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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

"If you want a man to think deeply and earnestly and with the fear of God upon him, set him thinking about education," advised L. P. Jacks in 1924. "He will soon find out, for example, that religion and education are not two things, but one thing; two only on the surface, but one in the ultimate foundations and the final aim."¹ Jacks' statement serves the purpose of pointing toward a very significant topic in the history of American education, society, and culture: viz., the controversial and constantly changing relationship between religion and public education in the United States of America. Within this general framework of the relationship between religion and public education this descriptive historical study will focus its attention specifically upon the views of American liberal Protestant religious educators, 1940-1974, with respect to studies of religion in public schools.

In the history of American education, the relationship between religion and education is evidenced at numerous points throughout the past 350 years. In colonial America, especially in the New England colonies settled by
the Puritans, the close relationship between religion and education was very evident. The Puritan view of the child—conceived in sin and born in corruption— influenced the child's educational experience, such as that suggested through the sermons of Calvinist clergyman Jonathan Edwards. In order to help their children read and understand the principles of religion, in 1642 the General Court of Massachusetts passed the first school law in colonial America, and in 1647 it passed the Old Deluder Satan Act. The famous *New England Primer* appeared in 1690, combining the basic rudiments of literacy with religious education. In the early part of the nineteenth century, when public schools became popular, religion again constituted an important influence in their operation. Even Horace Mann, one of the most significant figures in the common school movement of the nineteenth century, was confronted with the issue of the relationship between religion and public education. By the end of the nineteenth century, and early in the twentieth century, many aspects of religion had been removed from the public schools—either through strict adherence to Constitutional amendments or through sectarian jealousy.

Now, in the late twentieth century, the concern for the relationship between religion and education is still evident, but the relationship has undergone considerable change. Writing about this change during the 1960's,
Will Herberg, a sociologist of American religion and teacher of religion, said:

It is no longer taken for granted that religion has no place in the serious business of educating the nation; on the contrary, the tide would seem to be running all the other way. The concern now is to bring back religion to some sort of significant relation with education, and this concern is felt in varying degrees by professional educators and the lay public, by those involved in government schools as well as by those working in independent institutions, by those responsible for elementary and secondary education as well as by those engaged in college and university education. 3

This change in the relationship between religion and education, say Herberg, "... makes it possible at least to try to reestablish some bond between the total educational enterprise and the deeper levels of human life and thought." 4 Yet even Herberg acknowledges some difficulties with the bond between religion and education in the twentieth century: "The very resurgence of religious interest in education has brought with it certain new and pressing problems with which educator, religious leader, and concerned laymen will have to cope in the coming period." 5

Another writer of religion in American life in the early 1960's helps to summarize the concern during the mid-twentieth century about the changing nature of the relationship between religion and public education in America:

Despite the theoretical separation of church and state in America, there have been many points at which the two inevitably impinge upon each other. The place of religion in education has been an especially acute problem ever since the state assumed responsibility for the primary and
secondary schooling of all children. The last twenty years have seen a renewed demand, from many quarters, for inclusion of religious elements in the educational process, whether through parochial schools, "released time" arrangements, or some type of nonsectarian religious instruction in the public schools. This has given rise to a spirited discussion and a series of important Supreme Court decisions.6

With these background statements in mind, concerning the controversial and constantly changing relationship between religion and public education in the history of American education, and with their call for our own concern about religion and public education, and in view of even more recent concerns during mid-1975 about religion and public education,7 let us turn now to the present study and its specific focus upon one aspect of the historic relationships between religion and public education in America.

The main purpose of this descriptive historical study will be to discover and analyze the positions taken by American liberal Protestant religious educators concerning studies of religion in public schools from 1940-1974. One major objective of the study will be to discover these views of religious educators as expressed through various primary, secondary, and tertiary sources, and assemble these views for careful evaluation. A second major objective of the study will be to analyze the various positions taken by these religious educators, with respect to studies of religion in public schools, and to interpret these views according to their historical contexts and relationships.
A third major objective will be to determine whether or not the various views of these religious educators, covering this thirty-five-year period, could be clustered together into four or five major types of viewpoints. A fourth major objective will be to gather documents, statements, resources, and materials pertinent to the contemporary situation in studies of religion in American public education, to be used as a sourcebook of reference and information.

Assumptions of this study will include the following: (1) That American liberal Protestant religious educators, 1940-1974, took several varied positions regarding studies of religion in public schools; (2) That these several varied positions were expressed primarily in professional journals of religious education and religion, through monographs related to this subject, and in position papers and policy statements by leading religious associations and professional organizations; (3) That the religious and theological developments of this time period influenced the views of religious educators with respect to studies of religion in public schools; and (4) That several United States Supreme Court decisions during the period 1940-1974 significantly influenced the views of religious educators with respect to studies of religion in public schools, as well as having a direct role in influencing actual practices regarding religion in American public education.
The scope of this historical analysis will be guided by the following limitations of the study:

(1) American liberal Protestant religious educators in the study will be considered those persons who serve as local church educators, denominational and interdenominational church officials and representatives, and teachers of religion, religious studies, and religion and education in colleges, universities, and theological schools. Thus, in this study the views expressed by secular educators, such as public school teachers and administrators or professors of teacher education, will be dealt with only peripherally.

(2) In terms of theological perspectives, the study will be limited to the views of American liberal Protestant religious educators, and it will not attempt to deal with conservative-fundamental Protestant religious educators, Roman Catholic religious educators, or Jewish religious educators. (3) The primary focus of the study will be upon academic studies of religion in public schools, i.e., religion studies in the regular curriculum of public schools. Therefore, the study will not attempt to deal with matters in the broad area of religion and public education such as: the expenditure of public tax money for religious purposes (such as for textbooks, buses, teacher aids, parochial, etc.); religious activities and ceremonies in public schools (such as prayer, observance of religious holidays, singing of hymns and recitation of Psalms, display of
religious symbols in the classroom, teachers wearing religious garb, taking of a religious census in the public schools, checking on pupils' church and church school attendance by public school teachers, distribution of sectarian religious literature in public school classrooms, using criteria involving religion in hiring public school teachers, and baccalaureate services at public schools); activities in public schools from which an individual may be excused because of religious beliefs. (4) The study will deal only with the matter of studies of religion in public, tax-supported schools. It will not deal with studies of religion in parochial or private schools, nor with the role of the state in relation to parochial or private schools. (5) Finally, the study will be limited to a consideration of studies of religion in public elementary and secondary schools, and will not consider issues related to religion in public-state institutions of higher education, except for the relationship between studies of religion in public elementary-secondary schools and teacher education. In summary, the scope of this study clearly suggests that it will not be an exhaustive study, but is presented as a representative study within the bounds as they have been defined.

The time period of 1940-1974 was selected for the study because of a number of significant factors. Historically, this was a period of rapid growth, expansion, change,
and transition in American society—both domestically and internationally. Religiously, the time period included a postwar growth in Protestant liberalism, the establishment in 1950 of the interdenominational National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., and the impact of the ecumenical movement, including the Consultation on Church Union during the 1960's. Educationally, this was a period of important growth and change in American public education, especially under the influence of the progressive education movement of the early twentieth century. Legally, there were several United States Supreme Court decisions during this time period that greatly influenced the views of religious educators and the actual practices concerning studies of religion in public schools. Overall, with each of these factors considered, the time period 1940-1974 was a very exciting, challenging, and important era in which to study the views of American liberal Protestant religious educators with respect to studies of religion in public schools.

Although a wide variety of usages for key words pertinent to the study is to be found throughout the related literature, the following tentative definitions of terms should prove useful:

Religion.—Although the meanings and usages of this word appear to be almost infinite, many contemporary teachers about religion find it important to work with both a narrow and a broad definition of religion. According to the
Guidebook of the Public Education Religion Studies Center (PERSC) at Wright State University, Dayton, Ohio, the narrow definition of religion comes to mind immediately when the word "religion" is used: "... an institutionalized set of beliefs, dogmas, ethical prescriptions, and cultic practices which center around devotion to and service of a particular deity or set of deities. Hinduism, Judaism, Christianity, Islam, and Bha'i, for example, are religions of this type." On the other hand, a broad definition of religion "envisions religion as any faith or set of values to which an individual or group gives ultimate loyalty. Theravada Buddhism, Taoism, Ethical Culture, secularism, humanism, scientism, nationalism, money, and power illustrate this concept of religion." Both of these definitions of religion should be helpful in this study.

**Studies of religion.**—Various terms are used throughout the literature to refer to studies of religion, such as "religious studies," the "academic study of religion," and "teaching about religion," "learning about religion," and "taking account of religion." In this study, "studies of religion" will be used to refer to the formal, academic, objective study of religion, which assumes a nondoctrinal, nonconfessional, nonsectarian, open, critical, discerning, and empathetic examination of all religions, both narrowly and broadly defined, both past and present. The aim of this type of academic studies of religion, according to
Robert A. Spivey and Rodney F. Allen, is to create religious literacy. The teacher's role in this process "is to help students raise and consider three questions: (1) What is religion? (2) What are some of the significant religious traditions? (3) What is the relationship of religion and culture?" These objective, academic studies of religion are most closely related to public school curricula in social studies and literature.

Objectivity.—Throughout the literature of both religion and education, there has been a great deal of misunderstanding about the concept or pedagogical principle of objectivity as related to the academic study of religion. The perspective of Philip H. Phenix, Professor of Philosophy and Education and Religion and Education at Teachers College, Columbia University, can be most helpful in clarifying the concept of "objectivity" as related to studies of religion: "Every study in every school, public or private, should be objective. No teaching, no educative activity, in any school ought to be indoctrinative, but should be based upon evidence and fair-minded inquiry rather than upon subjective opinion or special pleading." But, Dr. Phenix continues, "'objective' does not mean value-free, abstracted from the domain of human interest. It is better interpreted as disciplined intersubjectivity." Then Dr. Phenix clarifies his challenging concept of "disciplined intersubjectivity":
To be objective is to enter into the subjectivity of persons other than oneself in a disciplined way. It betokens a person's capacity to enter imaginatively into the position of another. This is the fundamental mark of human intelligence. We are humanly intelligent to the degree that we are capable of getting inside points of view other than our own, in a way that is genuinely appreciative.14

The question of objectivity is a major issue in discussions about studies of religion in public schools, and it will be explored further through this study.

Of secondary but related concern to this study of the views of American liberal Protestant religious educators, 1940-1974, with respect to studies of religion in public schools, are the following brief definitions:

**Weekday programs of religious education.**—A type of religious education program, started in Gary, Indiana, in 1914, which is "on the weekday, sponsored and supported by the churches, which is related to the pupil's everyday study program and is included in the time customarily set aside for his education."15

**Dismissed time program.**—A type of religious education program sponsored by the churches, held in the churches, and taught by church educators, with the public-school day shortened either at the beginning or at the end of the day, when students would be "dismissed" from their public school to attend sectarian religious instruction off school premises. This type of program is also called "released time" throughout the literature, but the definition suggested
above is consistent with the distinction made by the United States Supreme Court decisions in 1948 and 1952. In those decisions, the Supreme Court ruled in 1948 (McCollum v. Board of Education, 333 U.S. 203) that programs of sectarian religious instruction given in the public school classroom during school hours—what is termed "released time programs"—were unconstitutional. But, in 1952 (Zorach v. Clauson, 343 U.S. 306) the Supreme Court ruled that programs of sectarian religious instruction given off of public school premises during school hours—what it termed "dismissed time programs"—were constitutional. Ultimately, then, the question of where the sectarian religious instruction took place was the crucial one regarding the constitutionality of the practice.

**Dual-school enrollment programs.**—A type of program, sometimes referred to in the literature as "shared time programs," whereby a student is regularly and concurrently enrolled in a public school part-time and a nonpublic school part-time, thereby "pursuing part of his elementary or secondary program of studies under the direction and control of the public school and the remaining part under the direction and control of the non-public school." This type of program also provides for a pattern of sectarian religious instruction by the churches, but with administrative arrangements worked out cooperatively between church and public schools concerning time schedules.
The methodology of this study will be primarily that of careful use of historical research methods. A thoroughgoing search for sources will be made; a conscientious evaluation of the sources will be conducted; an analysis and interpretation of the various views of American liberal Protestant religious educators found for the period 1940-1974 through the sources will be made; and an attempt will be made to skillfully synthesize the findings of this historical research and analysis into this present descriptive study.

The major sources for this historical study are:
(1) professional journals in religious education and religion, especially Religious Education, published by the Religious Education Association (founded in 1903); Spectrum-International Journal of Religious Education, originally published by The International Council of Religious Education (founded in 1922), and then, after 1950, published by the Department of Christian Life and Mission, Division of Christian Education and Ministry of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.; The Christian Century; Religion in Life; The Journal of Religion; and The American Academy of Religion Journal, prior to 1967 known as The Journal of Bible and Religion; (2) pertinent monographs related to the primary focus of this study; (3) position papers and policy statements by leading religious associations and professional organizations, such as The Religious

The organization of the study will follow a chronological sequence. This approach will be made in an effort to present a well-organized, unified, intelligible, reliable, consistent picture of the factual data gathered through this historical investigation. Following this introductory chapter, the next chapter will provide background material in three areas for the study of the views of American liberal Protestant religious educators, 1940-1974, with respect to studies of religion in public schools: (1) the major historical relationships between religion and education in America; (2) the major theological characteristics of twentieth-century American liberal Protestantism; and (3) the pertinent aspects of the United States Supreme Court decisions, 1940-1974, most relevant to this study. The legal cases dealt with in this section of the study will include: Everson v. Board of Education, 330 U.S. 1 (1947); McCollum v. Board of Education, 333 U.S. 203 (1948); Zorach v. Clauson, 343 U.S. 306 (1952); Engel v. Vitale, 370 U.S. 421 (1962); and Abington School District v. Schempp/Murray v. Curlett, 374 U.S. 203 (1963). The
succeeding four chapters—the major portion of the study—will deal chronologically with the major views of American liberal Protestant religious educators with respect to studies of religion in public schools, and will exhibit the development of a variety of positions through this third of a century. The final chapter will contain a conclusion plus suggestions for further research on the topic.

