

THE Presbyterian Quarterly.

NO. 44.—APRIL, 1898.

I. THE NEW PNEUMATOLOGY.

The genetic principle of the New Theology, the dynamic force with which it reconstructs the Old and organizes the New, is the *Immanence of God*.

Immanence and Transcendence are philosophical antitheses. Immanence (*immaneo*) literally means to remain in, indwelling, inhabiting, while Transcendence (*transcendeo*) literally means to go beyond, surpass, stand above, be superior to. An immanent soul is an embodied soul, an incarnated spirit, such as are all living men; a transcendent soul is one which has gone beyond the material organism, a disembodied soul. An immanent God is a world-embodied God, an intramundane God; a transcendent God is one which stands above the world and is superior to it and in no sense a part of it, an extramundane God. The life of an immanent God is an outflow; the life of a transcendent God is an inflow. An immanent God evolves; a transcendent God creates. An immanent God is natural; a transcendent God is supernatural. An immanent God operates *ad intra*; a transcendent God acts *ad extra*. An immanent God is related to the world as the Three Persons in the Godhead are related to each other; a transcendent God is related to the world in an extramundane and supersensible manner. Paternity, filiation, spiration, within the circle of the Godhead, are immanent and intrasitive acts; creation, providence, miracles, redemption are transcendent

V. THE RELIGIOUS ELEMENT IN EDUCATION— PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS.

Education, though it involves the implantation of certain facts and principles, pertains mainly to the development of the powers of the mind. In its broadest sense, education includes within its scope the body as well as the soul. But the development of the faculties of the soul being more difficult and important than the training of the physical powers, the term education has come to be used ordinarily with reference to the mental and moral nature of man.

If education be the development of the faculties of the soul, it is plain that unless the whole of these faculties is brought under its influence, the result will be a one-sided or maimed soul. The defect of ordinary educational schemes is the neglect of the moral as distinguished from the merely intellectual faculties. The study of the secular branches cultivates the intellectual but not, to any considerable degree, the moral faculties; the study of religion, and by that we mean Christianity, develops both.

If this be true, there can be no symmetrical education without the teaching of God's Word. To educate a people in secular branches only, is to leave a part of their nature undeveloped, and this is their better part, the part by which they know God, and apprehend moral truths. Man's moral nature is that which determines his character for good or evil. The leaving of the moral element out of education, is based upon a false conception of the state of the soul by birth. If the soul is born pure, it needs only exercise, on almost any line, to develop its powers: but in fact the soul is born corrupt. So it needs not development only; it must have implanted within it a new principle and be turned away from its natural bent towards righteousness and God.

M. Levasseur, member of the Institute of France, in a paper

on "Popular Education Among Civilized Nations," says: "There can be no question that the results have sometimes failed to justify the hopes that enthusiasm had engendered. The founding of the school has not dispensed with the prison, for criminality has numerous causes, both individual and social, that cannot be overcome by teaching children to read and write. The advancement of material well-being is not indissolubly joined, nor is it necessarily proportionate to the progress of education. It is even true that people may desire to feed upon debasing literature, as the success of more than one periodical and more than one French novel will testify."

Levasseur writes again: "To abstain from speaking to children, of God, of worship and of duty, under pretext of not wishing to interfere with their liberty of conscience, is not to be truly impartial, because such restraint will allow the tendency to indifference to implant itself in the soul."

The Rev. R. L. Dabney, D. D., lately deceased, said last year: "I wish that we could have a system of parochial schools as universal as Knox. If something effective is not done, both religion and civilization will be corrupted."

In the gigantic system of public education now being conducted in America with so much ability, and such vast expenditure of money, what is being done to educate man's moral nature? Almost nothing. Even the reading of a passage from the Bible is rapidly disappearing from the daily exercises of the public school. The great majority of the youth of the nation get no other education than that afforded by the public schools. The nation is trying an experiment fraught with momentous consequences, of educating its children in secular learning, to the neglect or exclusion of the moral. We are training the intellect, without the heart, and conscience.

May Christianity be taught in the public schools? The question has received its answer—No; and this is the logical result of the State undertaking the great work of education. Our government is pledged to entire separation from religion.

