of such parents as desire it from attendance at school on Wednesday afternoons, in order that they may be instructed elsewhere in religious subjects, has not been replied to in your issue of to-day. Failing a more competent person to answer your objections, may I make several suggestions in this connection?

(1) There is no complete and fully formulated proposition before us as yet, other than what is roughly stated above. At the same meeting where one speaker said that he would consider it beneficial to have truant officers compel attendance,

another said that there would be nothing to prevent some parents—though he thought that there would be very few of such—from taking advantage of this to keep their children at home for other reasons than to have them taught religion. Certainly many of us agree with you "that it is not the business of the public schools to give religious instruction," and "neither is it their business to see that it is given." So also your statement that this is a demand for "10 per cent" of the work hours of the school week depends upon the hour when the children shall be excused, and this is not yet determined. Evidently while discussion of details is quite to the point, condemnation of the scheme for such reasons is quite premature.

(2) Your next objection is that "The public schools need all the time that they can get for work. They have not an hour too much." Comparing our educational system with that of other Christian nations, we are alone, so far as I know, in not providing for religious instruction

within the school week. As a people, we have decided, and most of us think very wisely decided, that we shall not have religion taught by the state. But having surrendered these hours which other nations use for religious training, to purely secular training, does our secular training for that reason outstrip all others—the Germans, for instance? Yet they invariably have religion among their set tasks of the week. Or is it true again, as you claim, that there are no "relatively unimportant" studies which might be put on the Wednesday afternoon public school schedule? Here are certain subjects taught in the public schools to children of fourteen years and under, which do not all appear to be of first importance:

Carpentry, sewing, cooking, drawing, hygiene, singing, construction work (fancy boxes, etc.).

But now suppose it be asked if we have not our Sunday-schools to teach religious subjects on Sunday? The best answer to that would seem to be that, barring rare exceptions, the Sunday-school simply

does not do the work—and this in a day when there is little or no religious instruction at home, and therefore children must be taught outside. Two things, certainly, are accomplished in our Sunday-schools: in the person of the teacher the child comes into contact with a maturer Christian and often a highly consecrated character, and furthermore it is brought to public worship. These are splendid results, the value of which cannot be overestimated. But still crowds of children slip away forever from Sunday-school, never becoming church members, owing to the fact that religion soon ceases to interest and appeal to them—perhaps it never did—and those who do pass on into church are inadequately taught.

Among the causes for this failure we may note that, first, there is not time enough. Could you teach a child to read if you had him as one of an often disorderly class, for a lesson of from twenty to thirty-five minutes once a week, or could you teach him arithmetic, or religious truths, or anything, except in a

most superficial manner? As a matter of fact, you cannot and you do not, even if you are a clever teacher. And as a second cause of failure the teaching staff is not adequate for the work, often as to training and generally as to numbers. Leaving aside that class of teachers who stay at home because it rains or a friend calls, what the teacher accomplishes is commonly more in the line of character building than instructing, and if anything of real value is done by a good teacher, be sure that the pupils are met outside the regular Sunday-school session, and that brings us back to this question of week-day work.

It is necessary here that we should recognize that the standard of religious instruction which Christian people in America are contented with is shamefully low—there is nothing like it certainly among the Northern nations of Europe. To say nothing of the average, your *good* Sunday-school pupil can glibly recite the catechism, but, even if in an advanced grade, what can he tell of the doctrine of

the Atonement or the evidences of the Resurrection of our Lord? He knows the graphic stories of the Old Testament, but the profounder things concerning the struggles of the ancient Hebrew church are beyond him, while the beauty and majesty of the Hebrew prophets is a closed book even to many an older churchman who never had his eyes opened in his youth. The life of our Lord is learned in outline—fortunately the church year prevents our getting far from that—but how much thorough knowledge is there of this greatest of subjects? Think also of the life of St. Paul, the early church, church history, including the Reformation and our American church, the story of Christian Missions and the formation of our Prayer Book—no wonder that the men who are interested in seeing some real and thorough work done among our children and young people are discouraged. Nor does it lessen the discouragement to be told to go back and be content with one-half hour on Sunday! There is simply one way

to meet the problem. We must have opportunity to teach the children on a week-day, and we must have them taught by persons who have been trained to the work, and this not to supplant but rather to supplement the Sunday-school.