The tentative nature of the study is apparent throughout. Even a study of controversy shares the uncertainty of the controversy itself. As Paul Blanshard has phrased it:

In a sense there are no solutions to these fundamental church-state controversies. As long as men hold fast with deep conviction to their ideas of God, prayer, the scriptures and the church, they will disagree about the relationship of the state to those concepts and the part to be played by public and private schools as instructors of religion. This is no reproach to religion but a proof of its vitality. Men do not bother to quarrel about the things they consider unimportant. As long as religion endures and is considered vital by men, some continuing controversy about its relation to the schools is as certain as the rising and the setting of the sun.17

The challenge of this study is to offer some small bit of historical insight and understanding to the continuing, controversial, complex yet vital issue of studies of religion in American public schools.
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CHAPTER II
BACKGROUND FOR THE STUDY

Historical Background
As a part of the background to this study of the views of American liberal Protestant religious educators, 1940-1974, with respect to studies of religion in public schools, let us consider briefly the major historical developments concerning the relationships between religion and public education in America. Will Herberg, an American sociologist of religion and a teacher of religion, provides a succinct overview of this relationship:

Religion and education have been related throughout American history in a most intimate way, yet also in a way laden with tension and ambiguity. From the seventeenth century, when the two were closely identified in purpose and content, to the twentieth, when they have become separated and sometimes even hostile, the problem of the proper relation between the two has been one of the central concerns of both.¹

In colonial America, religion and education were closely tied. Lawrence A. Cremin, in his monumental study, American Education: The Colonial Experience, 1607-1783, describes the two critical duties of every seventeenth century colonial schoolmaster: "... to promote piety directly by teaching the young to read Scripture, and to
promote piety indirectly by educating a select group of ministers, who will in turn instruct a literate laity in the true meaning of the word."\(^2\) Even the first public school laws in colonial America indicated the close relationship between religion and education. The Massachusetts School Ordinance of 1647, better known as the "Old Deluder Satan Act," stated that towns in Massachusetts had to employ teachers and erect schools at public expense primarily for religious instruction, viz., teaching children knowledge of the Scriptures. Why? The preface to the act supplies the answer: "It being one of the chief projects of that old deluder Satan to keep men from the knowledge of the Scriptures . . . .\(^3\) Perhaps Gerald Lee Gutek, an historian of American education, best summarizes the relationship between religion and education in seventeenth century colonial America:

Because church and school were intimately connected, the religious influence was strong in all areas where the school served as a formal instructional agency, and much of the educational content was religious. This element persisted in the eighteenth and even into the nineteenth centuries.\(^4\)

In the eighteenth century, the strong sectarian nature of the relationship between religion and education was quite evident, as sectarian religion became the most important determinant of group life in the unstable, highly mobile, and heterogeneous society of eighteenth century America. Bernard Bailyn, in his definitive study, *Education*
In the Forming of American Society, indicates the influence of these sectarian groups upon education:

Sectarian groups, without regard to the intellectual complexity of their doctrine or to their views on the value of learning to religion, became dynamic elements in the spread of education, spawning schools of all sorts, continuously, competitively, in all their settlements; carrying education into the most remote frontiers.

However, in the early nineteenth century, through the influence of Horace Mann and other educational leaders, there was a gradual movement by the states toward schools that were free, universal, tax-supported, compulsory, and nonsectarian. Thus, there was more of a separation of church and state during this period of American education than ever before in colonial America. But Horace Mann, a Unitarian, faced a dilemma on the question of religion and the public schools. He saw education as a moral activity, as a way of making people better. But here lay the seeds of his dilemma: How could the state provide a moral education, in a religiously pluralistic society, without falling back into sectarian teaching of religious dogma, as had been true in colonial America? Mann's solution to this dilemma, though neither dramatic nor innovative, was a "common-elements" approach, which in effect created a "common religion" for his "common school." Clarence J. Karier, an historian of American education, best describes Mann's common-elements approach:
The schools would teach the common elements of all religions and thus produce a moral basis upon which the home and church could build their sectarian creeds. What kind of moral syllabus, then, would embody all the common elements, and what kind of practice would prevent sectarian conflict in the classroom? The answer was that the Bible was to be read periodically without comment by either teacher or pupil.6

Despite some objections raised by Roman Catholics and Jews to Mann's approach, his solution to the problem of religion in the public schools of Bible reading without comment found ready acceptance in a nineteenth-century America that was predominantly Protestant. In fact, it was not until 1963, in the Abington School District v. Schempp/Murray v. Curlett cases,7 that the United States Supreme Court ruled that this practice of Bible reading without comment in the public schools constituted an "establishment of religion," and thus a violation of the First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution.

What, then, has been the relationship between religion and public education in the last century of American history, having moved from the colonial, church-sponsored, sectarian schools, to the early nineteenth-century "common," state-sponsored, nonsectarian public schools? The answer to this question is that a gradual secularization of education took place in the late nineteenth century and on into the twentieth century, which, according to several historians, has caused institutional religion to lose its leadership in American education. Edwin Scott Gaustad, a
distinguished American historian, suggests three basic forces responsible for this quiet revolution in the secularization of American education—away from a pervasive Protestant-oriented influence upon education:

... (1) the growing prestige of a naturalized science and a scientized philosophy, (2) the increasing pluralism or religious diversity of American society that weakened or challenged older Protestant orientation, and (3) added anxiety about the "wall of separation" between church and state.8

Confronted by the secular revolution in twentieth-century American education, the churches' response, in their concern for the religious education of children and youth, has taken several forms. Efforts were made to strengthen an educational instrument developed by an earlier generation: the Sunday School. However, as Gaustad points out about the twentieth-century American Sunday School,

Despite impressive figures and ambitious programs few leaders expressed great satisfaction about what could be achieved or even hoped for in a weekly session of one hour or less. Attendance was spotty, trained personnel scarce, and pupil preparation virtually nil.9

Thus, something more seemed to be needed—but what? Gaustad continues:

Some abandoned the public school system altogether, setting up a church weekday school that offered a total curriculum. Certain groups conducted classes supplemental to the public schools, either in early morning or late afternoon or during the summer months. Others sought an accommodation between public and religious education by dividing the pupil's time between two schools or two teaching
groups. Still others experimented, with uneven success, in programs designed to insert or retain religion in public instruction.10

What Gaustad has suggested in the above quotation brings us directly to the core of this present study, because he succinctly outlines several of the viewpoints of American liberal Protestant religious educators with respect to studies of religion in public schools from 1940-1974, thereby focusing directly upon the relationship between religion and public education in contemporary America. It is with these viewpoints that the major sections of the study will deal.

Theological Background

In terms of the theological background for the study, a number of points need to be made—some historical, some theological.

Historically, there were some major religious events and developments early in the twentieth century that have a direct bearing upon the study. One of these events was the founding of the Religious Education Association in Chicago, Illinois, in 1903, with the subsequent publication in 1906 of the first issue of the Association's journal, Religious Education. Since 1903, this multifaith organization has worked unrelentingly "to draw together religious and educational leaders of all faiths to search for adequate solutions to the problem of providing effective religious
training for all the young" of both the United States and Canada, by uniting "local religious leaders of the major faiths with leaders of public and private education and civic leaders to consider the total religious education needs and resources of their respective communities." Among the first board members, officers, and charter members of the Religious Education Association were: Nicholas Murray Butler, President of Columbia University; George Albert Coe, Professor at Northwestern University; John Dewey, Professor at the University of Chicago; Charles Cuthbert Hall, President of Union Theological Seminary, New York City; William Rainey Harper, President of the University of Chicago; James H. Kirkland, Chancellor of Vanderbilt University; Francis G. Peabody, Dean of the Divinity School at Harvard University; James E. Russell, Dean of Teachers College, Columbia University; Frank Knight Sanders, Dean of Yale Divinity School; and Booker T. Washington, Principal of Tuskegee Institute. It was in this type of tradition that the religious educators discussed in this study were to follow.

In 1953, on the Golden Anniversary of the founding of the Religious Education Association, the basic, guiding principles which the founding convention set forth for the R.E.A. were again reemphasized.

(1) It should be universal in spirit, inclusive of widely varying viewpoints, avoiding control by any single school of thought, looking at each
subject in its entirety, considering the needs of the whole nation rather than a few sections.
(2) It should be cooperative in spirit, refusing to enter into competitive rivalries, and seeking to perform a general service which would make the work of all institutions effective.
(3) It should be scientific in spirit, in all its explorations, proceeding carefully on the basis of fundamental principles, seeking to observe accurately the facts, and from these to make deductions.
(4) It would be pioneering in spirit, seeking new ways to extend and improve religious education.¹³

These basic founding principles of the R.E.A. have been quoted here at length because these same basic principles very likely guided the thinking and views of the religious educators, 1940-1974, examined later in the study. Further, these principles of the R.E.A. also help us to identify basic theological characteristics of American liberal Protestant religious educators under examination in the study.

The threefold purpose of the Religious Education Association is expressed in its slogan:

To inspire the religious forces of our country with the educational ideal; to inspire the educational forces with the religious ideal; and to keep before the public the ideal of religious education and the sense of its need and value.¹⁴

This threefold purpose of the R.E.A. has been significantly fulfilled through its journal, Religious Education, published continuously since 1906. It is the only periodical in the field of religious education dealing inclusively with basic problems of education and religion from the
perspectives of the several major faiths in America. Primarily, this journal provides a means for the exchange of ideas among the R.E.A. membership, and for presenting members with the results of research, surveys, and the thinking of leading authorities in the fields of education and religion. The purpose of this journal is found in the subtitle of every issue of Religious Education: "A Platform for the Free Discussion of Religious Issues and Their Bearing on Education."

One of the major topics which has been treated extensively in Religious Education from its founding concerns the role of religion in public education, including, more specifically, teaching about religion in the public schools, or the academic study of religion in public school curricula. Therefore, Religious Education is an extremely important part of this study, providing extensive primary source materials for the study, since many American liberal Protestant religious educators from 1940-1974 used Religious Education as a major vehicle for expressing their views with respect to studies of religion in public schools.

Two other developments within religious education early in the twentieth century will be noted here briefly, but with expanded treatment in the major sections of this study. One development was in 1914, with the establishment in Gary, Indiana, of the weekday religious education program. This program of religious education as related to
public education has had a continuous and sometimes controversial history, but it did set a significant pattern for concern about the relationship between religion and public education in twentieth-century America. During the period under investigation in this study, 1940-1974, weekday religious education programs have been associated with released time, dismissed time, dual school enrollment, and through-the-week programs, all of which will be discussed in the major sections of the study.

The other development to be noted here briefly concerns the formation of the International Council of Religious Education in 1922. The I.C.R.E. combined churches of the United States and Canada in one common effort to expand the original Sunday School concept, to include a great many other activities as a part of the work of religious education in the church. The I.C.R.E. is important to this study because (1) one of its major concerns was the role of religion in public education, as noted in position papers and policy statements of the I.C.R.E.; (2) the journal which it published, the *International Journal of Religious Education* (since 1969 known as *Spectrum*), provided another vehicle for the expression of views of religious educators, 1940-1974, with respect to studies of religion in public schools, and thus provided this study with additional significant primary source materials; (3) in 1950, the International Council of Religious
Education became the Division of Christian Education of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., when the N.C.C. was formed from a number of ecumenical bodies. During the period of this study, 1940-1974, the National Council of Churches—primarily through its Division of Christian Education—produced a number of important position papers and policy statements concerning religion in public education. These N.C.C. statements provide further primary source materials for this study.

Some of the most important theological characteristics of twentieth-century American liberal Protestantism, as pertinent to this study of religious educators, will next be noted briefly. Acknowledging the wide diversity even within this one theological position, hopefully these comments will provide a broad, general framework within which to view these religious educators, but for purposes of this study, specific theological doctrines, such as within a theological system, will not be treated. Employing the distinction that David Jewell has suggested, liberal Protestantism in this study refers to "a particular spirit or attitude toward both old traditions and new understanding" rather than "referring to a particular body of doctrine giving a distinctive exposition of the basic beliefs of Christians."16

The major thrusts of this spirit or attitude characteristic of liberal Protestantism, with supporting
documentation, would be the following:  

1. A broader liberal spirit, calling for freedom of thought and openness of mind. Jewell says that this broader liberal spirit "refers to receptivity to that which is new, to freedom from prior commitments (save those to the liberal spirit), and to willingness to break through present structures of thought or practice in order to formulate new patterns."  

L. Harold DeWolf adds these words about this liberal spirit: "The mind should be always open. We should be trying to get evidence from every quarter: from the scientists, from the philosophers, from the Bible, from church history and from our own personal experience."  

J. Paul Williams further concludes: "Protestant Liberals more than other Christian groups stress the right of individuals to decide for themselves what is true in religion. The belief in freedom from theological domination by creeds, councils, bishops, pastors amounts to about the most basic religious conviction."  

2. A belief in the authority of the Christian experience. Edwin Aubrey illustrates this aspect of liberal Protestantism when he writes: "The liberal starts with the proposition that experience precedes theological formulas. In other words, religious experience is more fundamental than theology. Therefore, in order to understand the theology we must go to the experience behind it."  

Thus, according to Aubrey, even with the great variety of forms
of religious experience, the liberal's attitude toward all of these forms of experience is one of respect and of willingness to investigate—a type of "reverence for reverence." This would lead a liberal, encountering a number of faiths, to try to understand each one of them, respecting the authority of religious experience.

3. Respect for science and the scientific method. Again, Jewell provides insight about this aspect of the spirit of liberalism: "The method acceptable to the liberal spirit is that of science: the empirical, inductive process by which anything—any law, any common belief, any human experience—may be explored in the quest for knowledge or in the exposing of old falsehoods." J. Paul Williams further states that liberals, striving to be attuned to modern thought which is dominated by science, "strive to make science their ally, not their enemy; they take science into the very citadel of religion. Science is a new confederate in the battle for truth; thus Liberals hold that no vital religion can ignore scientific discoveries."

4. Use of the scientific method as applied to the study of the Bible, referred to by Biblical scholars as the historical-critical method. Carl Braaten flatly claims that "It is an undeniable fact that the historical-critical study of the Bible is a legacy of Protestant liberalism." James Richmond helps to clarify this method of Biblical
scholarship when he says that it is the "application to the biblical sources of those techniques which were applied to non-biblical materials, in order that they might be 'objectively' interpreted in the context of the historical circumstances in which they originated."26 This method of handling historical texts and Biblical sources is another freedom claimed by liberal theologians.

