

citizenship, not merely from books but by actual experience. As outlined in the local press Mr. Cooley's excellent plan of civic education—

contemplates the election of a national house of representatives from the grammar schools, considered as separate States, and the election of senators from the high schools. Each elementary school will send one representative to the national congress, and each high school will send several senators—one or two from each year's class—to the higher branch of the mock national government. The project first contemplates the organization of the national government, and if this miniature United States is found strong enough to hold together without insurrections or political disturbances, the State and city governments will be formed in much the same way. The president and all officers of the different branches of government will be elected by the Australian ballot system, and in every detail the machinery of the national government will be copied. Young women not only will be given the right to vote, but also will carry such titles as "senator," "congressman," and "alderman." The little government will be founded upon the principles of coeducation and equal suffrage. The meetings of the different legislative bodies will not interfere with the regular school work, and enfranchisement as well as participation in the affairs of the governments will be voluntary. The conventions, congress, councils and the State legislature will meet in school halls after school hours on Fridays, as often as is determined advisable. The plan will be brought to the attention of the high school teachers at their next meeting.

Prof. George Baker, of Harvard, puts his finger upon the educational disease when he deplures, as a result too common in college training, the graduation of young men with minds "like a desk with pigeon holes." This is not usually the fault of the student. It is the fault of a scholastic system which mistakes tutoring for education.

In one of the newspaper comments on Prof. Baker's observation, it is said that the "pigeon hole mind" is not peculiar to the college graduate, but is "common to all of us in an age of voluminous literature and of manifold interests and activities." In elaboration of that thought the comment continues:

We take a lot of magazines and newspapers, instead of one or two good maga-

zines and newspapers, and we are surfeited with books on a wide range of subjects. We therefore read none of them thoroughly, and we find we have assimilated nothing. We want to take everything in sight. We scatter. What is needed is more thoroughness and concentration.

That view will not commend itself upon reflection. While every man ought to be concentrated and thorough on some subject or part of a subject, he ought not to lock up his mind in one pigeon hole.

Diffusion of reading, observation and study is a good thing if assimilated; and assimilation depends not so much upon thoroughness, in the sense of completeness, as upon a disposition and ability to relate miscellaneous facts to unifying principles. Every new fact intelligently related, counts for progress in the educative process, no matter what afterwards becomes of the fact. But accumulations of miscellaneous facts upon miscellaneous strings of theory, untested by the original thought of the student, only lumber up the memory and make chattering parrots of beings who might be thoughtful men, no matter how many magazines or newspapers they read nor how wide or superficial the range of subjects they explore.

The greatest lack among college students is lack of that intellectual independence the possession of which tends to make a man, and the lack of which tends to make a parrot; and this lack is no more peculiar to students than to professors and business and professional men. It is a phase of the socialistic trend of the time, one of the phenomena of a state of society in which individuality is tabooed and solidarity is deified. The student who takes his principles from the professor, is like the professor who yields his own perceptions to the standard of his cult, or the preacher who yields his own message to the creed of his sect, or the citizen who yields his own political conscience to the demands of his party boss.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION.

Several weeks ago we criticised a speech of Archbishop Quigley, of Chicago (p. 595), in which he had advocated a division of public school funds. For this we are criticised in turn.

The part of Archbishop Quigley's speech to which we excepted was reported in the press as follows:

The State must provide schools for the minority as well as for the majority. The State should divide the public school system and maintain a separate system for the minority—separate in the sense of religious teaching. The two systems could be under one control, but in the Catholic division Catholic principles should be taught. This would give the minority an equal chance with the majority. This would be just and equitable, but not satisfactory to the Protestants. The cry all over is for non-sectarian education. The Catholic schools are recognized by the State, but they are not supported by the State because non-Catholics believe that it would be dangerous for the State to support them.