But here one may perhaps say, Take the children during the week if you will, but take them after school hours. Does such an objector know children after school hours? Still some of us will take them—some of us are already taking them—tired little bodies though they are, and going home to study their evening lessons later on, too. But we dare not neglect them while we are waiting for their elders to provide a fair and proper time for this important part of their work.

Again, another objector may say that, if clergy and parish staff, commonly hard worked enough, are to do this work, what is to become a regular parochial routine? The reply is that parochial duties must always be taken up in the order of their importance, and the older parishioners must be educated up to seeing that this

may demand a sacrifice on their part. * * * * * It can be done and it will be done if we realize that the place for the children is in the front ranks. We elders must look over their heads.

Other objectors doubtless will also raise other points—everything can be criticized—but this question is up now, and be sure it is with us to stay until we solve it. Whether or not we get Wednesday afternoon or any portion of it, whether one favors or objects to any particular scheme, the fact remains that the children are knocking at the door of the church, and I venture to say that as the church answers this appeal which is now beginning to sound in her ears, so she determines her own future. That future is to be built up out of these very children, by the aid of the spirit of God, and He surely will not lavish His grace upon any church or any religious body which neglects them. THORNTON FLOYD TURNER.

New York.

(*The Churchman*, June 9, 1906.)

APPENDIX

APPENDIX

RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION AND THE PUBLIC SCHOOL

An address before the Federation of Churches, Berkeley, California, by Frank F. Bunker, Superintendent of Schools, Berkeley, California, October 24, 1910.

WHILE not all of our American States have excluded the Bible wholly from their schools, yet without doubt strictly secular and neutral positions have been maintained by all. Though neither religious training nor religious instruction are to be found in them, it must by no means be thought that the public schools ignore the end which religion seeks, namely, the development of a sturdy moral character. In point of fact, in recent years there is no question which has been more to the front in every educational gathering throughout our country than this question of training for character, and in every school an earnest effort is being made to secure increasingly better results therein.

Except in a few of our schools, the means employed by American educators to secure this

moral training are largely *indirect* rather than *direct*. To illustrate: The routine of a well-ordered school cultivates habits of punctuality, regularity, and system which are elements of character. The mechanical arrangements of the school building to secure light, heat, sunshine, and fresh air are presumed to contribute to character formation. Manual training, domestic science, nature study, school gardens, provide pleasant and profitable occupation and remove the temptation to idleness, besides developing a respect for the property rights of others. Placing the child amid dignified and beautiful surroundings and in rooms tastefully decorated with good pictures is likewise thought to have an important influence on character. Good music and instruction in drawing and in other forms of hand-work is believed also to have an influence in the same direction. Beautiful thoughts and poems are memorized with the same objective in view. Then, too, the methods of teaching are so shaped as to place responsibility on the pupil, thereby developing initiative and self-reliance. Pupil organizations, such as literary and debating societies, athletic associations, musical clubs, and similar forms of student-body activities, are encouraged because of the belief that they, too, are moral factors of a high order. All these contribute to the making of the school "atmosphere," which

the most exacting critic of the American school-system must admit is highly moral. Granting that the "atmosphere" of our schools is moral, it must be seen from an examination of the means which have been cited to secure this result that they are unsystematic, indefinite, unscientific, and that the element of chance enters largely. It must also be observed from the illustrations given that the methods employed are those which tend to establish *habits* of conduct rather than the giving of ideas which may be serviceable in *directing* conduct.

In France and Japan, on the other hand, *moral instruction* in contrast to *moral training* is emphasized, for in both these countries such instruction is put on exactly the same basis as instruction in any other subject considered of value. In each a definite plan is outlined extending throughout the entire school course; a definite time for such instruction is provided for in the school program; and each teacher is expected to spend the allotted time in accordance with the provisions of the plan.

Practice in our own country places stress on *moral training* rather than on *moral instruction*. The one aims at good habits; the other at imparting moral ideas. The one emphasizes the educative power of the activities of the school community; the other emphasizes the didactic power of the school.