5. Care in proclaiming any truth to be "ultimate," yet coupled with the centrality of Jesus Christ in the lives of those who experienced the Christian faith. This spirit led to a new task concerning the investigation and understanding of religion—or religions, plural—as these, the religions of man, held the center of interest, rather than a specific, "ultimate" revelation of God. As James D. Smart said of this liberal approach:

At every step the contemporary religions were brought into the picture, but eventually the scope of investigation had to be widened to take in all the world's religions. Tapping the whole structure was a philosophy of religion with the task of bringing order out of the chaotic mass of phenomena and relating it to the immediate problem of the Christian's understanding and practice of his own religion.27

6. Confidence in man and his future—an optimism about this spirit of freedom, openness, and man's part in human history. Perhaps Daniel Day Williams best expresses this spirit of confidence and optimism of liberalism: "In its theological context it designates the spirit and attitude of those who sought to incorporate in Christian theology
the values of freedom of thought, tolerance, and the humanitarian motives in modern Western culture."

7. A positive attitude towards the achievements of democratic culture, generally stressing the ethical imperatives of the gospel. This ethical thrust of the liberal spirit found expression through some form of social action—concern for the worth and dignity of all persons, expressed by serving others through the community at large as well as through the church itself. Earlier exponents of this type of liberal spirit for social action were found in the work of Washington Gladden, Walter Rauschenbush, and George Albert Coe.

In conclusion, the seven major characteristics or thrusts of the spirit of liberal Protestantism detailed above, combined with those suggested earlier as related to the Religious Education Association, provide for this study a representative, general framework for the views of American liberal Protestant religious educators, 1940-1974, under examination in the study.

Legal Background

Probably one of the more important aspects of the background to this study is an understanding of the legal background. Therefore in this section, the most pertinent aspects of the U.S. Constitution and U.S. Supreme Court decisions most relevant to the study will be examined.
In the Constitution of the United States of America, four Amendments are important for this study: the First, the Fifth, the Tenth, and Section One of the Fourteenth Amendment. Each of the five U.S. Supreme Court cases treated below in this section deal primarily with the First and Fourteenth Amendments. The Tenth Amendment, ratified in 1791, states:

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.32

By this Amendment, then, matters pertaining to education are delegated to the States, rather than being a national power. The Fifth Amendment, also ratified in 1791, contains the famous "due process" clause, stating that no person in the United States shall be "deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law."33 This clause has been important for some U.S. Supreme Court decisions concerning religion and education, but it did not bear upon the cases examined in this study. Thus, the First Amendment and Section One of the Fourteenth Amendment are of paramount concern for this study.

The First Amendment of the Constitution of the United States of America, ratified in 1791, contains these first two clauses: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; . . . ."34 These two clauses are identified,
respectively, as the "Establishment Clause" and the "Free Exercise Clause." Although these two clauses seem quite unmistakably clear at face value in their intent and purpose, viz., that the United States government shall in no way participate in the establishment of any religion, nor shall it prohibit in any way the exercise of a person's religion, these clauses have been at the very core of judicial debate and decisions throughout our country's history. In the cases treated below, the complexity surrounding these two clauses dealing with religion, especially as they relate to concerns of education, will be described.

In 1868, the Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution was ratified. Section One of this Amendment states:

All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.35

The effect of this section of the Fourteenth Amendment compels states to afford all citizens in their domain the rights articulated in the Fifth Amendment, and, by extension, the rights articulated in the First Amendment. For purposes of this study, the primary impact of this section of the Fourteenth Amendment was to extend to the States the
Establishment Clause and the Free Exercise Clause of the First Amendment. The significance of this relationship will be noted in the cases below.

Although the matter of the academic study of religion in public schools has never been the primary focus of any U.S. Supreme Court decision to date, it has been dealt with as a secondary matter in a number of decisions—especially during the purview of this study, 1940-1974. In addition, during this time period, the U.S. Supreme Court dealt with a number of cases concerning several matters regarding religion and public education. Among them were the following: Everson v. Board of Education, 330 U.S. 1 (1947); McCollum v. Board of Education, 333 U.S. 203 (1948); Zorach v. Clauson, 343 U.S. 306 (1952); Engel v. Vitale, 370 U.S. 421 (1962); and Abington School District v. Schempp/Murray v. Curlett, 374 U.S. 203 (1963). It is to these five cases that we now turn, for a brief examination of their most relevant aspects as related to this present study of the views of American liberal Protestant religious educators, 1940-1974, with respect to studies of religion in public schools.

_Everson v. Board of Education._—This case, decided by the United States Supreme Court on February 10, 1947, is the classic case dealing with the Establishment of Religion clause of the First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution. At issue here was the validity of a New Jersey statute
allowing public school districts to pay the cost of the transportation of pupils to and from parochial schools.

In a 5-4 decision, the U.S. Supreme Court affirmed a holding of the New Jersey Court of Appeals, upholding the validity of the statute in question on the ground that no aid was being given by this law to any religious institution. Rather, aid was being given only to the school children and their parents—a view similar to the "child benefit theory" expressed in an earlier case, Cochran v. Louisiana, 281 U.S. 370 (1930). Justice Black summarized the majority opinion as follows:

This Court has said that parents may, in the discharge of their duty under state compulsory education laws, send their children to a religious rather than a public school if the school meets the secular educational requirements which the state has the power to impose. . . . It appears that these parochial schools meet New Jersey's requirements. The State contributes no money to the schools. It does not support them. Its legislation, as applied, does no more than provide a general program to help parents get their children, regardless of their religion, safely and expeditiously to and from accredited schools.

Thus, by this decision, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that parochial aid via busing was constitutional.

However, Justice Black, in delivering the majority opinion, also expressed the now famous "Everson dicta," which in very strong language stressed the necessity of not breaching the wall of separation between church and state erected by the First Amendment's Establishment Clause:
The establishment of religion clause of the First Amendment means at least this: Neither a state nor the Federal Government can set up a church. Neither can pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religions, or prefer one religion over another. Neither can force nor influence a person to go to or to remain away from church against his will or force him to profess a belief or disbelief in any religion. No person can be punished for entertaining or professing religious beliefs or disbeliefs, for church attendance or non-attendance. No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may adapt to teach or practice religion. Neither a state nor the Federal Government can, openly or secretly, participate in the affairs of any religious organizations or groups or vice versa. In the words of Jefferson, the clause against establishment of religion by law was intended to erect "a wall of separation between church and State." 37

The significance of this famous dicta for this present study is that this unequivocal interpretation of the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment apparently set the legal tone and precedent for matters of religion and public education for the decades of this study. But, as we shall soon discover in later cases, this "high and impregnable" wall between church and state would have its cracks and breaches.

Two important dissenting opinions were expressed by Justices Jackson and Rutledge. Justice Jackson took the position that the Court's advocacy of a complete and uncompromising separation of church and state--expressed above in Justice Black's dicta--was inconsistent with its declaration of the validity of the acts complained of in
New Jersey. Justice Jackson wrote sharply about the majority opinion:

The Court's opinion marshals every argument in favor of state aid and puts the case in its most favorable light, but much of its reasoning confirms my conclusions that there are no good grounds upon which to support the present legislation. In fact, the undertones of the opinion, advocating complete and uncompromising separation of Church from State, seems utterly discordant with its conclusion yielding support to their commingling in educational matters. The case which irresistibly comes to mind as the most fitting precedent is that of Julia, who, according to Byron's reports, "whispering 'I will ne'er consent,' consented."38

In his dissent, Justice Rutledge went even farther than Justice Jackson, stating that the Constitution requires absolute, complete separation of church and state, and that the aid in question in this case was absolutely prohibited by the First Amendment. Then, Justice Rutledge, in expressing his distress at the implications of the majority ruling, gave a prophetic glimpse of the future course of the Court's actions regarding religion and public education:

... Neither so high nor so impregnable today as yesterday is the wall raised between church and state by Virginia's great statute of religious freedom and the First Amendment, now made applicable to all the states by the Fourteenth. New Jersey's statute sustained is the first, if indeed it is not the second breach to be made by this Court's action. That a third, and a fourth, and still others will be attempted, we may be sure. For just as Cochran v. Board of Education, has opened the way by oblique ruling for this decision, so will the two make wider the breach for a third. Thus with time the most solid freedom steadily gives way before continuing corrosive decision.39
McCollum v. Board of Education.--The opportunity for the U.S. Supreme Court to invoke the "wall of separation" doctrine, espoused in the Everson case in 1947, arose just a year later when the Court decided, on March 8, 1948, the first of the two important "released time" cases, concerning to what extent public schools may constitutionally participate in, or give aid to, plans for providing religious instruction to children during school hours. In this 8-1 decision, the Supreme Court ruled that the "released time" plan as practiced in the public schools of Champaign County, Illinois, was unconstitutional under the First and Fourteenth Amendments. Specifically, the Court decided that releasing public school pupils during school hours to receive religious instruction held in public school classrooms violated the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment.

Justice Black, again delivering the majority opinion, invoked his "Everson dicta" here in the McCollum decision: ". . . as we said in the Everson case, the First Amendment has erected a wall between Church and State which must be kept high and impregnable." Then, he applied this doctrine to the use of public school classrooms for religious instruction by religious groups, on a "released time" basis:

Here not only are the State's tax-supported public school buildings used for the dissemination of religious doctrines. The State also affords
sectarian groups an invaluable aid in that it helps to provide pupils for their religious classes through the use of the State's compulsory public school machinery. This is not separation of Church and State.40

The major significance of this decision by the Supreme Court for this present study was its bearing upon weekday religious education programs, established in the U.S. since 1914, and the wide variety of forms of "released time" programs of religious instruction related to public schools existing throughout the U.S. at the time of this major decision in 1948. In a concurring opinion of the McCollum case, Justice Frankfurter hinted that this decision should not be construed as deeming unconstitutional all varieties of released time programs (and thereby hints at the Zorach case, decided in 1952):

We do not consider, as indeed we could not, school programs not before us which, though colloquially characterized as "released time," present situations differing in aspects that may well be constitutionally crucial. Different forms which "released time" has taken during more than thirty years of growth includes programs which, like that before us, could not withstand the test of the Constitution; others may be found unexceptionable. We do not attempt to weigh in the Constitutional scale every separate detail or various combinations of factors which may establish a valid "released time" program.42

Justice Jackson, in his concurring opinion to this case, presents the first major statement from a U.S. Supreme Court justice during the period of this study, 1940-1974, concerning studies of religion in public school curricula. Although this statement is quite secondary to
the major issue of the McCollum case, it is extremely significant for those religious educators who advocate the academic study of religion in public school curricula, and thus it is quoted here at length:

While we may and should end such formal and explicit instruction as the Champaign plan and can at all times prohibit teaching of creed and catechism and ceremonial and can forbid forthright proselyting in the schools, I think it remains to be demonstrated whether it is possible, even if desirable, to comply with such demands as plaintiff's completely to isolate and cast out of secular education all that some people may reasonably regard as religious instruction. Perhaps subjects such as mathematics, physics, or chemistry are, or can be, completely secularized. But it would not seem practical to teach either practice or appreciation of the arts if we are to forbid exposure of youth to any religious influences. Music without sacred music, architecture minus the cathedral, or painting without the scriptural themes would be eccentric and incomplete, even from a secular point of view. . . .
The fact is that, for good or for ill, nearly everything which gives meaning to life, is saturated with religious influences, derived from paganism, Judaism, Christianity—both Catholic and Protestant—and other faiths accepted by a large part of the world's peoples. One can hardly respect a system of education that would leave the student wholly ignorant of the currents of religious thought that move world society for a part in which he is being prepared.43

This statement by Justice Jackson, in 1948, may have been several years ahead of its time. Nevertheless, it planted a seed which was to erupt into full bloom during the 1960's and on into the 1970's, concerning not only the need for the academic study of religion in public schools, but also its constitutionality.
In the McCollum case, Justice Reed expressed the lone dissenting opinion. Pointing out that there are many examples of federal practices in relation to religion that appear to be relevant to this case, Justice Reed concludes his dissenting opinion as follows:

With the general statements in the opinions concerning the constitutional requirements that the nation and the states, by virtue of the First and Fourteenth Amendments, may "make no law respecting an establishment of religion;" I am in agreement. But, in the light of the meaning given to those words by the precedents, customs, and practices which I have detailed above, I cannot agree with the Court's conclusion that when pupils compelled by law to go to school for secular education are released from school so as to attend the religious classes, churches are unconstitutionally aided.44

With this statement by Justice Reed, and with the opinion of Justice Frankfurter noted above, we begin to move in the direction of the next major case, Zorach v. Clauson, which appears to be very similar to the McCollum case—but with very different results.

Zorach v. Clauson.—A distinctly negative public reaction greeted the McCollum decision, and there was evidence of noncompliance on the part of some school systems. Other schools sought to modify their existing "released time" programs of religious education to make them constitutional in terms of the McCollum decision. Then, in 1952, a challenge to one of these modified "released time" programs reached the U.S. Supreme Court. At this point, the Supreme Court had an opportunity to reassert its strong
separationist stand taken in the Everson and McCollum cases—i.e., the wall of separation between Church and State, high and impregnable—or to step back from this position. In Zorach v. Clauson, the U.S. Supreme Court chose the latter view—and thus began moving in the direction of neutrality in relations between Church and State.