In our criticism of this pronouncement, we said:

We can conceive of nothing better calculated than this to revive in the United States the almost obsolete hatred once vigorously entertained by non-Catholics for Catholics. Moreover, the demand is utterly indefensible from any point of view but that of medieval European ecclesiasticism. The only defense of the public school system is that the State should provide opportunities for secular education, in order that all may have the ordinary educational benefits. Religious education is another matter. If the public school officials try to proselyte Catholic children through unfair teachers or unfair books, that is good ground of complaint. Any fair-minded non-Catholic will acknowledge it as such, and will volunteer his influence to correct the wrong—provided he is not thereby placed in a false position by demands of Catholic dignitaries for public money for church uses. But religious teaching is wholly a private matter. To make it a public matter with reference to one kind of religious teaching would make it so with reference to all kinds. Consequently if one division of the public school system were given over to Catholic teaching it could be logically insisted that the other should be divided up into sub-divisions of Presbyterians, Episcopallians, Methodists, Baptists,

Disciples, Christian Scientists and the rest, and also agnostics and atheists.

It is for that criticism that our critic, William L. Steele, of Wilkensburg, Pa., calls us considerably to account. He writes:

It may be that the Archbishop's remarks are "calculated" to revive in the United States "the almost obsolete hatred once vigorously entertained by non-Catholics for Catholics;" but if so, so much the worse for the non-Catholics. Like all other questions concerning the public welfare, the school question is open to discussion. Our public school system, highly successful as it has been (so far as it goes), is not so sacrosanct that hatred for Catholics need be stirred up because Catholics here and there are honest enough to express dissatisfaction with it. As American citizens that is their right.

The Catholic finds this indictment against the public schools: They are insufficient for the complete education of the Christian man or woman. Education should deal with the whole man—not merely sharpen his wits. It should regulate his emotions, call forth his higher nature. To neglect the spirit is to leave him an animal—and an educated animal is a dangerous animal.

The Catholic is therefore moved by his conscience to maintain schools in which the child is taught of his eternal destiny, where he may never lose sight of the fact that the life in this world is but a preparation for a higher life in the world beyond. In short, the Catholic school is based upon the most ambitious of ideals—its object is to educate the Christian man and the Christian woman. Whatever the shortcomings of the Catholic schools, their aim is nothing short of the highest.

Under existing conditions Catholics are forced to maintain their own schools and in addition are obliged to pay taxes for the maintenance of the public schools. This is a serious hardship and good ground for complaint. The large majority of Catholics are poor, or at least people of moderate means.

Whatever Archbishop Quigley's personal views may be, I do not understand it to be the position of the Catholics of America that they are demanding government aid for their schools. Not at all. They merely would like to be let alone. They would like to be permitted to cease paying taxes in support of a school system under which they do not wish to place their children. They are willing to submit their schools to government supervision and examination as a guaranty of good faith that they will maintain as high a standard and, if they can, a higher standard than is maintained in the public schools.

Let us not talk of sectarian hatred. As surely as the Christian religion makes true progress, the spirit of bigotry is doomed. This is a matter that concerns the deepest welfare of the nation. If there is any hope for our democratic institutions it lies in the spirit of Christ, the spirit of love.

Let us not be too well satisfied with our existing methods of education. There is complaint of the godlessness of our present system not only from Catholics, but also from prominent Protestant educators, if the daily press is to be believed. What if the sects should follow the leadership of the Catholic church and demand their share of religious instruction? Who can reasonably object if they are willing to pay for it as the Catholics have been and are? Is our present system a fetish that it must be jealously guarded?

What have we to show for our public school system in the way of results? Is The Public proud of our national course of imperialism? I know it is not. Is it proud of our private greed? our thirst for money, for luxury, our extravagance, our towering selfishness? I know it is not. What are all these things but phases of a terrific blight of materialism—the worship of earth and earthliness with God left out. Is our public school system a force opposed to this materialistic spirit? By its very nature it is not. God and the soul are left out of it.

All it has to show can be expressed fairly well by the averages at the head of an examination paper. We are an intellectual people. We have a wonderful command of scientific data, we have harnessed nearly all the forces of nature; we can read and write and cipher; but is there nothing more?