In this age, where conditions are rapidly changing, where each day sees a new alignment of the forces of good and evil, where almost hourly we are called upon to draw new moral distinctions and to shape our conduct in accordance therewith, it will not suffice to rest back upon the operation of instinct nor trust to the reactions which have become habitual through moral situations which have arisen in the schools. The "rule of thumb," serviceable in some departments of education, breaks down in the field of the moral and the ethical. To secure the ability to meet with strength new moral situations, or, what is the same thing, to identify the old moral principle in a new setting, in my judgment requires in addition to all this something more, namely, the process of conscious analysis, applied to moral situations, which is the natural accompaniment of the right kind of didactic instruction.

To a degree this need, also, is being met by the public schools, for it is customary in each, whenever a lesson assigned in literature, in history, or in collateral reading presents an ethical problem, to analyze it into its elements and to seek to determine the conduct which rightly follows. To this extent, and this only, do the schools go in giving *direct* moral instruction. But at best such instruction is haphazard and lacking in system and definite-

ness as well as completeness, for such lessons are assigned not because they teach moral truths, but because they conform to some other line of organization which the schools deem important. In a few cities in the United States (New York, Los Angeles, Berkeley, and some others whose names I do not recall) the school authorities have recognized the need for more systematic instruction in ethics and have provided their teachers with a comprehensive and detailed outline to be used in such instruction. Even in these cities, however, the course is permissive and suggestive rather than obligatory and, therefore, in reality, the whole matter is left entirely to the discretion of the individual teacher.

In view of the foregoing considerations and after as careful an examination of the methods employed by France and Japan as one can make who has never visited either, I am convinced that our American schools will find that through the medium of direct moral instruction they can yet greatly increase the efficiency of their work in the field of the moral and ethical. To this view many of the leading educators of this country are rapidly coming. In 1907 the National Educational Association, to mention but one instance, at its Los Angeles meeting adopted the following resolution: "It is the duty of the teachers to enter at once upon a

systematic course of instruction which shall embrace not only a broader patriotism but a more extended course of moral instruction, especially in regard to the rights and duties of citizenship, the right of property and the security and sacredness of human life." But when this shall have been accomplished and America shall have added systematic moral instruction to the excellent moral training of her public schools, she will have gone as far in the approaches to religion as public opinion and the laws of the land will permit.

I believe it is true that the educative process cannot be considered complete nor wholly vital unless it ministers to the threefold nature of each individual—the physical, the intellectual, and the religious. This does not necessarily presume that either the Church, the home, or the school must supply the whole of such education, but on the other hand it does mean that the individual himself, if he is being educated in the truest sense, is receiving, from whatever sources, that training and that instruction which will contribute to his physical, his intellectual, and his religious needs.

The physical needs of our youth are being ministered to with constantly increasing discernment and efficiency through such agencies as the public school, the Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Associations, the Boy

Scout movement, the playground commission, and kindred organizations. The intellectual need of the future citizens is the particular problem of our schools, public and private. Whatever may be the defects of these institutions, without question the general level of the intelligence of the masses has been greatly raised because of their work. It now remains to ask, Does the educative process satisfy in the same hopeful way the third important need, which is the religious?

Some would say that the moral training which the schools are giving satisfies reasonably well this need, and that when the schools finally shall have gone as far in giving definite moral instruction as public opinion and the laws of the land will permit, then all the necessary demands of the individual's religious nature will have been met. Others on the other hand hold—and with them I agree—that morality and religion have distinguishing characteristics which are fundamental, and that the one is by no means synonymous with the other; neither is the one, in the education of the individual, an adequate substitute for the other. The latter, while believing that in a complete education morality and religion are inseparably connected, in that the ultimate sanctions of all morality are found in religious faith, hold that for America at least, and for the

reasons already given, the teaching of the religious sanctions must be entrusted entirely to the family and to religious organizations. Those who agree with the position that the moral training of the schools is not adequate to supply the religious need must turn, therefore, to the home and to the Church if they would know whether or not our youth are receiving that which yet remains to make up an education which is both complete and vital.