In the Zorach case, decided on April 28, 1952, the main issue, as in the McCollum case, centered around religious instruction during public school hours. But by its 6-3 decision, the Supreme Court decided that the crucial question with "released time" programs of religious education, as related to public schools, was not the matter of time, but rather the matter of place—where these programs were to be held. Thus, the majority of Justices in the Zorach decision ruled that the plan for religious education in Brooklyn, New York—which they now termed a "dismissed time" program—was constitutional, because under this plan the children were dismissed from their public school classes during regular school hours to attend sectarian religious instruction—but away from the public school. In the McCollum case, released time programs of religious education held in public school classrooms were ruled unconstitutional. It should be noted here that a very vigorous protest was expressed by three dissenting Justices in this Zorach decision.
Justice Douglas, in presenting the majority opinion, clearly distinguished the Zorach case from the McCollum case:

This "released time" program involves neither religious instruction in public school classrooms nor the expenditure of public funds. All costs, including the application blanks, are paid by the religious organizations. The case is unlike McCollum v. Board of Education, which involved a "released time" program from Illinois. In that case the classrooms were turned over to religious instructors. We accordingly held that the program violated the First Amendment which (by reason of the Fourteenth Amendment) prohibits the states from establishing religion or prohibiting its free exercise.45

Continuing with the majority opinion, Justice Douglas discussed the true meaning and purpose of the First Amendment:

The First Amendment, however, does not say that in every and all respects there should be a separation of Church and State. Rather, it studiously defines the manner, the specific ways, in which there shall be no concert or union or dependency one on the other. That is the common sense of the matter. Otherwise the state and religion would be aliens to each other—hostile, suspicious, and even unfriendly."46

Then, beginning to move in the direction of neutrality, Justice Douglas emphasized the many ways in which government in fact must interact with religion. It there were not these interactions between government and religion, said Justice Douglas,

. . . Municipalities would not be permitted to render police or fire protection to religious groups. Policemen who helped parishioners into their places of worship would violate the Constitution. Prayers
in our legislative halls; the appeals to the Almighty in the messages of the Chief Executive; the proclamations making Thanksgiving Day a holiday; "so help me God" in our courtroom oaths—these and all other references to the Almighty that run through our laws, our public rituals, our ceremonies would be flouting the First Amendment. A fastidious atheist or agnostic could even object to the supplication with which the Court opens each session: "God save the United States and this Honorable Court." 47

This new position of the Court moving toward neutrality was a significant movement away from the strict separationist position of the Everson dicta. As Justice Douglas concluded with his now famous statement:

We are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being. We guarantee the freedom to worship as one chooses. We make room for as wide a variety of beliefs and creeds as the spiritual needs of man deem necessary. . . . But we find no constitutional requirement which makes it necessary for government to be hostile to religion and to throw its weight against efforts to widen the effective scope of religious influence. 48

As might be expected, Justice Black, author of the Everson dicta, which he also applied in the McCollum case, presented a strong dissent to the majority opinion, and thus reaffirmed the Everson dicta: "In dissenting today I mean to give more than routine approval to our McCollum decision. I mean also to reaffirm my faith in the fundamental philosophy expressed in McCollum and Everson v. Board of Education." 49 Justice Black left no doubt that, in his opinion, the Zorach case was not distinguishable from the McCollum case:
I see no significant difference between the invalid Illinois system and that of New York here sustained. Except for the use of the school buildings in Illinois, there is no difference between the systems which I consider even worthy of mention. In the New York program, as in that of Illinois, the school authorities release some of the children on the condition that they attend the religious classes, get reports on whether they attend, and hold the other children in the school building until the religious hour is over. As we attempted to make categorically clear, the McCollum decision would have been the same if the religious classes had not been held in the school building. . . . McCollum thus held that Illinois could not constitutionally manipulate the compelled classroom hours of its compulsory school machinery so as to channel children into sectarian classes. Yet that is exactly what the Court holds New York can do.50

In his dissent, Justice Jackson was even stronger than Justice Black—even to the point of sarcastic bitterness about the majority opinion:

A number of Justices just short of a majority of the majority that promulgates today's passionate dialectics joined answering them in Illinois ex rel. McCollum v. Board of Education. The distinction attempted between that case and this is trivial, almost to the point of cynicism, magnifying its nonessential details and disparaging compulsion which was the underlying reason for invalidity. A reading of the Court's opinion in that case along with its opinion in this case will show such difference of overtones and undertones as to make clear that the McCollum case has passed like a storm in a teacup. The wall which the Court was professing to erect between Church and State has become even more warped and twisted than I expected. Today's judgment will be more interesting to students of psychology and of the judicial processes than to students of constitutional law.51

Despite these vigorous protests by the dissenting Justices, the Zorach decision was upheld—then and even today. Thus, for this present study, the Zorach case is
highly significant because (1) for all practical purposes it effectively determined the legality of "released time"/"dismissed time" programs of religious education as related to the public schools, (2) thereby affecting the views of American liberal Protestant religious educators concerning weekday religious education programs. Further, (3) this case moved the Supreme Court in the direction of a principle of neutrality regarding matters of Church and State in education—expressed in two cases during the 1960's which eventually influenced views on the academic study of religion in public schools.

Engel v. Vitale.—It seems that all that had previously come before the U.S. Supreme Court concerning religion and the public schools became a minor prelude when the Court accepted the Engel v. Vitale case, and agreed to decide whether or not a prayer composed by the New York State Board of Regents could constitutionally be recited in public school classrooms. This short, denominationally neutral, voluntary prayer was worded as follows: "Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee, and we beg Thy blessings upon us, our parents, our teachers and our Country." In this case, the recitation of this prayer was attacked as a violation of the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution. Three New York State courts had upheld the validity of use of this prayer, principally on the basis of the provision permitting
nonparticipation by children whose parents objected to such recital of this prayer.

On June 25, 1962, in a 6-1 decision (Justice Frankfurter, due to illness, and Justice White, appointed to the Court after arguments in the case had been heard, did not participate in the decision), the U.S. Supreme Court reversed the rulings of the three New York State courts, and held that the recital of this prayer was a violation of the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment. Justice Black, delivering the majority opinion, immediately made clear the position of the Court:

We think that by using its public school system to encourage recitation of the Regents' prayer, the State of New York has adopted a practice wholly inconsistent with the Establishment Clause. There can, of course, be no doubt that New York's program of daily classroom invocation of God's blessings as prescribed in the Regents' prayer is a religious activity. It is a solemn avowal of divine faith and supplication for the blessings of the Almighty. The nature of such a prayer has always been religious.

Then, invoking the now familiar "wall of separation" metaphor, Justice Black agreed with the petitioners in this case that,

... the State's use of the Regents' prayer in its public school system breaches the constitutional wall of separation between Church and State. ... since we think that the constitutional prohibition against laws respecting an establishment of religion must at least mean that in this country it is no part of the business of government to compose official prayers for any group of the American people to recite as a part of a religious program carried on by government.
In his lone dissenting opinion, Justice Stewart offered the following viewpoint:

With all respect, I think the Court has misapplied a great constitutional principle. I cannot see how an "official religion" is established by letting those who want to say a prayer say it. On the contrary, I think to deny the wish of these school children to join in reciting this prayer is to deny them the opportunity of sharing in the spiritual heritage of our Nation.

The significance of this U.S. Supreme Court decision in Engel v. Vitale for this present study can be summarized as follows: (1) The strong public reaction to this decision about a state-composed prayer caused many American liberal Protestant religious educators to be reawakened to the need for their re-examination of matters concerning religion and public education; (2) Although the "wall of separation" metaphor was used in this case, the language of the majority opinion was much less militantly separationist than it had been in Everson and McCollum, and thus—almost from what the Supreme Court did not say rather than what it did say—the "neutrality" door, beginning to open in the Zorach case, remained open to further interpretation; (3) The Engel v. Vitale decision set the stage for the very important Supreme Court rulings the following year (1963), on Bible reading and prayer, which also contained significant statements regarding the academic study of religion in public schools.
Abington School District v. Schempp; Murray v. Curlett.—On June 17, 1963, in an 8-1 decision, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled on these twin cases in a single set of opinions, since both cases dealt with the same substantive issues. The Abington School District v. Schempp case arose in Pennsylvania where a state statute required reading of verses from the Bible without note or comment in public school classrooms. The Murray v. Curlett case arose in Baltimore, Maryland, involving the constitutionality of a requirement that the Bible be read and the Lord's Prayer be said in public school classrooms. These cases were brought to trial dealing with the alleged violations of the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment by these practices of Bible reading and prayer. In Pennsylvania, the U.S. District Court ruled that the state statute requiring Bible reading in public school classrooms was a violation of the First Amendment, and this decision was appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court by the Abington School District. In Maryland, the Court of Appeals of Maryland ruled that the regulation of Bible reading and prayer in public school classrooms was not a violation of the First Amendment, and this decision was appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court by William J. Murray III, etc., et al., Petitioners, including this boy's mother, Mrs. Madalyn Murray (O'Hair), an avowed atheist.

Justice Clark, delivering the majority opinion, declared that the practices of Bible reading and prayer in
public school classrooms complained of in these two cases were unconstitutional under the terms of the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment, as applied to the states through the Fourteenth Amendment. However, tracing the religious influences in American life and the importance attached to religious freedom in a pluralistic society, Justice Clark stated that neutrality on the part of government toward religion is part of the American heritage. He then formulated the following "test of neutrality," as related to legislation and the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment:

The test may be stated as follows: What are the purpose and the primary effect of the enactment? If either is the advancement or inhibition of religion then the enactment exceeds the scope of legislative power as circumscribed by the Constitution. That is to say that to withstand the strictures of the Establishment Clause there must be a secular legislative purpose and a primary effect that neither advances nor inhibits religion.56

This principle of neutrality was an important climax to the Court's view of Church-State-education relations during the period 1940-1974, for it expressed the reasoned opinion of eight justices.

Justice Stewart, as he had done in the Engel v. Vitale case, filed the lone dissenting opinion in this decision, again expressing disagreement with the Court's interpretation of the Establishment Clause, and advocating as a goal a system of religious exercises in public schools
which meets proper constitutional standards:

What our Constitution indispensably protects is the freedom of each of us, be he Jew or Agnostic, Christian or Atheist, Buddhist or Free thinker, to believe or disbelieve, to worship or not worship, to pray or keep silent, according to his own conscience, uncoerced and unrestrained by government. It is conceivable that these school boards or even all school boards, might eventually find it impossible to administer a system of religious exercises during school hours in such a way as to meet this constitutional standard—in such a way as completely to free from any kind of official coercion those who do not affirmatively want to participate. But I think we must not assume that boards so lack the quality of inventiveness and good will as to make impossible the achievement of that goal.57

The concern of many persons, that exclusion of religious exercises from the public schools means fostering secularism, or even irreligion, was recognized by Justice Clark, speaking for the majority. He rejected this reasoning and enunciated, in three sentences frequently quoted since that time (underlined here for emphasis), the general principle that a proper education ought to include studies about religion:

It is insisted that unless these religious exercises are permitted a "religion of secularism" is established in the schools. We agree of course that the State may not establish a "religion of secularism" in the sense of affirmatively opposing or showing hostility to religion, thus "preferring those who believe in no religion over those who do believe." . . . We do not agree, however, that this decision in any sense has that effect. In addition, it might well be said that one's education is not complete without a study of comparative religion or the history of religion and its relationship to the advancement of civilization. It certainly may be said that the Bible is worthy of study for its literary and historic qualities. Nothing we
have said here indicates that such study of the Bible or of religion, when presented objectively as part of a secular program of education, may not be effected consistent with the First Amendment.\(^5\)

This statement by Justice Clark was to become in many ways, the cornerstone for studies of religion in public school curricula, after 1963, as will be examined in later chapters of this study.

In the concurring opinions filed by Justices Brennan and Goldberg (the latter joined by Justice Harlan), the need for and the constitutional legality of academic studies of religion in public school curriculum were emphasized and justified further:

The holding of the Court today plainly does not foreclose teaching about the Holy Scriptures or about differences between religious sects in literature or history classes. Whether or not the Bible is involved, it would be impossible to teach meaningfully many subjects in the social sciences or the humanities without some mention of religion. To what extent and to what points in the curriculum religious materials should be cited, are matters which the courts ought to entrust very largely to the experienced officials who superintend our Nation's public schools. They are experts in such matters and we are not (Brennan).\(^5\)

Neither government nor this Court can or should ignore the significance of the fact that a vast portion of our people believe in and worship God and that many of our legal, political and personal values derive historically from religious teachings. Government must inevitably take cognizance of the existence of religion, and indeed, under certain circumstances of the First Amendment may require that it do so. And it seems clear to me from the opinions of the present and past cases that the Court would recognize the propriety of
providing military chaplains and of teaching about religion, as distinguished from the teaching of religion, in the public schools. The examples could readily be multiplied, for both the required and the permissible accommodations between state and church frame the relation as one free from hostility or favor and productive of religious and political harmony, but without undue involvement of one in the concerns or practices of the other. To be sure, the judgment in each case is a delicate one, but it must be made if we are to do loyal service as judges to the ultimate First Amendment objective of religious liberty (Goldberg).

The forthright language of Justice Brennan may be regarded as largely responsible for the rapid proliferation of curriculum materials developed in the late 1960's and early 1970's for use in studies of religion in public schools, as will be reflected in later chapters of this study.

In conclusion, the position of the U.S. Supreme Court had moved from its strict "wall of separation" view in the Everson dicta (1947), reaffirmed in the McCollum case (1948), slightly cracking in the Zorach case (1952), dealt with but less militantly in the Engel case (1962), to a clearer position of neutrality in the twin cases of 1963. The effects of these shifts by the Supreme Court upon the views of American liberal Protestant religious educators, 1940-1974, will be examined in the remaining chapters of this study. Fully as important, for our purposes, as these developments in successive opinions of the Court were the statements just quoted from the concurrent opinions of the majority in the Abington/Murray cases which
bear upon the study of religion in public schools. The Court had ruled strongly against certain religious exercises in the public schools, but its ruling was not against the academic study of religion--especially the study of comparative religion, the history of religion, and the literary study of religious literature. These crucial points of the decision in the Abington/Murray cases have frequently been missed by many observers, both religious and educational.
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CHAPTER III

THE DECADE, 1940-1949

The Pioneering Years

In this historical study of the views of American liberal Protestant religious educators* with respect to studies of religion in public schools,* the first decade of the study, 1940-1949, provides both a transitional period and a foundational period. Prior to 1940, with a few minor exceptions, little organized effort had been made by either public school or church educators with respect to the academic study of religion in public schools. Certainly, since 1914 with the Gary, Indiana, plan, there was a wide variety of released-time-weekday religious education plans throughout public schools in the United States. Certainly, prior to 1940, the Religious Education Association and the International Council of Religious Education were interested in the matters of religion and public education. But, by 1940, there were a number of legal questions that pervaded discussions of religion and public education, and there seemed to be an atmosphere of confusion, uncertainty, hesitation, 

*For brevity, hereafter commonly referred to as "religious educators" and "studies of religion."
and disunity concerning studies of religion in public schools. Therefore, the decade 1940-1949 served as a period of transition from this past era of uncertainty to a new era of progress in studies of religion by laying the foundations for fruitful results in the decades ahead. The variety of views and concerns expressed by religious educators from 1940-1949 with respect to studies of religion provides the evidence that this was truly a pioneering period.