During many ages one of the greatest questions among men has been—"What is the best form of civil government?" And each country answers this question for itself. An equally important but much less studied question is—"What is the proper province of civil government?" In some countries and periods the province of government seems to have included the entire life and business of man. Under a paternal system, government is supposed to take care of everything and everybody. The tendency of modern progress has been to repudiate this idea, and the province of civil government has been much curtailed. In America, religion has been properly stricken out of it. Government still has too much to do with business, and in the State claims education as a part of its province. It will be strange if men do not learn by experience that, as it is a mistake for civil government to interfere in religion, so also it is a mistake for it to undertake education.

The best governed people are those who are little but wisely governed. Men should be left to work out their own welfare, and simply be protected in their rights. The State can only protect men in their religion as it does in their business. The State can have no direct agency in religion. Properly, civil government, as we understand it in this republic, is mainly for the protection of the rights of persons and the rights of things, and the doing for the people of such things as they cannot do for themselves. The intrusion of government into the private business of citizens, is always paralyzing and usually corrupting. Does the practical assumption of the duty of educating youth, as exemplified in our public schools, promise an un-mixed blessing to the nation? No; rather it tends to the development of an irreligious people.

This leads to the inference that whatever may be said of the State lending aid to education, it ought not to assume control of it. The logic of the situation is unavoidable. The State being the creature of people of all creeds, can adopt no particular creed, can authorize no positive religious teaching whatsoever. Therefore the State cannot give a complete or

symmetrical development of the soul; can give only a one-sided education. This raises the question—If the State can give only a one-sided education, ought it to give any?

Behind this question lies another—Is it expedient to educate the intellectual powers without the moral? Is it an advantage to the individual himself, or to the nation, to give a man secular learning, and intellectual skill, without awakening and instructing his conscience? The answer must be no—if we believe that man is born with a sinful nature. In other words, to give a man a godless education only makes him more powerful for evil. It is putting a rifle in the hands of a wild Indian and teaching him to use it, before he has become civilized and moral.

As to the supreme importance of religion as a part of education, there can be no debate among wise men. Daniel Webster said: "In what age, by what sect, where, when, by whom, has religious truth been excluded from the education of youth? Nowhere. Never! Everywhere, at all times, it has been regarded as essential. It is of the essence, the vitality of useful instruction." These words were uttered in Mr. Webster's famous speech in the Girard will case of Philadelphia.

Prof. John B. Minor, LL. D., of the University of Virginia, says: "It must be acknowledged to be one of the most remarkable phenomena of our perverted humanity, that among a Christian people, and in a Protestant land, such a discussion" (whether the education of youth may not be secularized) "should not seem as absurd as to enquire whether school rooms should be located under water or in darksome caverns. The Jew, the Mohammedan, the follower of Confucius and of Budha, each and all are careful to instruct the youth of their people in the tenets of the religion they profess. Whence comes it that Christians are so indifferent to a duty so obvious, and so obviously recognized by Jew and Pagan?"

Governor Rice of Massachusetts, at a public anniversary, lifted up a warning voice against "the inadequacy and perils of our modern system of one-sided education, which supposes

it could develop manhood and good citizenship out of mere brain culture."

But it may be said that the family and the church are responsible for the religious training of the young: let them instruct the children in morality. Well, so be it. This is just where the responsibility should lie. But has not the State by her public school system rendered it almost impossible for the parents to discharge this responsibility to the young? Can a sufficiency of religious instruction be given children by the church in one hour of Sunday school teaching on Sunday morning? Can children get any systematic religious education in this way? No; the parents must do the greater part of the work of religious instruction. But what opportunity have the parents for this undertaking when their children must attend school all day, and study their lessons at night? Because parents have neither time nor, as a rule, ability to educate their children, they turn them over to those appointed for the purpose, and who thereby become the agents of the parents, the parents transferring to the teachers, for the time, a part of their authority, to be recalled if improperly exercised. Now when the parent commits his child to an agent to educate, shall he have an understanding with this agent that he is to educate only one class of faculties in the child? The parent by sending the child out of his house for education, has made it difficult for himself—the parent—to give systematic instruction in anything—including even religion. Therefore it amounts to this, the child shall have no systematic moral development. His head shall be educated, but not his heart; his mind, but not his conscience. He shall be trained imperfectly for this world, and not at all for the next. This is the practical result of the State school system of education.