Would a religious education—and by that I mean an education of the whole man—have brought forth the armies of eager young men who are carrying the American flag to places where it never belonged and defying older and wiser men to haul it down? Are our teachers selected for their moral fitness, for their love of teaching, for their enthusiasm, for their joy in the highest of vocations?—or are they not rather chosen because of a set of well written papers prepared for the county superintendent? Too many of them are young women, who teach for a few years merely as a makeshift, intending to marry later on. Teaching is a vocation. The teacher should be as truly called of God as is he who preaches. The education of the child is far more than a question of averages and per cents. Let the American people, not Protestants or Catholics, but the whole people, look to it.

We are not so sure as our critic that bigotry is dead or doomed. And for that reason we are not so

sure as he that a revival of the old American hatred for Catholics would be "so much the worse for the non-Catholics" who foster it—in any other sense than that the martyr has the best of it in his martyrdom. It is very far from our wish that such a revival occur under any circumstances. Intolerance of adverse opinion is most detestable, but the sad fact is that such intolerance is always on tap. That is the fact to which we alluded; and we repeat that we can think of nothing better calculated to arouse anti-Catholic prejudice, with almost unexampled virulence, than an authoritative movement on the part of the Catholic church to secure control, as Archbishop Quigley proposes, of a department of the public school system.

It is quite true, as our correspondent asserts, that, "like all other questions concerning the public welfare, the school question is open to discussion." That is, it ought to be. It is also true, as he asserts, that hatred for Catholics ought not to be stirred up because they express dissatisfaction with that system. But other things are just as true. It is as true that expressions of dissatisfaction which are coupled with a demand that part of the public school system be placed under the control of the Catholic church do stir up precisely that hatred which our critic assumes to be dead. It seems to us to be important to warn the medievalists among our Catholic fellow citizens—a proper distinction, since American Catholics generally are by no means in sympathy with Archbishop Quigley's demands—that the enemy they suppose to be dead is only asleep, and that they will certainly arouse him if they seriously attempt to give vitality to such demands.

As to the merits of the Archbishop's proposition, it has none.

We concede our critic's contention that education should deal with the whole man—with the spirit as well as with the intellect. But it by no means follows that both should be dealt with by the same educational authorities. Neither does it follow that religious organizations should be supplied with common funds out

of the public treasury for teaching their own particular views of spiritual truth.

Our critic urges that nothing is asked from the common fund for Catholic schools but a return of taxes which Catholics, notwithstanding that they maintain schools of their own, are obliged to pay for public schools. All they ask, he says, is "to be let alone," "to be permitted to cease paying taxes in support of a school system under which they do not wish to place their children." That is certainly a reasonable argument, whether conclusive or not, against any public school system at all. Men may fairly object to paying taxes for the support of an institution from which they derive no benefits. But it is really no argument for collecting taxes for educational purposes and then distributing them among religious organizations. And being no argument for such a general distribution, it is none for a particular appropriation for particular religious organizations.

Of those pernicious tendencies which our critic ascribes to the public school system—imperialism, selfishness, sordidness, commercialism, materialism—we confess that we are no more proud than he. But how much better than the public schools in those respects have the religious schools proved to be?

Many men of all religious denominations have risen superior to those tendencies, but in which direction has the influence of the organizations themselves gone?

It may be that the graduates of Catholic parochial schools have been notable for resisting those tendencies, but if they have been the fact has not come to our attention. On the contrary, it has seemed to us that the churches and Sunday schools, and religious colleges of every religious connection, have contributed their full quota to the armies of greed and oppression.

The question which Archbishop Quigley has raised is not at bottom merely a Catholic question. Nor are he and his church alone responsible for it. Other forms of religion are equally insistent upon utilizing public school funds for propagating their religious views.

Nebraska furnishes a case in point. Public school authorities in that State, stimulated by Protestant influences, forced the reading of the Bible upon pupils, not as a secular study, but as an act of religious worship. But the Supreme Court of Nebraska has interfered. Although the reading of the Bible in the Nebraska schools is now permitted, its reading in such manner as to be worship or a religious exercise is properly forbidden.