Early in this decade, Harrison S. Elliott, highly respected Professor of Religious Education at Union Theological Seminary, New York, New York, and also President of the Religious Education Association, prepared a syllabus for study on "Religious Education and Public Education." This suggested syllabus was made available by the Program Committee of the Religious Education Association for the use of local and regional groups studying the relationships between religious education and public education. In this important document, Elliott succinctly presented the four major alternative positions which persons were using as strategies and methods with respect to religious education and public education. Very significantly, these four major positions which Elliott presented in 1940 provide the basic framework for the views examined in the remaining years of this entire study. The four possibilities examined and posited by Elliott were:
First, official recognition of religious education in the general educational scheme through "released time," credits, and the like; . . . weekday religious education on released time or some similar arrangement with public school recognition and credit; . . . 1

Second, inclusion of religion within the program and life of the public school. . . . education in religion made a part of the public school curriculum, either by dealing with the religious aspects of culture at the places where they naturally belong in teaching history, the social sciences, and literature, or by teaching the common and basic beliefs about God and religion on which all faiths agree, or by both of these methods; . . . 2

Third, making religion an integral part of education through parochial or private schools; . . . establishment of parochial schools connected with particular faiths. . . . 3

Fourth, concentration on strengthening the religious education in church and synagogue, . . . for which position two divided groups emerge: First, those who believe that such an approach is hindered, if not indeed rendered ineffective, if children and youth are in secular public schools for their general education and who would send their children to parochial schools; and, second, those who believe that public schools as at present constituted are carrying out their true function of education for life in a democracy and are an asset rather than a liability for religious education, and who would send their children to public schools and depend upon religious education in connection with the family and the church or synagogue for education in religion. . . . 4

With few minor exceptions, each of the wide variety of views expressed by religious educators during this entire study, 1940-1974, with respect to studies of religion can be located within one of these four major positions delineated by Elliott in 1940. The primary focus and concern of this present study, and of this writer, is with the second of Elliott's four positions, viz., inclusion of
religion within the program and life of the public school through the academic study of religion in the public school curriculum. The three other positions, especially the first position regarding released-time-weekday religious education programs, will also be treated in the study, but to a much lesser extent than the second position described by Elliott.

In a related article, "Are Weekday Church Schools the Solution?" Dr. Elliott provided insight into his own personal views regarding the relations of public and religious education. First, he stated the seriousness of the situation as it existed in 1940:

There is no question about the seriousness of the problem facing Protestants and, for that matter, Jews and Roman Catholics, for which weekday religious education is advocated as a solution. The teaching of religion has been practically eliminated from publicly supported education in the United States.5

But, to answer the question raised by the title of this article, Elliott does not believe that weekday church schools, even under a cooperative released-time plan with the public schools, is the solution to this problem. Why? Elliott explained:

The difficulty with weekday religious education is that it introduces another atomistic element into the already broken-up experiences of children. Weekday religious education is integrally related neither to their life in the school nor their life in the church. The experience with weekday religious education during the last twenty-five years has made this evident. Since Christian life and experience are
nurtured in the fellowship of a Christian group, we must focus our attention upon the participation and experience of children in the life of the family and the life of the church. Weekday religious education results in the church's not facing its fundamental problem with children, but attempting to solve it by putting them into classes one day a week under public school coercion.6

Therefore, Elliott called for Protestant churches to concentrate on strengthening the religious education programs within the family and within the churches themselves. But he also called for Protestant church leaders to "join with public educators in developing a community sentiment which will enable public educators to introduce religion at the places it integrally belongs."7 Such places, said Elliott, would include classes in social sciences, the teaching of history, and the teaching of literature. Thus, for Elliott, the major problem of the relations of public and religious education could not be solved through weekday church schools. Rather this problem will be solved only through a joint effort between public school and church school educators "by bringing the teaching of religion actually back into the school and by building up a life for children in church and home which is educationally sound and definitely Christian."8 The details of this cooperative effort between public school and church school educators here suggested by Elliott would be the arduous task of educational leaders in the years ahead.
Emerson O. Bradshaw, Secretary of the Department of Christian Education, Chicago Church Federation, agreed with Elliott's call for the inclusion of studies of religion in the public school curriculum. In fact, said Bradshaw,

There is a growing feeling, . . . especially among educators, that religion should be studied in our public schools along with science, art and other such studies. It is believed that in America where there are only three major divisions of religion and where these three are so intimately related historically, a way can be found to include religion in the public school curriculum.

Bradshaw went on to point out that frequently church leaders, both lay and professional, too quickly brushed aside the suggestion of including studies of religion in public school curricula by appealing to the problem of the separation of church and state:

The church to date has hardly taken the trouble to go back into the historical background to learn that there was never a time when religion was officially and legally separated from the public school curriculum; that there are many places where religion is included legally; that in only one state is there legislation shutting religion out of the schools.

The real problem, said Bradshaw, was with the divisive sectarian interests of the churches themselves:

Religion has, therefore, been removed from the schools by default as a result of division and sectarian concern rather than as an outcome of any studied policy arrived at by either the church or the state. The doctrine of the separation of church and state has been brought to bear increasingly without any intelligent consideration as to whether the inclusion of religion in
the public schools is in reality unconstitutional or whether it does jeopardize the principle of religious freedom.11

Thus, Bradshaw called upon church leaders to explore with leaders of public education, openly, honestly, and in unity, the proper place of studies of religion in public school curricula.

In an address delivered at the Annual Meeting of the International Council of Religious Education, February 7, 1940, Luther A. Weigle, Dean of the Divinity School at Yale University, proposed his now famous "common core" approach for including religion within the program and life of the public school. With this approach, the common core of basic beliefs about God and religion on which all faiths—at least the three major faiths in the United States—agree would be included in public school teaching. Weigle thus indicated the kind of common core beliefs which he proposed with this approach:

Underlying all our differences, America has a common religious faith—common not in the sense that everybody shares it, for there are some among us who deny or ignore God; but in the sense that it is common to the three great religious groups—Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish—to which the great majority of American citizens profess to belong. These citizens—Protestant, Catholic, and Jew—worship the one God, Creator of all things and Father of men. They believe that His will has been revealed in the life and literature of the Hebrew people, as this is recorded in the Bible, and that this is discernible in nature about us and in conscience within. They acknowledge the principles of human duty set forth in the Ten Commandments, in the teachings of the Hebrew
prophets, in the Golden Rule, and in the law of love to God and to fellow men.\textsuperscript{12}

Weigle then suggested some general ways in which these common core beliefs might affect the program and life of the public school:

The public schools may and should refer to religion, as occasion arises, naturally and wholesomely, without dogmatism, without bias, and without affectation or strain. They should in all of their teaching manifest reverence for God and respect for religious beliefs. . . . The public schools should aim at the development of a citizenship which is founded upon character; and they may in their efforts to educate for character give due place to religious motives. They can teach that morality is more than custom, public opinion, or legal enactment; they can point to its grounding in the structure of the universe and in the nature of God.\textsuperscript{13}

More specifically, in his pre-Engle/Schempp/Murray days, Weigle suggested that the practice of opening the public school with a brief period of devotion, including the reading of a selection from the Bible and the recital of the Lord's Prayer, should be retained—not so much as a means of keeping religion in education. This "common" period of devotion, said Weigle,

\ldots is an act of reverence, an acknowledgment of the God from whom all life proceeds, and a recognition of the rightful place of religion in human affairs. By a careful selection of materials, making use of Catholic and Jewish as well as Protestant versions of the Scriptures, it may be divested of sectarian elements and be made expressive of our common faith.\textsuperscript{14}

Despite Weigle's enthusiasm for this common core approach, and despite his respected position in American liberal
Protestantism, this approach for the inclusion of religion in public schools was never extensively accepted or adopted—but it was vigorously discussed in the years to come, and it did provide an alternative approach to the complex question of religion and public education.  

Early in the 1940's, serious reservations and questions about including studies of religion in public schools came from a number of sources. One very notable viewpoint in this category was that of George Albert Coe. Active in the Religious Education Association since its founding in 1903, Coe exercised a tremendous influence in the whole liberal period of the religious education movement. He was greatly influenced by John Dewey, and the motif of "the social" and his concern for democracy dominated Coe's thought. From 1909 to 1922, Coe was a Professor of Religious Education at Union Theological Seminary, New York, and from 1922 until his retirement in 1927, he was a Professor of Education at Teachers College, Columbia University. Writing actively until his death in 1951, Coe wrote "What Sort of Religion?" late in 1940 in which he raised several cogent points about studies of religion. Primarily, the focus of Coe's concerns about religion and public education was,  

... not that we should keep religion or any of its great themes out of the schools, but that we should keep democracy in them, and that we should welcome religion into the schools whenever it is
ready to enter by the democratic door instead of attempting to climb up some other way.\textsuperscript{16}

Then, to help clarify his position on this matter, Coe offered the following important democratic "test" for studies of religion in public schools:

If we believe in democracy, should we not subject every proposal for the teaching of religion in the public schools to this test: Does it provide for a democratic approach of both teachers and pupils to the facts and the beliefs involved? Or, does it, on the contrary, assume the conclusion of some pre-democratic procedure, and ask the school to hand over this conclusion to pupils? Does it provide for frankness with respect to shortcomings in the conduct of religious bodies? Or, on the contrary, does it assume that these bodies will be characterized, in such presentation, by their virtues only?\textsuperscript{17}

In a companion article to Coe's article, Hugh Hartshorne, a Professor of Religion at Yale University, in discussing "The Real Issues," agreed with Coe's position about the need for a democratic approach to studies of religion in public schools: "If religion is to be a part of the curriculum it must be treated like other parts. . . . this means an open-minded democratic approach to religious phenomena, historical and contemporary."\textsuperscript{18} This viewpoint, as expressed by Coe and Hartshorne, was another aspect of the concern by religious educators for including studies of religion in public school curricula.

Early in 1941, Laird T. Hites, Editor of Religious Education, issued the following statement on behalf of the Religious Education Association, concerning studies of
religion in public schools:

An unfortunate interpretation of the principle which traditionally has separated the administration of church and state has removed the teaching of religion from public schools—not merely sectarian religion, but practically all religion. As a result, we have witnessed an increasing secularization of American life, and, as some would say, we are rapidly developing a nation of religious, if not spiritual, illiterates.19

To try and help remedy this unfortunate situation of "religious illiteracy" in America, the Religious Education Association pledged,

...to discover how religious education and public education may be so interrelated that the net product might become a spiritually and religiously literate nation. Not ignoring the continuing need to inspire the churches with the educational ideal, we are now definitely seeking to inspire the educational forces of America with the religious ideal.20

This position statement by the Religious Education Association is significant because it was the first major effort in the 1940's by an organized body of religious educators to work at the task of including studies of religion in the public schools. In fact, Laird states that this was a new emphasis for the Religious Education Association, after little organized effort in this direction during the previous decades of this association. So, another breakthrough emerged for advocates of this position.

During the early 1940's, there were many liberal Protestant religious educators who favored the released-time-weekday religious education approach for bridging
relationships between religious education and public education. This was the first major alternative suggested in Harrison Elliott's 1940 definitive article noted earlier in this chapter. Among the avid supporters of this position was Dorothea K. Wolcott, head of weekday religious education programs for the Council of Churches of Greater Cincinnati, Ohio. Ms. Wolcott was especially enthusiastic about the advantages of weekday programs when she wrote in the April-June, 1941, issue of Religious Education:

> While public schools cannot take cognizance of the particular principles of Christianity, a weekday program of religious education can. It can integrate its program with what the child is learning in public school, so he will have an integrated religious education five days a week. It can provide children with a Christian interpretation of all they are studying, and thereby make religion explicit.21

Frances Nall, a teacher in the weekday church schools of Oak Park, Illinois, was even more explicit about the correlation of the curriculum of the public school and the church school, through weekday programs in the churches:

> Two types of correlation are being experimentally tried. One is a close correlation in which the teacher of religion tries to enrich, interpret, and evaluate the public school subject from a religious point of view. The public school teacher gives the secular facts, the religion class teacher adds religious aspects, and interprets the whole in religious terms. The other is an incidental correlation between the religious course and any public school subject, as art, literature, social studies, or science, whenever the two happen to overlap.22
The importance of this correlation between the curriculum of school and church through weekday programs was stated by Ms. Nall:

Through correlating the work of the two teachers, religion may become a part of the fabric of everyday living and not remain something apart from life. When religious significance is given to the public school curriculum, the student is given a zest for study which is most helpful to teacher and student alike.23

Walter M. Howlett, Secretary of the Department of Religious Education of the Greater New York Federation of Churches, in writing about released time programs of religious education in New York City, perhaps best summarized this position for religious educators during the early 1940's:

It is doubtful if released time is the ultimate solution of our problem; it is merely a step in the right direction. . . . The objective of the committee is to reach those especially who were not getting any organized training in religion. We are a long way from the goal, but good progress has been made.24

Other notable programs of weekday religious education as related to public schools during the early 1940's were found in River Forest, Illinois, Oak Park, Illinois, and in North Carolina.25

Early in the 1940's, another major advocate of studies of religion in public schools emerged in the person of William Clayton Bower. A noted Professor of Religious Education at the University of Chicago and a member of the Educational Commission and the Executive Committee of the
International Council of Religious Education, Bower discerned in a 1941 article some serious problems resulting from the exclusion of religion from public education, under the principle of the separation of church and state:

The practical results of the exclusion of religion from the public schools have been disastrous and far reaching. The culture into which the child is initiated has been distorted. Emotional conflicts of serious proportions have been created in the child's life, since what the child is led to believe in his home and church is the most important interest of life is ignored by the principal educational agency of society. More than half of our children from five to seventeen years of age are receiving no systematic religious instruction. Parents, publicists, and the moral leaders of society are deeply concerned over the decay of traditional standards of conduct and of sanctions. While the present moral and cultural chaos is too complex to be attributed to any single factor, there is a deep and growing conviction that the neglect of religion in education has much to do with it.26

Later, in a book published in 1944, Church and State in Education, Bower evaluated a number of different ways that the churches and schools attempted to solve this problem of excluding religion from public education. Weekday religious education programs, growing in popularity, were found by Bower to be inadequate for the needs perceived, because they still leave "the major issues unsolved by separating religion from the rest of education; by perpetuating, even in mitigated form, the sectarianism of religion; and by failing to reach the entire school population."27 Rather, the program which Bower detailed in this
book as the best solution to this problem centered around a functional approach. Bower regarded both religion and education as functions of the community. Thus, his program was essentially one of cooperation of school, church, and family—the primary agencies concerned with the growth, development, and education of children and youth. Each agency had its specific function to perform. In the school, the children and youth would learn the content of religion and would make use of religious values in their daily lives. This religion, said Bower, unlike that taught in early American schools, would not be sectarian. The church, then, in cooperation with the family, could devote its energies to making explicit the religious values and cultivating in the children and youth habits of worship and a genuinely religious life. As Bower concluded about this functional approach:

There is imperative need . . . that the base of education in religion, like that of all other forms of education, shall be drawn in the total life of the community. Around this new center of education it becomes the responsibility of the whole community to sit down before the needs of its children and young people, including their religious needs, and ask what it is that each agency has to contribute to a comprehensive and coordinated program of education for the whole self and for the whole community.28

Specifically, Bower advocated that the major function of the school in this cooperative program of education in religion was to teach the content of religion in the regular public school curriculum, including religion as a field of
knowledge comparable with the fields of literature, natural science, history, the social sciences, and the arts. This inclusion of religion in public school curriculum was necessary and possible, asserted Bower, because,

... religious behavior is as amenable to observation, description, analysis, and appraisal as any other form of human behavior. It has as rich a subject matter as any other field of knowledge dealt with in the school curriculum. On every ground, therefore, there is as much reason for making religion a field of special study as there is for making science, literature, history, philosophy, and the arts fields of special study.29

Early in 1942, Dr. Conrad A. Hauser, Director of the Department of Field Work of the Board of Christian Education and Publication, the Evangelical and Reformed Church, made an even stronger appeal than Bower's for an intensive effort to include studies of religion in public schools. Hauser first noted that a policy of "hands off" the public schools in this matter had been adopted as an expediency measure a century ago, and that this policy had become a stumbling block in the way of the spiritual life of the nation. In fact, Hauser said, the extreme secularization of public education at the expense of any concern for religion in education was the result of this "hands off" policy. This situation, warned Hauser, was a dangerous one for America:

If one half of our population has become spiritually illiterate and paganized within a single century, how long will it take for America to be totally paganized? ... Either we much admit
that religion has no place in education, or we must find the proper place for it and the legal way of handling the issue cooperatively.  