The plan has now been in operation long enough for its fruits to appear. What can be said of the moral condition of the people of the United States? Is it improving? Is there a higher tone of public opinion? Is there more loyalty to

truth, more reverence for law, more honesty and virtue? Every thoughtful observer must answer—No; not more of these best elements of human character, but less, much less. We are distinctly on a down grade, driving forward, we know not whither. And this in spite of the fact that there has never been so much activity in Church work among all classes. What is the reason? It seems to be in considerable part, because for five or six days in the week, the rising generation are under the influence of purely secular training, and for one hour or two on Sunday only, they are subject to religious instruction. It is impossible, under these conditions, to secure a systematic moral training, and a symmetrical development of the powers of the soul. This is the fact with reference to those children who attend Sunday schools, but what shall be said of that vast body of youth who are not Sunday school scholars? They get practically no religious instruction whatsoever. We hear a great deal said about the parochial schools of the Roman Church. But is not that Church wiser than we? Indeed, it is better for a child to be trained up a devout Roman Catholic than an infidel or a sceptic.

What shall be done about it? Shall the State be made to teach religion? No; this is impossible and undesirable.

The parents must undertake the education of the young. The State is a voluntary human institution, recognized indeed of God, but the Church and family are his own direct creations. Parents hold the responsibility under God for the training of the young. We must have schools undertaken and carried on by churchmen—that is by Christian parents who are God's trustees for children; but it must be as Christian parents, and members of the Church of God, and the religious instruction of these schools must be under church direction. The church has a right to require her members to educate their children in secular and sacred branches of learning, and it has a right to superintend the religious instruction of the young in the school as it has in the family.

In this matter the Roman Catholic Church shows consum-

mate wisdom in keeping its children in her parochial schools, and it would be impossible for that church to live long without such a means of inculcating its doctrines in the minds of rising generations. The public schools would soon educate Catholic children away from the church if they were allowed to attend them.

The Lutherans also have been wise in recognizing the importance of Church schools. The Rev. C. J. Oelschlaeger, D. D., pastor of Bethlehem Evangelical Lutheran Church, of Richmond, who has a parochial school in connection with his church, tells me that "the Evangelical Lutheran Church has a system of church schools fully as well developed as that of the Catholic Church," and furnishes the statistics "one Synod of the Southern Church, the so-called Synod of Missouri, for 1896. Communicant members, 380,006. Parochial schools, 1,527; Parochial school teachers, 1,586; Parochial school scholars, 87,908." This surely is a very handsome exhibit. In these schools, in addition to the secular branches, the Bible, the Church catechism and Church history, are regularly taught. Why cannot we Presbyterians emulate the example of our Lutheran brethren, who are so much like ourselves in polity and doctrine?

In Canada we may learn something from the experiments there being tried on several lines. In the province of New Brunswick there is a public school system, and by law, religious instruction is excluded from the curriculum. In the Protestant province of Ontario the Protestant public schools are without religious instruction. This is said to have come about as an effect of denominational jealousies. The teachers are forbidden to read any except certain passages from the Bible, selected by the general school authorities, and are not allowed to make any comments. They are also required to read very indefinite and unsatisfactory forms of prayer at the opening and closing of each day's exercises. The Catholics have a portion of the school funds and control their schools absolutely, giving the children a thorough indoctrination in the tenets of the church.

In Ontario there is a system of Episcopal Church schools culminating in Trinity University of Toronto. The schools are modeled after English Church schools and give thorough religious instruction. In the elementary stage of education the schools have not been established in all communities, but their numbers are growing, and the Episcopal schools of Ontario are acknowledged by eminent Presbyterians to be giving the best results of all the schools in the province.

In the province of Quebec there is a division of the school funds. The Protestants here are in the minority, and they have their own schools with a complete religious curriculum, under the direction of a Protestant Board of Commissioners.