The power of the home in grounding its children in religious faith is beyond calculation. No effort of Church or school or society can ever compensate if the home fails in this its great opportunity. It is not possible to estimate the advantage with which a young man begins life who at his mother's knee has acquired the habit of daily prayer; who during his entire young life has bowed his head before breaking bread, giving God thanks; and who has gathered nightly with his sisters about the family altar and listened on bent knee while the father asks that God's blessing shall fall on each member of the houshold. Society's weaklings and misfits do not come from the ranks of these. But the daily prayers of the little children, the words of grace at mealtime, the practice of family worship, are becoming obsolete. Except in rare instances these beautiful customs have disappeared from our

homes, and with their passing the home has lost an invaluable ally in the begetting and nurturing of religious faith.

It has remained for the Church, including its auxiliary organizations, to stand as the one institution which has consistently conserved the religious faith of our people. Like the school it has been subjected to much criticism. While some of the criticism which has been directed at it is doubtless merited, nevertheless it is true that the Church has been a powerful force for good among our people, and through its Sunday-schools, its parochial schools, its organizations for young people, and its club work among boys it has exerted a powerful influence on the lives of those who are affiliated therewith. For those of our youth who participate in its activities it offers the hopeful outlook for satisfying the religious need which is the third element in the complete education of which I have been speaking. While the result of a canvass which was made of our schools to-day shows that a much larger percentage of our school children come within the direct influence of the Church than I had thought, the proportion approximating fifty per cent., yet even this figure shows that only one child in every two is receiving religious instruction, for the children in the homes where such instruction is given will be found, for the most

part, enrolled in the churches. Putting this fact another way, one-half of the children are receiving nothing more than the schools are giving, which, as we have seen, is limited to moral considerations alone, and yet doubtless the percentage is much higher in Berkeley than in many cities. We are forced, therefore, to conclude that for great numbers of our young people the educative process is not complete, and furthermore that it is incomplete just where many of us believe it should be the strongest.

As it is clear that America can look only to her religious organizations for the grounding of her youth in religious faith and for the giving of the religious sanctions which underlie the moral training and instruction of her schools, it therefore remains to ask:

1. How can the Churches make their work more vital and hence increase their hold on the masses?

2. How can the home and the school strengthen the place and position of the Church in the community in its work of religious instruction?

The discussion of recent years points the way as to the first: Securing more time; procuring a better trained body of teachers; adjusting instruction to the age and understanding of the child; substituting concrete situa-

tions for abstract generalizations; adapting the spirit of instruction to the spirit of youth; giving as much attention and care in religious matters to the adolescent as the schools are doing in matters secular; organizing and grading the content given—these suggestions and many more which have been offered will help. But we need to go farther and consciously seek means to uphold the hands of the Church in the community. This brings me to the discussion of a plan wherein the school can render signal service and yet do so without departing from the limitations placed upon it by law and by public opinion.

In brief, the plan, which has been given some discussion in this country, though never placed in execution I believe, is this: To set apart a definite time during the weekly session of the schools when the regular work of the same will be suspended and the children dismissed to scatter among the religious organizations which they elect and by them to be given that particular form of religious instruction which the given organization believes will be most vital. To illustrate: The school officials of this city have it within their power to say, "We believe so strongly in the value of religious instruction in providing a complete and vital education for each child that we are willing on each Wednesday morning to excuse

for half a day all children in the public schools whose parents desire them to spend that time at the several churches in religious study and worship." The time of those who do not desire such instruction could be spent profitably at the school in reviewing ground which has already been covered by the class. While the attendance of every child, during this particular period, would be required, yet as between the Church and the school it could be made a matter of choice.

There are no legal difficulties in the way of such an arrangement. I asked the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Mr. Edward Hyatt, who is our legal adviser in such matters, for an unofficial opinion on this point. He wrote me as follows: "I see no objection to the course you propose, either legally, morally, or in any other way. If you want a formal official opinion I shall write it for you any time you need it."

The only objection from the side of the schools which I can see relates to the time which will thereby be taken from their usual work. While the time is all too short as it is, I am confident that the ultimate results in character, in seriousness of purpose, in attitude to work would more than compensate. If this were not so then there is nothing in religious

instruction and the churches would better close their doors.