The same question has been raised in Kansas and is soon to be passed upon by the Supreme Court of that State. In the Kansas case it appears that the daily reading of the Bible in the schools of Topeka, as part of the general school exercises, was petitioned for by the Ministerial Union, an organization of Protestant clergymen. They asked that the board of education make "the reading of a portion of the Bible and the repetition of the Lord's Prayer obligatory as part of the opening exercises in all the public schools" of Topeka; and they were particular to specify that it was as an act of religious worship that they wished this done. "We are not now asking for the reading of the Bible in our public schools as a feature of general literary instruction," they said; but "we are now asking for the daily reading of the Scriptures in the schools for their moral and religious influence." The petition was granted and the regular reading of the Bible and recital of the Lord's Prayer were adopted for the Topeka schools as religious features of the general opening exercises of the schools. One of the pupils—acting under instructions from his father, a taxpayer who opposed the introduction of religious exercises into the public schools—refused to participate in these exercises, but quietly pursued his studies instead. He was consequently suspended by the principal for having "refused to obey the order of the Board of Education of this city, namely, that all pupils shall refrain from study and be in order, subject to the direction of the teacher, during all general exercises." This order of suspension, approved by the Board of Education, was so drawn as to seem to eliminate the basis for religious

controversy, and some of the testimony given in court for the Board was similarly evasive. But it was clearly proved that the exercise was intended as an act of religious worship and that the only offense of the suspended pupil was his passive refusal to participate therein. So the issue is now squarely before the Kansas court. It is the same issue as that which the Nebraska courts have decided against the ecclesiastical theory of public school management; and however the Kansas court may decide upon the law of Kansas, there seems to us no reason to doubt that upon grounds of public policy the law ought to be as the Nebraska courts holds it to be in that State.

If one would know the dangerous reactionary tendency of intrusions of ecclesiasticism into non-ecclesiastical matters, he has only to turn to the history of the Centrist party of Germany. It originated in a just protest against proscription of Catholics by the government, and made its appeal to the people of Germany as a democratic party demanding general suffrage. But now that it has gained popular strength it puts ecclesiasticism to the fore. Turning against its former democratic ideals, it is bartering its influence to the government for concessions to ecclesiasticism; and there is no difficulty in seeing that the concessions most often demanded are grants to the Catholic clergy of greater and greater authority in the educational regime of the country.

This is not a Catholic tendency peculiarly, nor a religious tendency at all. But it is peculiarly an ecclesiastical tendency. Though "the spirit of Christ is the spirit of love," as our critic reminds us, the spirit of ecclesiasticism is not. Be its type what it may, from oldest pagan to latest Christian, the ecclesiastical spirit is the spirit of power and persecution.

Should the Kansas court decide in favor of the suspended pupil in the Topeka case noted above, we can easily imagine the Ministerial Union of Topeka as joining in those complaints of Protestants and Catholics alike (to which our critic refers) of "the godlessness" of our public school system. But

how absurd. To call public schools godless because they are not opened with Bible reading and prayer, is like calling a blacksmith shop godless for the same reason.

Nothing useful is godless. It may be churchless; but it is not godless. The blacksmith who does his work conscientiously is worshiping. So is the school boy who pursues his secular studies conscientiously. To insist upon intermingling these duties with forms of church worship on the theory that only the latter are religious, is to reveal a very paganistic idea of religion.

While we agree cordially with our critic that a religious education should mean the education of the whole man—his moral and religious as well as his intellectual side, and for argument's sake will assume with him that religion and ecclesiasticism are one—nevertheless, it does not seem necessary to us that both sides of the man must be educated in the same schoolroom, or by the same teacher, or under the direction of the same educational authorities. The whole man should be clothed as well as educated; but who would therefore insist upon his getting his hat at the shoemaker's?

The truth about this educational controversy is simple enough. A secular education is at least part of the mental equipment which every person should have. It is the object of the public school system to provide this. Beyond that the public schools cannot safely go. Ecclesiastical instruction must come from ecclesiastical sources. The state cannot meddle or permit meddling here without promoting a reunion of church and state, and that would invite conditions the return of which could not be contemplated with satisfaction.