Hauser believed that the solutions proposed to this problem of religious illiteracy through released time, dismissed time, and other such programs were of little real significance. Rather, he said, what needed to be developed was an adequate system of education which would insist "that religion of a nonsectarian nature be taught in the public school by public school teachers as qualified to teach religion through training in the state teacher's college as they are to teach any of the other branches." This last point by Hauser, concerning the training of teachers for studies of religion in public schools, was a new, important theme during this period, which would receive much greater attention in the years ahead. But Hauser's call to action, early in the 1940's, was clear and strong:

We conclude by repeating that as the forces of religion--Jewish, Catholic, and Protestant--face their duty toward the new world, no fact is more disturbing and challenging than that--Every other boy and girl is spiritually illiterate. . . . Therefore, instead of "hands off the public school," the challenge today to church school and public school leaders alike is All shoulders to the wheel!"  

Nevertheless, during the early 1940's not all religious educators supported the position of including studies of religion in public school curricula. For example, Dayton T. Yoder, Minister of the First Unitarian Society of Spokane, Washington, believed that attempts to
teach nonsectarian religion in public schools would really result in the teaching of orthodox Christianity in these schools. Sectarian rivalries would develop within this teaching, as various denominations would compete for this part of the public school curriculum. Thus, feelings of disunity—counter to the democratic principles which public schools attempt to foster through feelings of unity among the students who attend them—would be fostered among the public school students. Furthermore, said Yoder,

Children tend to be more partisan than their elders, and denominational loyalties come to light as elements of religious attitudes under the stimulus of religious education during school time. Religion thus becomes a barrier rather than an aid to democracy.33

This intrusion of religious teachings into the public schools, because of its divisiveness, Yoder concluded, would impose an undue mental and emotional conflict upon the students subjected to such teachings.

Then, in 1944, Conrad Henry Moehlman, James B. Colgate Professor of the History of Christianity at the Colgate-Rochester Divinity School, offered a vigorous protest against studies of religion in public schools, in his book, School and Church: The American Way. In this book, Moehlman argued that there were many cogent grounds for rejecting attempts to reintroduce religious teaching into public schools. Opposing any breaking down of the "wall of separation" between church and state, Moehlman particularly
opposed the reintroduction of formal study of the Bible in public schools. He said sharply: "A good way to depreciate religion in the United States would be to reintroduce formal Bible study into the curriculum, for it would turn the existing educational unity into sectarian divisiveness." In American Protestant sectarianism alone, Moehlman argued, over two hundred and fifty sects would quarrel over any religious program to be imposed upon public education. Furthermore, he indicated a variety of difficulties in understanding the Bible, with a multitude of approaches to Biblical interpretation, including use of the controversial historical-critical method. And the use of this scientific method would lead to major problems in school-church relations:

The American environment endorses the scientific approach to the problem of the Bible. No dogmatic reconstruction of the historical facts would long be tolerated. But the historical study of the Bible in day school would shortly make the dogmatic approach in Sunday School intolerable.

Finally, said Moehlman, American Protestantism should not attempt to impose formal religious teaching in public education because it would mean self-destruction:

Religious education is in decline. To pass it over to public education would signify its complete cancellation. . . . For the churches to abandon religious education to the day schools would be suicidal.

Obviously, in his intense opposition to studies of religion in public schools, Moehlman fearfully envisioned a more
elaborate and more extensive program of religious education in the public schools than did many other of his contemporaries—including Elliott, Bower, and Hauser, noted earlier in this chapter.

During the mid-1940's, Erwin L. Shaver, director of weekday religious education for the International Council of Religious Education, emerged as the leading representative and advocate of released-time-weekday programs of religious instruction related to the public schools. Early in 1946, during the legal struggle over the released time case in Champaign, Illinois—but prior to the final decision by the U.S. Supreme Court—Shaver wrote enthusiastically about the movement for weekday religious education in relation to the public schools:

It is a new plan, whereby religious groups and public schools seek to cooperate so that religion may become a part of the child's everyday education. Therefore, it is a type of educational programming for which we have no direct precedent, although there are several somewhat related programs and precedents, such as Bible reading in the public schools, high school credit for Bible study and the excusing of children on religious holy days and festivals and for catechetical instruction. 37

Then, very strongly, Shaver appealed:

We must prove the right of this plan to a place in the educational structure of American life on the basis of existing laws or, failing this, see that specific legislation is passed to insure its legality. . . . the weekday program deserves a permanent place in our total program of religious education. 38
Throughout the next twenty years, Shaver maintained this type of vigorous advocacy and leadership for weekday religious education in relation to the public schools.

At the same time during the mid-1940's, strong support in favor of academic studies of religion in public school curricula was building. For example, Dr. J. Paul Williams, Professor of Religion at Mt. Holyoke College, Massachusetts, offered the following excellent statement concerning the descriptive teaching of religion in public schools:

The public schools also can aid in helping individuals achieve a worthy religious faith. They can do for religion what they do for politics—treat it descriptively. Religion could be taught descriptively, on school time, in non-sectarian classes, by teachers employed by the public—teachers who make a studied effort to do no more than describe religion. Such teaching of religion is legal almost uniformly in the United States; for, generally, the law prohibits not the teaching of religion but the teaching of sectarianism.39

Williams also believed that this type of descriptive teaching of religion was a better device than sectarian classes taught on time released by the public schools. In fact, Williams asserted that the descriptive teaching of religion in the public schools—providing students with nonsectarian religious information—would also benefit the sectarian educational efforts of America's church and synagogue schools: "... if their schools could build sectarian education on a solid foundation of factual knowledge
supplied by the public schools, there would be much more chance that the churches could supply significant educational experiences."⁴⁰

In a similar nature, Charles Clayton Morrison, founder and editor of the prestigious journal of American religious life and thought, *The Christian Century*, challenged church and educational leaders to an active role in developing a plan for including studies of religion in public schools. Writing in the April 17, 1946, issue of *The Christian Century*, Morrison said:

A way must therefore be found to incorporate the teaching of religion in the public school system, as an integral part of its curriculum, in accordance with modern educational theory, if the downward curve of our culture toward religious illiteracy and secularism is to be arrested. Such a way, I believe, can be found. Its difficulty is, in large part, due to an inherited taboo. If we approach it in light of modern pedagogical theory and method, and with fresh and open minds, the taboo can be dispelled. . . . The time has come to break the taboo against religion in general education. If the churches are not able to show how this absurd interdiction can be broken, let the teaching profession challenge them by showing how it can be done.⁴¹

This challenge by Morrison, especially directed toward Protestants, was to be dealt with in a variety of ways in the ensuing years.

In February, 1947, the United States Supreme Court rendered its 5-4 decision in the *Everson v. Board of Education* case. Based primarily on the "child benefit theory," the Supreme Court ruled in this decision that parochial via
busing was constitutional. But this decision also contained the "Everson dicta," a doctrine which stressed the necessity of not breaching the "wall of separation" between church and state, erected by the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution. This strong, unequivocable language concerning the "high and impregnable" wall between church and state appeared to set the pattern for relationships between religion and public education for the present and the immediate future. Nevertheless, very shortly new efforts were being explored to include studies of religion in public school curricula.

One major effort to promote studies of religion in public schools came in 1947 with the publication of a report by the Committee on Religion and Education of the American Council on Education. This committee, composed of both public school educators and religious educators, was chaired by Dr. F. Ernest Johnson, Professor of Education at Teachers College, Columbia University. This extensive report was published in its entirety, with the evaluations of fifteen persons, in the May-June, 1947, issue of Religious Education. The report, titled, "The Relation of Religion to Public Education--The Basic Principles," covered many different aspects of relationships between religion and public education, but primarily the report focused on the inclusion of academic studies of religion in public schools. Noting its concern over an increasing
secularization of American education, combined with an increasing religious illiteracy in America, the Committee offered its basic thesis of the report:

Holding to the principle of the separation of church and state in America, we nevertheless deplore what we consider a strained application of that principle to our school system. We are unable to believe that a school which accepts responsibility for bringing its students into full possession of their cultural heritage can be considered to have performed its task if it leaves them without a knowledge of the role of religion in our history, its relation to other phases of the culture, and the ways in which the religious life of the American community is expressed. An educated person cannot be religiously illiterate [emphasis added].

The Committee rejected the common core approach for solving this problem of religious illiteracy (suggested earlier in the decade by Luther A. Weigle), and also indicated that weekday religious education was peripheral to the subject of this report. Rather, the Committee believed that the basic responsibility of public schools in relation to religion was to facilitate intelligent contact with religion as it has developed in American culture and among American institutions. This fundamental learning experience with religion would include a basic minimum of "learning about" religion. Actual possibilities for such contact with religion within the public schools could come, said the Committee, through regular existing social studies and English literature curricula. In terms of curriculum theory, the Committee thus recommended "that a total
orientation toward religion as part of the culture is better accomplished if religion is not abstracted from those fields of study, however designated in the curriculum, of which it is a part because religion is inseparably bound up with the culture as a whole, and to confine the teaching of religion to separate "religious courses" would tend toward the kind of secularization they argued against--i.e., the splitting-off of religion from the rest of life.

Fundamental to these proposals by the Committee was an interpretation of "teaching" which distinguished it from "indoctrination," in the ordinary sense of that word:

We have recognized that religious indoctrination is widely practiced in our churches and synagogues. It is their right to practice it if they are so disposed. But in order to introduce the study of religion into the public schools, the teaching process must be understood in a different sense, the sense in which it is commonly used today in application to all study of controversial subjects about which reasonable people differ. We have frequently used the phrase "the study of religion" instead of "teaching religion" because the latter so commonly implies indoctrination.

This distinction of the Committee between "the study of religion" and "teaching religion" is a significant and helpful distinction for advocates of studies of religion in the public schools. Thus, this distinction has been employed in the present study for clarity and for emphasis.

Another very important aspect of this Committee's report in 1947 was its emphasis upon the importance of
teacher education in its proposals for the study of religion in public schools. Acknowledging two problems in the process of training teachers for studies of religion—viz., the fact that there are large numbers of teachers who are not adequately informed in matters of religion and who lack interest in the study of religion, and, secondly, the fact that teachers with deep religious convictions are tempted to teach religion along sectarian lines—the Committee called for intensive efforts to provide adequate preparation for teachers of studies of religion, through both pre-service and in-service teacher education programs—particularly the latter:

... probably most of the teachers thus employed would need further training in order to fit into the kind of program we have sketched, for it cannot be too strongly emphasized that this program is not something to be added on to the school curriculum, but rather something to be integrated with it. By and large, the task we have in mind ... is one for which the teacher-education institutions of the country will have to prepare the larger part of the leadership if the task is to be done.45

The importance of the Committee's concern for teacher education and studies of religion was remarkable. Their pioneering concerns in this area are still a major matter in the development today of studies of religion in public schools.

Finally, perhaps the conclusion of the Committee best summarized its basic position with respect to studies of religion in public schools:
The intensive cultivation of religion is, and always has been, the function of religious institutions. To create an awareness of its importance is a responsibility of public education. In creating such an awareness the school is but rounding out its educational task, which culminates in the building of durable convictions about the meaning of life and personal commitments based upon them.

... Let us abate none of our enthusiasm for scientific knowledge and useful skills, but let us remember that only a strong faith that can resolve the perplexities of life and a lasting commitment to high purposes will make education complete [emphasis added].

The significance of this report in 1947 by the Committee on Religion and Education of the American Council on Education must be clearly emphasized. It provided a major position statement by a very respected organization advocating studies of religion in public school curricula. The report represented a cooperative effort on this important yet complex matter by both public school and religious educators. The report signaled the beginning of several major, organized efforts by various groups and associations to plan and attempt to implement programs of studies of religion. Finally, this report, as might be expected, elicited in the following years numerous responses from religious educators with respect to studies of religion in public schools.