The only objection which society at large could raise to this plan would be the fear that this division of the schools into groups would introduce sectarian oppositions, rivalries, and jealousies to the detriment of the nation. This might be a result were we considering some European nation where sectarian feeling runs high, and, indeed, it might have had this result in our own country a few generations ago; but I should not fear it now, for in this country such organizations have grown beyond the doctrinal differences which in the past caused so much bitterness. There is such a spirit of tolerance among all our sects as to place one entirely at ease in respect to this danger. The very fact that you gentlemen of the Federation of Ministers, representing practically every shade of religious belief, assemble from time to time in earnest discussion of questions of common interest relating to your work is sufficient assurance that this fear is ungrounded.

There remain to be considered the objections which would be raised by the Church itself. These would relate only, I presume, to the difficulties involved in carrying the plan into execution. The chief of these would be that of

securing a sufficient force of well-equipped workers whose services could be commanded during the time set apart. The fact that this would have to be on some day other than Sunday would add to the difficulty. Each organization would have to adjust its machinery to the new demand in its own way, but I believe this can be done; at any rate it would seem that if a considerable demand of this character developed the Church ought to be resourceful enough to meet it. The adjustment would require time, but I think it entirely possible.

There are no two institutions created by society which are more thoroughly grounded in the confidence of the people than the institutions of the Church and of the public school. Were the school's influence, which is now passive with respect to the Church, actively exerted in support of the same, according to some such plan as this, I am confident that the attendance on such organizations as the Sunday-school would be increased greatly. Were the public school to say to the people: "We believe so thoroughly that a part of the time of each child should be spent in religious training, instruction, and worship, to the end that his education may be complete and vital, that we have provided a time when this can be secured without detriment, and

strongly urge you to send your children at this time to the church of your faith or preference for such instruction as shall be given therein," I am confident that few would decline.

In producing effective character the institutions which society has created for the purpose of rearing and training its youth are facing to-day a task infinitely more difficult than ever before. The world of to-day is far more complex than was the world of our Puritan ancestors and makes infinitely greater demands upon the moral intelligence of its citizens. Our forefathers wrestled with forest and mountain and plain, with wild beasts and with wild men, with flood and famine and disease. The story of their victorious struggles is a thrilling one—one of which we, their sons and daughters, may well be proud; but it was a struggle which required pre-eminently physical rather than moral courage.

We talk of the sterling qualities of the American pioneer and grieve over what seems to us to be a decadence of moral fiber in our own time. We forget that the scene has shifted, that the setting is very different. It was easier for our forefathers to be frugal, for luxury was not visible at every turn; to be industrious, for he "who would not work did not eat"; to be home-centered, for neither duties nor pleasures were such as to draw the

parents away; to be guileless in legislation, for there were no great corporations seeking favors; to be honest in business, for penalties for dishonesty were more immediate and hence more effective. In those days there was no tariff problem, no social problem, no slum problem, no labor-union problem, no problem of business mergers, no problem as between employer and employee, between producer and consumer, nor between the very rich and the very poor. Then man sought to master nature and to harness the forces of nature; now man seeks to dominate society and to organize and direct in right channels the forces which have their sources in society. The first required physical hardihood and physical courage of high order; the latter requires the ability to draw fine distinctions and the highest order of moral intelligence and courage. In the first, instinct was the safe and sure guide to conduct; in the latter, conduct has no such mentor. In short it is harder to be good to-day than it was in the time of Roger Williams and Anne Hutchinson and Standish and Winthrop, and those who criticise our institutions for not securing finer moral standards fail to recognize that the modern world makes infinitely greater demands upon the moral intelligence of its citizens and that the problem of training to meet such demands is more difficult than ever before.

Recognizing the seriousness of this task, it behooves the Church and the school to redouble their efforts to make the work of each increasingly effective. Since in this country there never will be a union of the two, let us seek to bring about co-operation.

FROM THE REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF THE FEDERAL COUNCIL TO CONSIDER WAYS AND MEANS TO PROMOTE WEEK-DAY INSTRUCTION IN RELIGION.

THE REV. GEORGE U. WENNER, D.D.*

From conferences and correspondence with leading educators and churchmen, as well as from observation of the trend of discussion in ecclesiastical bodies and in periodicals, we have gained our impressions of the state of public opinion on the subject committed to our consideration.

We note a deepening appreciation of the need of religion in the education of the young and a widespread interest in all plans that will further this end.