In Manitoba the Protestants are in the majority, and there are no separate public schools. But the priests are allowed at certain hours to come in and give religious instruction. An eminent Canadian Presbyterian declares that in the Catholic province of Quebec the backbone of the Roman Church is the Catholic schools, supported as they are by public funds. It so happens there that the Protestants, though a minority, pay the greater part of the taxes, and the funds being distributed by the per capita of the children, the Roman Catholics get the larger portion of the money. A Presbyterian minister of the province of Quebec speaking this said to me, that he did not object to this. It was far better for children to have a Roman Catholic training than to get no religious instruction of any kind. Better to be Romish than infidel.

It is plain that the logical result of the State undertaking to educate the young is that religion shall be eliminated altogether from the schools. It takes time to reach this result but it is certain to come at last. Therefore I argue the State has no business to undertake education, for the evident reason that it cannot give the young a complete education of their whole nature. The whole system is wrong, and it is time that the Church and parents awoke to their responsibility for the proper education of children.

The Christian people of the United States have long since

begun to supply their youth with religious education in connection with their secular training. There are Church colleges scattered over all the land, and they are doing a vast work, not only, but the best work that is being done, to make good men and women. The great number of these institutions, and the host of students on their rolls, show that there is a demand for colleges in which Christian influences are paramount.

Notwithstanding the great influence given by civil authorities, and the vast sums expended out of the public taxes, upon State institutions, two-thirds of the graduates of the nation are from Church and independent colleges. It is plain that a very large proportion of the best people of the land are not satisfied to have their youth educated without positive religious instruction, at least during the years immediately preceding graduation.

It may also be stated that the greatest institutions of America are not as a rule State Universities; witness—Harvard, Yale, Cornell, Columbia, Princeton, Johns Hopkins, Vanderbilt, Leland Stanford, Chicago, Brown, and Amherst. The subsidizing of a University by the State prevents its receiving large bequests, and also brings the University into politics. So in point of fact few State Universities attain greatness.

Through the personal kindness of Hon. W. T. Harris, U. S. Commissioner of Education, I have secured the following interesting statistics of education in the United States. These are the figures for 1896–1897 for students in universities and colleges for men, and those to which both sexes are admitted, and for schools of technology. They do not include colleges exclusively for women:

Students in Public Institutions.....	27,196
Students in Independent Institutions.....	18,946
Students in Denominational Institutions.....	36,150
<hr/>	
Total number of students.....	82,292

The following are the statistics of colleges for women exclusively :

Students in Public Institutions.....	458
Students in Independent Institutions.....	2,921
Students in Church Institutions.....	4,959

These figures show that in male colleges the church is doing a third more than the State, and in female colleges ten times as much.

In the Church colleges religion is taught of course, and that is the case also in many independent colleges that have no connection with either Church or State. Washington and Lee University is a notable example of this class, so also is Hampden-Sidney College, which is classed as non-sectarian or independent, in the National Educational Reports.

All this shows that twice as much is being done for higher education by church and independent institutions as is being done by the State. But when we come to the lower branches of education, and look at the elementary schools, we find that though there are numerous independent private schools, the State is doing the great mass of this work, and the Church (except the Roman Catholic) comparatively little. The Church has failed to appreciate the importance of religious training in elementary schools. The unwisdom of this is manifest from the fact that it is while children are in their elementary studies they are most easily impressed with religious truth.

The whole number of pupils in the public elementary schools of the United States in 1897, was 13,998,585.

In private elementary schools there were 1,334,800 pupils. I have not been able to get the denominational elementary schools, but the following are the reports for high schools, academies, and seminaries not connected with the State :

Denomination.	Schools.	Teachers.	Pupils.
Non-Sectarian	1,182	4,605	57,385
Roman Catholic.....	271	1,237	11,728
Methodist (North and South)....	125	533	8,786
Episcopal.....	119	675	4,895
Baptist.....	115	474	7,294
Presbyterian.....	106	394	4,816
Friends.....	61	292	4,006
Congregational	58	231	2,813
Lutheran.....	33	134	1,989
All other Denominations.....	36	117	2,942
Total.....	2,106	8,752	106,654

The Roman Catholic and the Lutheran are the only churches that have undertaken to have a complete system of elementary church schools. In this they show their wisdom. The most important years in the life of a youth, regarded from a religious standpoint, are from 6 to 16—the period when religious impressions are usually received, if ever. The Roman Church does not greatly encourage higher education, for reasons of its own, but it does keep its hand on its children until they are thoroughly indoctrinated with the teachings of the Church.