Some immediate evaluations of the Committee's report were presented in the May-June, 1947, issue of Religious Education. George Albert Coe, Professor Emeritus of Religious Education, Union Theological Seminary, New
York, in his usual concern for the democratic and social aspects of education, supported the Committee's report, but called for even more:

Not only am I for much more religion in the curriculum than the report asks for; I believe that much more can be put there. It is practicable to increase pupils' acquaintance with known acts of ethical love; also with known acts that contradict or defeat love. . . . This is the only way now open or likely to open for increasing the appreciation of religion through the school curriculum. It will lead ultimately . . . to recognition of really democratic relations of person to person as religious relations.47

Robert Ulich, Professor of Education, Graduate School of Education, Harvard University, with a very strong interest in the history of religious education,48 noted the potential stimulus of this report for positive action:

. . . we must hope that it arouses the attention and perhaps also the controversy which will make people aware of the responsibility which education has in relating youth to one of the great problems of our civilization. Nothing is worse than complacency or indifference. Only through great challenges can men in their majority be motivated to think and act. The Committee on Religion and Education is the beginning of such a challenge within the ranks of American educators.49

Samuel P. Franklin, Dean of Education at the University of Pittsburgh and President-elect of the Religious Education Association, called for an open, experimental attitude in working out the best solution to the problem of the relation of religion to public education:

. . . the answer in regard to many of its elements lies in the future only as we are willing to experiment and learn as we go. This experiment is
already under way in this country on a large scale. This report, I believe, leaves this way open and challenges us to venture in it. 50

In his evaluation of this 1947 report, William Clayton Bower, Professor Emeritus of Religious Education at the University of Chicago, again emphasized the important distinction between "teaching" religion and the "study" of religion:

Teaching religion assumes a definite theological content and tends to result in the reduction of content to a sterile irreducible minimum on the one hand or to propagandist sectarian use on the other. The study of religion makes it a subject of inquiry by the use of the same objective methods employed in history, literature, the natural and social sciences, and the arts.51

Thus, with this latter approach, said Bower, "religion can be dealt with in its full-bodied content, its variant and developing historical forms, and its different interpretations by the several religious groups, without the slightest trace of sectarianism or propaganda."52 Then, Bower offered the following strong argument in favor of an interdisciplinary, interdepartmental approach to studies of religion in public school curricula:

. . . religion as a subject of study in the curriculum should be approached as an aspect of the several fields of study rather than through a department of religion. Perhaps more than any other subject, religion cuts across all departmental boundaries. Much as other subjects suffer from the present departmentalization of education, religion by its nature as a comprehending experience suffers most when set off from its sustaining sources in every area of man's intellectual and practical concern.53
Finally, an evaluation of this 1947 report was given by Ernest J. Chave, Head of the Department of Religious Education at the Divinity School of the University of Chicago. Chave, noted during the 1940's and 1950's for his development of a functional approach to religious education, indicated what he believed to be several positive values in the report, and then turned to several helpful, critical comments. For one thing, Chave said that "it is a serious question whether schools are the places to begin this objective study of religion, and to look for outcomes which may influence conduct through giving 'religion' more attention in cultural studies." Rather, Chave suggested, informal adult groups were probably the most fruitful possibilities to begin the objective study of religion—especially as implemented through parent groups in local churches. More importantly, Chave wrote, there will be great difficulty in getting objective study of religion in public schools, even when the values of such study are recognized, primarily because "it will be extremely difficult to develop an atmosphere of freedom, and to secure teachers who can use freedom to advantage." Other such critical comments related to this 1947 report would be raised in the years ahead by other American religious educators.

In another very important document of 1947, the Committee of the Study of Christian Education, established
by the International Council of Religious Education, published a lengthy report in a book edited by Paul H. Vieth, Chairman of the Committee, titled *The Church and Christian Education*. In the section of the report on religion and public education, this impressive group of religious educators made the following important "declaration of free inquiry" for studies of religion in public schools:

> Such subject matter must be studies with integrity and with complete fidelity to the principles of free inquiry. The fact that religion holds an exalted place in our thought and life must not be made the ground of a claim that it is privileged subject matter with respect to objective inquiry. This need hamper the study of a religious classic no more than it hampers the study of the Declaration of Independence or the Mayflower Compact, which contain profound religious affirmations. Nor need the requirement of free and honest inquiry be a limitation in the study of religious institutions any more than in the study of political and economic groups with their sharply conflicting philosophies. Here, as always, respect for persons and for freedom of conscience is of the essence. Where it obtains, education can proceed unhampered. Where it is lacking, no education worthy of the name is possible.57

Through position statements such as these, interest and support for academic studies of religion in public school curricula continued to grow during the late 1940's.

In the meantime, support continued for the other major alternative in dealing with religion and public education, viz., released-time-weekday religious education programs in connection with the public schools. Early in 1948, in an article, "The Legal Situation in Weekday Religious Education," Erwin L. Shaver (noted earlier in this
chapter) prophetically anticipated the possible outcomes of the McCollum v. Board of Education case pending before the U.S. Supreme Court, concerning released time programs of religious education. In March, 1948, the Supreme Court announced its 8-1 decision, ruling that releasing public school pupils during school hours to receive religious instruction held in public school classrooms violated the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution. Some religious educators were fearful that this decision by the Supreme Court meant the end to this approach for religious education. But, apparently, this result did not occur. In fact, changes, adjustments, and adaptations were made as necessary in many weekday programs, to the favorable extent that Shaver claimed in an early 1949 article concerning this movement:

The present situation in weekday religious education is not only strengthening the movement itself but it is stimulating other related proposals and projects for a greater emphasis upon education in religion, both through the church and through the public school.

In similar ways, other religious educators agreed with Shaver's assessment of the good health of the weekday religious education movement by the end of the 1940's.

Another reaction to the Supreme Court's 1948 McCollum decision was expressed in an editorial in the April 28, 1948, issue of The Christian Century, "Public Schools Can Teach Religion!":
The extent to which the device known as "released time" was spreading throughout the country before the Supreme Court declared it unconstitutional was symptomatic of a deep concern about the secularization of our culture. It represented the belief that religion rightly belongs in the general educational process. The court's decision has been interpreted as a blow to any possible program of teaching religion in the public schools. This we believe is an erroneous interpretation. What the court did was to forbid the church to teach religion in the public schools. It did not forbid the public school itself to teach religion [emphasis added].

Despite the absence here of the helpful distinction between "teaching religion" and "the study of religion" made earlier in the 1947 American Council on Education report, this editorial was helpful in restating the position of many religious educators with respect to studies of religion in public schools.

Just before the end of this decade, in February, 1949, at its Annual Meeting in Columbus, Ohio, the International Council of Religious Education adopted statements of policy for weekday religious education and for religion and public education. These semi-official declarations of Protestant policies were important position statements for many religious educators on these two approaches, as well as serving as important springboards for discussion during the early 1950's. Furthermore, these two policy statements by the International Council of Religious Education in 1949 serve as a useful summary of these two major positions developed during the 1940's.
Erwin L. Shaver, of the International Council of Religious Education (ICRE) staff, summarized the weekday religious education program as follows:

It is church-centered in organization, administration and support. It emphasizes the basic principle that religious growth and commitment come primarily through a fellowship group—the church. The Supreme Member of this group is God—which fact therefore establishes its teaching program upon certain 'eternal verities.'

Similarly, the ICRE policy statement regarding religion and public education also presupposed a strong theistic, nearly Judaeo-Christian viewpoint, which raised considerable discussion during the early 1950's. The most pertinent section of this statement asserted:

Faith in God, the God of the Old and New Testaments, and faith in free men as His responsible creations have inspired our life and history from the early days of the nation and in its earlier Colonial history. . . . As far as the schools can, in view of the religious diversity of our people, judicial opinions, and our American traditions, we expect it to teach this common religious tradition as the only adequate basis for the life of the school and the personal lives of teachers, students, and citizens in a free and responsible democracy.

Concerning this policy statement, Shaver summarized:

The responsibility for including in public education the religious interpretation of life rests primarily with the public school, since it has dedicated itself to a complete education of America's children. The now accepted philosophy of education requires a unitary, rather than a fragmentary approach to learning, which means that the teaching of any and all subjects demands proportionate attention to their religious aspects. The State, as well as the individual and the Church, is "under God." This fact and the facts of America's history, governmental acts and social
practices commit the American public educational system to a theistic approach to teaching [emphasis added].

As might be expected, this conclusion by Shaver would be challenged in the immediately following years.

In relation to his summaries of these two 1949 policy statements by the ICRE, Erwin L. Shaver, late in 1949, helpfully posited the following, still unanswered, important questions for religious educators to deal with in the next decade, as related to the unsettled situation with regard to religion and the public schools:

1. Why must a religiously-minded parent, who chooses to send his child to a public school, be thereby penalized by having religion eliminated from his child's regular school day, while the parent of a private or parochial school child may have his child taught religion within a day of the same number of hours?

2. Is religion to be the only controversial subject to be excluded from the public school curriculum, at a time when modern education claims its willingness and its ability to face all controversial subjects in the scientific and democratic spirit?

3. Can religion be worth while, if it has no cutting edge, if it is to be confined to the "lowest common denominator," if it has no sectarian character? Must we not expect and welcome variety and difference in religion, as we do in politics with its various parties and in economics with its several "schools"?

4. Is America shifting its national policy away from one of "encouraging religion," as our Founding Fathers intended and stated it, toward one of "lofty neutrality," not merely between various religions, but between religion and non-religion?

Finally, the following words of Dr. Lawrence C. Little, Professor of Religious Education at the University
of Pittsburgh, late in 1949, provide a concise summary and a poignant conclusion for this chapter on the pioneering 1940's:

The relation of religion to American public education is a problem of the greatest magnitude. It has been a matter of concern throughout most of our educational history but increasingly so during the past decade. It has been the occasion for innumerable conferences and discussions and has called forth a vast flood of literature centering attention upon it. There is every reason to believe that it will continue to demand consideration for many years to come.68

Indeed, Dr. Lawrence, the 1950's demanded significant consideration of this problem—through many more conferences, discussions, policy statements by concerned groups, and a continuing flood of literature centering upon studies of religion in public schools. Therefore, to the views of American liberal Protestant religious educators, 1950-1959, with respect to studies of religion in public schools, let us now turn our attention in the next chapter.
Notes to CHAPTER III

1 Harrison S. Elliott, "The Place of Religion in Elementary and Secondary Education," Religious Education, XXXV (October-December, 1940), 203-204.

2 Ibid., 204.

3 Ibid.

4 Ibid.


6 Ibid., 9.

7 Ibid., 40.

8 Ibid.

9 Emerson O. Bradshaw, "Can Religion Be Taught in Our Public Schools?" Religious Education, XXXV (January-February, 1940), 34-35.

10 Ibid., 37.

11 Ibid., 37-38.


13 Ibid., 72.

14 Ibid., 72-73.


17 Ibid., 13-14.


20 Ibid.


22 Frances Nall, "Correlating the Curriculum of Church and School," Religious Education, XXXVII (September–October, 1942), 287.

23 Ibid.


27 Ibid., p. 94.

28 Ibid., pp. 63–64.

29 Ibid., 102–103.

30 Ibid., 104.


35. Ibid., p. 131.

36. Ibid.


38. Ibid., 7, 15.


40. Ibid.


43. Ibid., 151.

44. Ibid., 161.

45. Ibid., 152.

46. Ibid., 163.


Ibid.

Ibid.

Ibid.


Ibid., 190.


See also the very helpful article on this matter of language clarity in discussions of religion and public education by Samuel P. Franklin, "The Language of the Problem," Religious Education, XLII (July-August, 1948), 193-197.


CHAPTER IV

THE DECADE, 1950-1959

The Evolving Years

Quite early in this decade, Dr. J. Paul Williams, Professor of Religion at Mt. Holyoke College, Massachusetts, provided a very helpful analysis of "The Relation of Religion and Public Education." Specifically, Williams identified six major options that had been suggested by early 1950 for allocating responsibility for religious teaching as related to public education. The six live options discussed by Williams were these:

1. Keep things as they are; i.e., do not make religion a part of the public school curriculum. This option was maintained by a variety of persons for a variety of reasons: some persons were afraid that the members of some one church might get control of the school and run it in their own interest; some persons believed that the public school in America already had a Protestant bias, and they favored this bias; other persons, opposed on principle to the traditional religions, believed that the present situation was unfavorable to the continuance of the traditional religions, and they rejoiced; still other persons asserted that
the teaching of religion should be the concern of homes and churches, not public schools—and they, too, favored this first option of keeping things as they were.

2. Indoctrinate nonsectarian spiritual values; i.e., the teaching of the basic moral obligations in the public schools—such as honesty, generosity, bravery, the Bill of Rights, the rights of minorities and the majority, and the responsibilities of living in a democracy. Sometimes these nonsectarian values were called "spiritual," sometimes "ethical," and at other times "democratic."

3. Teach religion objectively; i.e., describing the religions, introducing students to religion as one major aspect of the whole culture, presenting the truth about religions without personal bias. This option was a major one advanced early in the 1940's, thus continued here in the 1950's.

4. Indoctrinate the core of the traditional religions; i.e., the common core of beliefs held by the overwhelming majority of Americans should be indoctrinated at public expense. Persons favoring this option contended that 90 percent of Americans belonged to the three major faiths—Judaism, Roman Catholicism, and Protestantism. This option was similar to the common core position espoused by Luther A. Weigle and others during the 1940's.

5. Public support of schools controlled by the church; i.e., the state should provide the schools but turn their
operation over to the churches. This option was especially favored by many Roman Catholics during the early 1950's.

6. Weekday religious instruction on released time; i.e., release students from their public schools to attend religious instruction at their religious meeting places, sometime during the regular weekday public school hours. As was noted in Chapter III, a variety of forms of this option were tried during the 1940's, with some legal problems involved. Also, during the 1940's, Erwin L. Shaver became the leading exponent of this option, through his devoted work with the influential ICRE.

Having clearly identified these six options as projections of things to come during the 1950's with respect to allocating responsibility for religious teaching as related to public education, Williams then personally concluded that the effective teaching of religion required a variegated approach—involving homes, church schools, and public schools:

Surely it is probable that no effective solution of the problem of teaching to the general public anything as subtle and complex as religion—in the sense of life orientation—can be found apart from the utilization of the resources of many institutions. . . . Education in spiritual values is the most important education a child ever gets. Only by bringing all our educational skill and the resources of all our institutions to bear on the problem can we hope to preserve liberty of personal belief, secure depth of religious experience, and ensure religious faith in the democratic ideal. 2
Even if American liberal Protestant religious educators could not agree with Williams' conclusion, they surely would be aided during the 1950's by his careful analysis of the options suggested with respect to studies of religion as related to public schools.

At about the same time, in 1950, Erwin L. Shaver, Director of Weekday Religious Education for the ICRE since 1942, stated some basic principles concerning this option of weekday religious instruction on released time. For the first time, a clear, concise, helpful description of the weekday church school was posited:

A weekday church school is a school set up by the churches singly or in co-operation, in which the attending pupils are excused from their usual public school program, at the written request of parents, to go to a church or other building to receive religious education.3

The five basic principles noted by Shaver, upon which weekday church schools are based, help to further clarify this option for studies of religion as related to public schools:

1. Education in religion must take place on the weekday as well as on Sunday. (2) Education in religion must be included in the everyday school program of the child and be related to his other learnings and experiences as closely as possible. (3) The contents and procedures used in teaching religion must be educationally acceptable. (4) The teachers employed must be as well trained professionally as those who teach the child in his other areas of learning. (5) The churches of all faiths can work together in conducting such an enterprise, and most of them can go so far as to carry on a common teaching program.4
Then, in his own conclusion, Shaver very strongly supported these programs of religious education on the weekday, sponsored and supported by the churches, related to the pupil's everyday study program, and included in the time customarily set aside for his/her education:

. . . the concept of teaching religion on the weekday, with serious intent and through the use of the best educational methods, is here to stay. . . .