A generation has grown up under the influence of a materialistic philosophy with a conception of life alien to the teachings of Christianity.

*Chairman. Other members: W. M. Bell, J. Y. Boice, W. H. Boocock, S. C. Breyfogel, J. B. Calvert, B. C. Davis, W. B. Derrick, R. Dubs, H. C. Griffith, O. Huckel, M. L. Jennings, R. L. Kelly, M. W. Leibert, R. D. Lord, P. H. Milliken, R. W. Miller, F. M. North, G. W. Pepper, J. M. Philputt, A. Schmidt, A. B. Shelley, R. L. Rudolph, H. M. Sanders, H. A. Stimson, G. B. Stewart, M. Summerbell, J. C. Scouller, E. S. Tipple, E. Talbot, J. I. Vance, A. Vennema, A. Walters, G. B. Winton, J. Wood.

The Church, by her emphasis on the value of the individual soul, has sometimes overlooked her obligation to the community. By confining her work to the narrow circle of the parish or the denomination, she fails to reach many of those who do not belong to her immediate society.

The public school, by reason of the independence of Church and State, is unable to enforce the highest moral standards because it is unable to avail itself of the effective influence of religion.

The lack of religious restraints, more than that, the lack of religious inspiration in the pursuit of high ideals, is generally acknowledged to be a serious defect in the American system of public education.

With no disposition toward pessimism, we believe that the state of society, from the standpoint of the Church or State, demonstrates the need of such a force as religion only can supply, and emphasizes the importance of more comprehensive and systematic instruction in religion than our present methods afford.

Education does not mean the impartation of information. It means the development of character.

It is generally conceded that without religion there can be no true education. We do not confound religion with dogma. We know very well that religion is a life. It cannot be taught. It must be imparted. But we also know that the Christian Church in her fellowship of faith, and in the Divine forces with which she has been endowed by her Master, has the resources that are required for the development of soul and character which is the aim of all true education.

On the other hand, the precepts of morality, unsupported by faith in God and the verities of

religion, are found to be incapable of producing the highest attainments in character. This is leading many, who for a time have stood aloof from the Christian Church, to recognize her true function as a teacher of the nations in the things that pertain to God and the eternal life.

Here, then, is presented our great opportunity. Instead of being discouraged by the outlook, we now behold an open door through which we may enter in upon a field of largest usefulness and service. The very conditions that seemed to spell defeat will in due time prove to be the harbingers of victory.

At the meeting in Philadelphia in 1908, the Federal Council by resolution endorsed the general principle, recognizing the duty of the churches to provide adequate religious instruction for their children and calling for more time to be given to this subject on week-days, in view of the fact that the hour at Sunday-school and the religious exercises of the public school do not meet the requirements of "adequate religious instruction."

A careful study of the situation, however, convinces us that we are confronted by conditions which prevent the immediate adoption of a practical plan.

A unanimous public opinion does not support our claim. It is not a time when moral and religious considerations have compelling cogency, and it is not our purpose to introduce an element of confusion or strife.

There are theoretical questions among ourselves, arising from diverse conceptions as to the relations of Church and State. While the State concedes to some denominations the use of the entire week in the parochial school for the purpose of

educating their children, there is a lurking fear that some principle would be violated if to other denominations were given even a portion of a single day. It will take time before some of these seeming inconsistencies can be reconciled.

It is a question whether the churches would be prepared to avail themselves of the opportunity if it were given. The lack of pedagogical experience on the part of some of the ministers and the paucity of men and women in our Protestant churches fitted for expert work in assisting the pastor, will for a time prove an objection to the plan. The inadequacy of educational material in our church buildings and schoolhouses would for some time hamper the churches in their educational work.

Denominationalism, the identification of religion with a certain theory of religion, makes it difficult for Protestants to unite upon an effective method of carrying out such a plan.

The work of instruction in religion has for so long a time been delegated to other agencies, in our earlier history to the public school, subsequently to the Sunday-school, that only a small percentage of our churches regard it as a distinct duty and function of the Church, as truly as preaching or public worship. Even in that holy of holies, the Christian family, not a foreign or independent society, but from the Christian viewpoint a part of the Church, there has been a marked neglect of this duty under the mistaken assumption that it is being adequately attended to by some other organization.