The Church should enjoin upon parents the duty of establishing for their children, schools in which the Christian element is dominant, and should superintend the religious instruction given.

A conference of four South Atlantic Synods, four or five years ago, adopted a report, asking each Synod represented to appoint a permanent committee on "Church and Christian Education to excite interest in Christian education; and urging ministers to preach on the subject, also enjoining Presbyteries and Church Sessions to establish primary and preparatory schools in which the Bible should be a text book." This report was adopted by the Synods and the work was undertaken as proposed. In North Carolina collections are taken

up in the churches to aid in establishing schools in poorer and newly evangelized districts. The Synod of North Carolina has a permanent committee of "Church and Christian Education," and has adopted a "Constitution for Parochial Schools" prepared by the committee, and "proposed" it to the churches. It proposes that a school shall be conducted by three trustees appointed by the Session, and also that in addition to secular branches, the Bible and the standards of the church shall be regularly taught. The Synod "has undertaken to establish a day school wherever its missionaries are sent, and such has been the success of Church Extension by means of this adjunct to the preachers' work that it is becoming our fixed policy of universal approval." I quote from a letter from Rev. J. B. Shearer, D. D., chairman of the Synod's committee. Encouraging success has attended these efforts.

The following is the document referred to :

Constitution for Parochial Schools. Approved by the Synod of North Carolina, and Proposed to the Churches.

1. The Presbyterian Church of ——— does undertake to establish a school, to be under Church control as a Christian school.
2. The sole government and administration of the school shall be vested in a Board of Trustees of three members appointed by the session, whose terms of office shall be one, two, and three years, respectively, and the session shall fill vacancies as they recur, electing for three-year terms. Two members shall constitute a quorum.
3. The school shall be limited in its scope and design to primary and preparatory education, male or female, or both.
4. The Bible shall be used as a text book throughout the school in such measure and proportion as the Board may determine, so as to make the school distinctively a Christian school; and the standards of the Church, also, as far as it may be found practicable.
5. The Board shall have power to raise and disburse monies and to hold property in trust in furtherance of this object if necessary.
6. The Board shall, at their discretion, found and develop

the school as rapidly as the means in hand may justify without incurring debt.

7. The Board shall adopt their own by-laws subject to the limitations of this paper, which shall be of the nature of fundamental law to the Board in the execution of their trust.

8. In case it shall ever prove desirable to secure a charter of incorporation, the provisions of this paper shall be incorporated into the charter, or else adopted as a fixed part of the by-laws.

9. This paper, *mutatis mutandis*, is recommended to the Presbyteries for the founding of Presbyterian schools of any grade.

In Columbia, S. C., under the auspices of the Second Presbyterian Church, there is a school conducted successfully by the Session, in which "The Children's Bread," "The Child's Catechism," "The Shorter Catechism," and the Bible are regularly taught. It grew out of a mere class for study. It was formally organized under Mr. T. P. Junkin as principal, with four teachers. It began with forty scholars, and in two years it grew to a membership of 186. It is now flourishing and doing a great work for Christ and the Church. The Session has the right of giving free scholarships to not more than fifty children, the others paying from \$1 to \$4 per month tuition, according to grade.

This shows that the scheme is practicable, and that Presbyterian parents will be willing to pay for the education of their children in a Church school.

No doubt many parents not Presbyterians would send their children to such a school, especially if a high standard of scholarship be maintained. It is an interesting fact that "in the Presbyterian schools of Montreal there are 800 Jewish children, of which number almost none have been excused, by request of their parents, from studying the New Testament."

The success of Roman Catholic and Lutheran schools is proof enough that Presbyterians could establish and maintain parochial schools. The wonder is that we have not undertaken this work long ago.

If we are going to have Christian education in any thorough and effective way, it must be in a system based upon Christian elementary schools; and how this can be accomplished without the agency and indeed initiative of the Church, it is difficult to imagine.