As to the essentials of moral and religious training, this never depends upon the inculcation of pious precepts. Even in the public schools under purely secular administration, moral and religious training can and do naturally proceed along with secular training—not by rote, but through the human association with teachers and fellow pupils. It is quite within the province of public school teachers, for exam-

ple, to teach the golden rule and live by it, without so much as even quoting it. The same is true of the first great commandment: "Love thy neighbor as thyself." To the principle of justice expressed in these two formulas no one objects; and the child that learns to love and live by that principle will grow up to be a good citizen though he never hears of a future state of reward and punishment.

Is it replied that the public school system does not require this instruction and that teachers do not give it, and consequently that an ecclesiastical system must be added? The all-sufficient answer is that of experience. The graduate of ecclesiastical institutions of whatever affiliation does not appear to be any more familiar with the vital principle of justice—love for his fellow men,—nor anymore devoted in the performance of his functions as a citizen, than is the product of our "godless" public school system. If, then, secular teachers do not inculcate the essential principles of justice, there is no reason to expect better things from ecclesiasticising the schools. Just as certainly as education of the intellect alone does not foster true spiritual growth or valuable civic qualities, just so certain is it that they would not be fostered merely by the addition of ecclesiastical tutoring.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

WASHINGTON.

Washington, D. C., March 19, 1904.—The post office appropriation bill has held sway in the House during the entire week. Under general debate there were two or three speeches delivered for campaign purposes, the others were all germane to the bill. While there has been no such display of feeling as marked the closing scenes last week during the discussion of the "Hay" resolution to investigate the post office department, yet the hostility which is felt on both sides towards the Department has been evidenced on several occasions.

The investigating committee of seven appointed by the Speaker under the McCall resolution is perhaps as good a committee as could be expected. Of the Republican members McCall, the chairman, and Burton have some reputation for party independence; while of the minority Judge Bartlett, of Georgia, has a deserved reputation as a forcible, fearless and aggressive antagonist of "graft." As he combines with these qual-

ities quickness of perception and length of service he ought to be as successful in getting at the real facts as the scope of the resolution will permit.

The post office appropriation bill discloses the usual liberality in the dealings of the post office department with the railroads, a liberality which has forced the people to pay millions of dollars each year in excess of the real cost, to the railroads, of the service they furnish, the appropriations for "inland transportation by railroad routes" appropriated by the bill being \$40,000,000. As in the past, the old cry, "we must economize," is raised when it comes to the compensation for the great mass of the postal employees. It is true that the bill carries an increase of the pay of the rural free delivery carriers of from \$600 to \$720 per annum, but as from \$250 to \$300 of this represents the cost of purchase and maintenance of horses, wagons, sleighs and harness, and for repairs, even the \$720, means that these men will receive only from \$400 to \$450 a year for delivering and collecting the mail 300 days in the year over routes from 25 to 30 miles long, their net income heretofore probably averaging about \$300, and this during these much vaunted "prosperity" times. It's the old policy so popular where the interests of special privilege corporations (which have passes and other valuable favors to grant) are concerned, of opening the barrel at the "bung" for the railroads and closing it at the "spigot" for the carriers and clerks.

In this connection it is interesting to note a pamphlet charging Congressman Babcock, of Wisconsin—for several years now the chairman of the Republican Congressional committee—with "stuffing the mails," by sending into his Congressional district, during March, April and May of last year, tons upon tons of all kinds of books and public documents, mostly useless and many obsolete, there being hundreds of volumes of reports of the centennial exhibition at Philadelphia, of the first Paris exposition, and reports on the foreign relations of the United States during the administration of President Arthur. It is claimed and the facts are set forth with great particularity of detail, accompanied by affidavits of the contractors who hauled this perfect flood of printed matter to the local post offices, that in one city alone—Baraboo—Babcock sent eight to ten tons to one of his appointees alone. As this period coincides with the exact period when for three months—once in every four years—all of the mail carried by the railroads within that district was weighed and is made the basis for payments to them for the entire four-year period, it will be seen how good a friend Mr. Babcock was to the railroads traversing that postal division. Taken in further connection with the fact that as chairman of the committee on the District of Columbia, in the last Congress, he made a strenuous and successful fight for a bill which practically gave the rail-