Instruction in religion is a function of the Church, through its ordinary agencies, in particular the ministry and the parents. Until the churches realize their obligations in respect to this

fundamental duty of the Christian communion, it may be premature to ask for privileges of which they would not and could not avail themselves.

We are compelled, therefore, to concede the weight of these practical objections to our plan. We do so with sorrow, because we thus publish to the world the shortcomings of the Church. For we cannot forget that the Church is the mother of education. The public school system was not originally a creation of the State. It is the outgrowth of the schools which the Church established for the promotion of religion. For generations she has failed to exercise the functions that properly belong to her. She has transferred them to auxiliary organizations or has neglected them altogether, and now she justly suffers the consequences of atrophied powers.

A question like this is too momentous to be settled by the resolution of a convention. It is a subject in which the churches themselves need to be educated and stimulated. They must realize their obligation and obtain a vision of their opportunity. It will then be easy to provide adequate agencies and means for the accomplishment of the task that is set before us.

We therefore recommend:

1. That the Federal Council again place on record its resolutions of 1908:

"That there can be no true and complete education without religion; to provide adequate religious instruction for their children is the duty of the churches, a primal and imperative duty. That the hour at Sunday-school, the religious exercises of the public school and the ethical instruction of the public school, through the personal influence of the great body of religious public school teach-

ers, do not meet the requirements of adequate religious instruction. That to provide religious instruction for their children is not only the duty of churches, it is their inherited and inherent right, and this right should be recognized by the State in its arrangement of the course of school studies."

2. That whenever and wherever public sentiment warrants such a course, the public schools should be closed for half a day for the purpose of allowing the children to attend instruction in religion in their own churches. As compared with other Christian countries, an allotment of eight per cent. of school time for religion would not be an immoderate allowance.

3. That where it is not feasible to obtain a portion of the time belonging to the school curriculum, the churches should see to it that after school hours on week-days, at least one hour's instruction in religion be given to each child of the congregation.

4. That ecclesiastical bodies and theological seminaries be urged to give increased attention to the pedagogical training of candidates for the ministry.

5. That as citizens, having in mind the highest ideals of education, we exercise care in the selection of teachers and superintendents of public schools with respect to their religious character and the personal influence they would be likely to have upon their pupils.

6. That we invite the National Education Association, the Religious Education Association, and other Associations interested in this subject, to appoint committees to confer with our committee on ways and means for promoting week-day instruction in religion.

7. That the further consideration of the subject be entrusted to the Federal Council's standing Committee on Education, with the request to report from time to time to the Executive Committee, and at the next meeting of the Federal Council.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE FIRST MEETING OF THE FEDERAL COUNCIL HELD IN PHILADELPHIA IN 1908

1. That there can be no true and complete education without religion; to provide adequate religious instruction for their children is the duty of the churches, a primal and imperative duty.

2. That the hour at Sunday-school, the religious exercises of the public school and the ethical instruction of the public school through the personal influence of the great body of religious public school teachers do not meet the requirements of "adequate religious instruction."

3. That to provide religious instruction for their children is not only the duty of the churches, it is their inherited and inherent right. But it is the duty of parents to give instruction to their children, and this right should be fully recognized by the state in its arrangement of the course of school studies, which right also calls for more time during the week-day to be given to religious instruction in the homes and churches of our land.

4. That we note with decided approval the measures which have been adopted in various sections by which provision is being made by school authorities to enlarge the opportunity of parents

and the churches to give systematic week-day religious instruction to children.

5. That this Federal Council appeals to the churches of America, to all ecclesiastical bodies, to the religious and secular press, to the educational boards of the Church and the State, to private individual institutions, to all fathers and mothers, to all who desire that the children of this land may be brought up in the fear of God and the love of His truth, to exercise their right and responsibility as citizens in promoting the religious instruction of the young.

6. We hereby invite the National Education Association and the Religious Education Association to appoint committees to confer with the committee of this body to be appointed by its Executive Committee, made up of at least one member from each of the constituent bodies of this Council, for the full consideration of ways and means to promote week-day religious instruction; the committee of this Council to report to the Executive Committee, and at the next meeting of the Federal Council.

Date Due

Mr 21 '38			
Mr 22 '38			
[redacted]