What religious teachings would you have in an elementary parochial school? Answer—the Bible above all things. How can any one be called educated who is not familiar with the greatest of all books? I would have also the catechism of the Church, the history of Christianity, and Christian ethics. I would have attendance upon these studies compulsory, but any pupil might be excused on the written request of his parents. Comparatively few would make any such request, and when they did it would probably be only in the matter of the Church catechism, and possibly Church history.

In reply to those who oppose the teaching of the Shorter Catechism, on the plea that it is not wise nor liberal to have children study what contains so much dogma, I will quote from an address delivered in Edinburgh, January 18, 1898, by Lord Balfour of Burleigh, an elder in the Scottish Kirk. "Religion," said he, "in our Scottish schools has always been a fundamental part of education. What is wanted is Christian education by Christian teachers. We are constantly told that this or that catechism or manual is too advanced for children, and that what was wanted was a simple knowledge of the Bible without dogma. This is a contradiction in terms. You cannot teach the most elementary doctrines of Christianity without dogma. The catechism properly used is of incomparable value. The Lord's prayer even contains dogma."

It has been objected that the interference of the Church in education has not been productive of the best results—instance Russia, and the Roman Catholic countries. The obvious reply is that in these countries the Church has not had the Bible taught the young, but only a mass of mingled truth and error, in which Ritualism and Superstition were the predominant religious elements. In countries where the Church has had

the Bible and Christian truth taught, the results have been most beneficent.

It has also been objected that it is best to educate children in the midst of evil associates, that they may be able to learn how to resist evil. But surely it is wise to keep the young away from evil until their characters are formed, and their minds filled with the truths of God's Word.

The great object of religious teaching is to establish God in the soul, and to develop a new character having the divine stamp upon it. It is not enough to have the law of God occasionally presented to the mind. It must be constantly pressed upon it. What God has revealed of himself should be taught every day, especially during the formative period of youth. Our present method of confining religious teachings practically to one day, or a very small part of one day, per week, makes religion a thing apart from the life and education of a child. He puts it on and off with his Sunday suit, and the natural result is that religion has little or no influence upon conduct.

If we have Christian schools in which the religious elements of instruction are under ecclesiastical control, what should be the attitude of the church towards the State schools and colleges? Answer. It should certainly not be a hostile attitude. On the contrary all good people should endeavor, in all lawful ways to bring religious influences to bear upon them. At the same time, churches have a perfect right to establish schools of their own for the Christian education of youth, neither antagonizing public schools, nor asking any aid from the State.

If any argument were necessary to show the advantage of Church schools in which Christian truth is taught from the beginning, Scotland furnishes an unanswerable one. The most religious of all nations are the Scotch, and no people are more sturdy, and morally robust than they. There can be no doubt but that the great agency through which this has come about is the parish school. Knox in establishing and maintaining parish schools, had the enormous advantage of a State Church, and one including practically the whole population.

We cannot have that, but as a people, we have far greater wealth. Our parents would be willing to pay for having their children educated in schools where religion is dominant. It might be difficult at first, and progress slow, but as the merits of the system became understood and appreciated, endowments would crystalize about Church schools as they do about Church colleges, and they might be made free or nearly so. If one denomination established such schools, others would imitate their example. Well, all the better. Competition would tend to elevate and maintain the standard of education, and if the public schools were absorbed, so be it.

It is objected that the system would tend to intensify the sectarian spirit. This would depend of course largely upon what was taught in the schools. If only the distinctive tenets of a church were taught, of course the results would be sectarian. But if the Bible were the principal text book, and if the great doctrines of God and salvation were magnified, denominational peculiarities might safely be inculcated. But this is to be said, sectarianism comes largely from ignorance. A thorough education in Presbyterian church schools would produce intelligent Presbyterians; no harm in that surely; but they would be too well educated to be narrow and bigoted. The best Christians are not those who have no special regard for any particular church, but rather those who intelligently believe in the church to which they belong. The best citizens are, as a rule, the best churchmen, of whatever evangelical church they are members. The foundation of all permanent national greatness is moral character, and Christianity alone can give this. "Our help is in the Lord who made heaven and earth." "Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God is one Lord: And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might. And these words, which I command thee this day, shall be in thine heart: and thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children." Deut. vi:5-7.

ROBERT P. KERR.

Richmond, Va.