Through the weekday church-school movement the public school has been challenged to give a large place to religion in its program and will respond to the challenge. Americans—Protestants and those of other faiths alike—have been awakened by the weekday church-school movement to the seriousness of a national and world situation which can be remedied only by the seven-days-a-week teaching of the laws of God.

Whether or not other religious educators would agree with Shaver's personal conclusion concerning weekday religious education programs, certainly he helped greatly to clarify this option early in the 1950's, and he remained the acknowledged leader for this option throughout this decade.

Just before the end of 1950, on November 28-December 1, in Cleveland, Ohio, an event of utmost significance occurred in the history of American Christianity—an event that would influence American liberal Protestant religious educators for many generations to follow. This momentous event was the Constituting Convention of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America—hereinafter referred to as the NCC. This great milestone of ecumenical progress in the history
of the Christian churches of America merged together the individual identities, traditions, and activities of eight interdenominational agencies: the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, the Foreign Missions Conference of North America, the Home Missions Council of North America, the International Council of Religious Education, the Missionary Education Movement, the National Protestant Council of Higher Education, the United Council of Church Women, and the United Stewardship Council. In addition, the charter membership of the NCC consisted of twenty-five Protestant and four Orthodox churches. From these thirty-seven groups—the eight interdenominational agencies and the twenty-nine denominations—one powerful body for the attainment of spiritual goals in America was consummated: the National Council of Churches. For purposes of this present study, let it be especially noted here that the influential ICRE, in independent existence since 1922, became the Division of Christian Education of the newly formed NCC. Thus, it was through this division in particular, and the NCC in general, that the views of many religious educators would be expressed in the following years with respect to studies of religion in public schools. Within this decade, a unique Department of Religion and Public Education would be established by the NCC.

Early in the 1950's, a mounting concern over the lack of moral and spiritual values in public education
climaxed. Various agencies had investigated this concern, and several programs were started to attempt to deal with this problem. For some persons, the answer to this problem was to be found in the second option delineated earlier in this chapter by Professor Williams: indoctrinate non-sectarian spiritual values in the public schools—an option also suggested for allocating responsibility for religious teaching as related to public education. Of the several programs developed in this area, the Kentucky program of "Moral and Spiritual Values in Education" was one of the earliest. William Clayton Bower, Professor Emeritus of Religious Education at the University of Chicago, became a part-time professor at the University of Kentucky and provided a first-hand report on this program early in 1951, in Religious Education. Bower, in stating one of the basic principles of this program, provided a basic, general definition of moral and spiritual education:

Moral and spiritual education is defined as that phase of the school program which seeks to help growing persons to achieve an understanding of their relations to nature and society, to discover the moral and spiritual nature of these relations and the moral obligation involved in them in light of the growing moral and spiritual values which man has tested through centuries of living and which are recorded in his cultural traditions, to learn to control their conduct by these standards, and to achieve a philosophy of life.  

Later in 1951, the National Education Association would elaborate and build more specifically upon this general
definition of moral and spiritual values as related to public education.

In February, 1951, the Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association of the United States issued its long-awaited, basic report, *Moral and Spiritual Values in the Public Schools*. This report was three years in the making, and represented much discussion and critical thinking on the part of many people, concerning the problem of moral and spiritual values in America's public schools. William G. Carr, Commission Secretary, drafted this document, and in an article in *Religious Education*, he summarized the major principles of this 100-page report, of which three aspects will be noted here. First, the report listed ten "guiding" moral and spiritual values, on which Americans agree, which should be dealt with explicitly in the public schools. These ten basic moral and spiritual values are summarized as follows: (1) The supreme importance of the individual personality—the *basic value*; (2) Moral responsibility; (3) Institutions as the servants of men; (4) Common consent; (5) Devotion to truth; (6) Respect for excellence; (7) Moral equality; (8) Brotherhood; (9) Pursuit of happiness; (10) Spiritual enrichment. Although these ten basic values are rather vague at some points, they do supplement the general definition of moral and spiritual education suggested above by William Clayton Bower, as related to the Kentucky program in this area.
Second, this National Education Association (NEA) report emphasized that the teaching of values—especially the ten basic values—should permeate the entire educational process. As Carr commented:

Character cannot be taught by simply scheduling so many minutes a day to the task. Values are best incorporated into conduct by example, experience, and observation. Such experiences must be repeated in a variety of situations to establish habits, rooted in intellectual understanding, and linked to emotional responses to provide the dynamic for action.10

Third, and of utmost importance for this present study, this 1951 NEA report on moral and spiritual values in the public schools included a significant section which advocated that "The Public Schools Can and Should Teach about Religion." Although this matter was not the primary concern of the report, it is significant that this section was included in the document. Because of its importance, the section is quoted here at length:

The public school can teach objectively about religion without advocating or teaching any religious creed. To omit from the classroom all references to religion and the institutions of religion is to neglect an important part of American life. Knowledge about religion is essential for a full understanding of our culture, literature, art, history, and current affairs.

That religious beliefs are controversial is not an adequate reason for excluding teaching about religion from the public schools. Economic and social questions are taught and studied in the schools on the very sensible theory that students need to know the issues being faced and to get practice in forming sound judgments. Teaching about religion should be approached in the same spirit. General guides on the teaching of all controversial issues may be helpful. If need be,
teachers should be provided with special help and information to equip them to teach objectively in this area.

Although the public schools cannot teach denominational beliefs, they can and should teach much useful information about the religious faiths, the important part they have played in establishing the moral and spiritual values of American life, and their role in the history of mankind. . . . The unity of our own country, our understanding of the other nations of the world, and respect for the rich religious traditions of all humanity would be enhanced by instruction about religion in the public schools.11

The fact that this strong position in favor of the academic study of religion in public schools was taken by the influential Commission of the NEA—a secular education association—appeared to encourage and stimulate religious educators about this very important yet complex issue.

In the July-August, 1951, issue of Religious Education, several religious educators presented their evaluations of the NEA report, Moral and Spiritual Values in the Public Schools. F. Ernest Johnson, now with the Central Department of Research and Survey of the NCC, in New York City, strongly supported the report. He was especially enthusiastic about the section quoted above at length, "The Public Schools Can and Should Teach about Religion," as he called this "one of the most impressive statements we have seen concerning the place of religion in public education."12 William Clayton Bower also strongly supported this report, especially on two key points:
From this evaluator's point of view, the Commission is pre-eminently on sound ground in recommending that a program for developing moral and spiritual values should permeate the entire educational process and be integral to it rather than be undertaken through special courses in character traits or through dependence upon the illusion that knowledge about values can be a substitute for the actual experiencing of them.13

On the matter of studies of religion in public schools,

Bower affirmed:

• • • the Commission, in this reviewer's opinion, correctly suggests that the schools can and should include an objective study of religion as it appears as an aspect of culture and community life on precisely the same basis as the school deals with other aspects of culture and personal and social behavior.14

Then, very precisely, as he had done earlier in the 1940's, Bower again made a careful, necessary distinction, which the NEA report omitted:

The differentiation between the study of religion and the teaching of religion is of fundamental importance, since the teaching of religion tends to connote the exposition and inculcation of a particular theological or ecclesiastical interpretation of religion, whereas the study of religion rests upon the basis of inquiry and seeks an understanding and appreciation of religion in its universal aspects as a fundamental phase of man's interaction with his natural, social, and cosmic world and as inseparable from his historic culture.15

For Bower and other religious educators, and for us today, it would seem, this distinction needs to be kept clearly and sharply in focus as we continue to discuss the viable relationship between religion and public education in America.
Further support for this NEA report came from Dr. Paul Vieth, Horace Bushnell Professor of Christian Nurture at the Divinity School, Yale University:

It is an epoch-making statement, and if taken seriously by the schools, and acted upon, it will have a profound influence on the character of our public schools. It deals with difficult issues, and does so without fear or evasion. If these issues are in many cases left unresolved, it is at least to the credit of the Commission that they have been brought into the open.\(^{16}\)

Then, in a helpful way, Vieth—a member of the committee which produced the report of the American Council on Education, *Religion in Public Education: The Basic Issues*, published in 1947 and treated at length in Chapter III of this study—significantly compared the content and implications of the 1947 American Council on Education report with this 1951 NEA report:

The American Council committee was not composed entirely of members of the general education fraternity, but had on it a number of persons interested primarily in religious education. It did not deal with the broad subject of moral and spiritual values but rather with the specific problem of the place of religion in general education. Nevertheless, in most important particulars, the Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association has embodied the recommendations of the earlier committee in its report. We may hope that, with this reinforcement of emphasis on an acute need in education today, greater progress may be made in the direction of carrying the recommendations and implications into effective practice.\(^{17}\)

The comparison by Vieth is especially helpful in historically evaluating the various documents related to this present study.
More critical of the NEA report, in a constructive way, was Dr. Ernest J. Chave, Professor of Religious Education at the Divinity School, University of Chicago.

Although acknowledging the contributions of this report, Chave noted a basic shortcoming with the document:

There is no underlying philosophy as to the meanings and worth of life, of man's place in the universe, and the significance of the individual in the social order. While some basic assumptions are evident there are no general concepts underlying the listings of values.18

Then, by way of concrete, constructive suggestions, Chave asserted:

More concrete illustrations of what is involved in moral and spiritual, religious, Christian, or "good" living, need to be gathered and organized relative to different age levels, different situations, and different kinds of interrelated values.19

In conjunction with this, said Chave,

Methods of teaching moral and spiritual values at all age levels need to be studied by representatives of different agencies. The best psychological and pedagogical methods and experiences need to be made available to workers in this field.20

Needless to say, the 1951 report by the NEA on moral and spiritual values in the public schools generated much discussion and debate—even among religious educators. The end result, though, was an intensified effort by these religious educators to further promote studies of religion in public schools—plus attempt to improve the educational work of the churches at the same time, in a related manner.
Perhaps Dr. Lawrence C. Little, Professor of Religious Education at the University of Pittsburgh, best stated this two-fold concern of religious educators early in the 1950's:

... we must more clearly distinguish between (1) knowledge about religion as an aspect of human culture, which is a necessary part of the equipment of any well educated person and therefore might rightly be regarded as part of the task of the public school; and (2) personal participation in a particular form of religious worship and faith, which is a private matter and the special concern not of the public school but of the home and the church. These two aspects are closely related, of course, and it is likely that mastery in one always involves some measure of achievement in the other, but they are distinguishable and it should be possible to distribute responsibility for them within the framework of separation of church and state.21

A continuing approach in the early 1950's by some religious educators to distribute the responsibility for "knowledge about religion" and "personal participation in a particular form of religious worship and faith"—to use Little's words—was the approach of weekday religious education programs. As related to the public school, this approach received a tremendous boost with the U.S. Supreme Court decision in the Zorach v. Clauson case. On April 28, 1952, in a 6-3 decision, the Supreme Court ruled that the plan for religious education in Brooklyn, New York—which they now termed a "dismissed time" program—was constitutional, because under this plan the children were dismissed from their public school classes during regular school
hours to attend sectarian religious instruction—but away from the public school buildings. This landmark decision contrasted with the Supreme Court decision in the 1948 case, McCollum v. Board of Education, in that the released time programs of religious education in Champaign, Illinois, were held in public school classrooms, and were ruled unconstitutional. This crucial distinction in the location of these religious education programs—viz., whether they were held away from the public schools as in Brooklyn, New York, and thus constitutional, or whether they were held in the public schools as in Champaign, Illinois, and thus unconstitutional—was hailed by many religious educators as significant support for "dismissed time" programs.

As might be expected, Dr. Erwin L. Shaver, now Executive Director of the Department of Weekday Religious Education, Division of Christian Education, NCC, avidly supported the Supreme Court decision in the Zorach case. Following this decision, Shaver wrote optimistically yet challengingly in the International Journal of Religious Education:

We are grateful that the dark days of legal uncertainty have now come to an end. The bright new day that is dawning for the weekday religious education program will continue to be bright if those who believe in it and have fought for it accept the challenges which it now offers. These challenges are: to preserve the letter and spirit of the law, to give the program deserved moral and financial support, to provide educationally valid curricula and teaching methods and to work for the utmost cooperation between the churches.
The future of the weekday movement is now in our own unfettered hands.22

Although many religious educators shared the views of Shaver, not all of them were as delighted with the decision in the Zorach case. Notably, The Christian Century, in its May 14, 1952, issue editorialized a dissenting view:

If the churches cannot carry out the educational program which they hold essential on Sunday or in hours when the public schools are not in session, would not their purposes and the purposes of all Americans who desire to see the separation of church and state maintained be better served if an effort were launched to close the schools for the period during which religious classes were being held, whether that closing involved a matter of an hour, or a half-day, or even a full day in every week?23

Yet, despite this type of dissent and other criticisms of the decision in the Zorach case, weekday religious education programs—on a "dismissed time" basis, held away from public school buildings—were to grow and develop during the years ahead.

Organized support during the early 1950's for religious educators who favored academic studies of religion directly within public school curricula came very clearly from the NCC, formed in 1950. In December, 1952, in session at Denver, Colorado, the General Assembly of the NCC presented in its "Message" the following viewpoint concerning studies of religion in public schools:

... a way must be found to make the pupils of American schools aware of the heritage of faith upon which this nation was established, and which has been the most transforming influence in
western culture. This we believe can be done in complete loyalty to the basic principles involved in the separation of church and state. 24

In May, 1953, in session at Chicago, Illinois, the NCC expressed further concern for studies of religion in public schools: "The school can do much in teaching about religion, in adequately affirming that religion has been and is an essential factor in our cultural heritage." 25 Then, at the same time, as further support in this area, the General Board of the NCC established a Department of Religion and Public Education, and named Rolfe Lanier Hunt as its Executive Director. Thus, by the mid-1950's, through the NCC in general, and through its newly created Department of Religion and Public Education in particular, religious educators were provided a major vehicle for expressing their views with respect to studies of religion in public schools. This vehicle of expression would be extensively used in the years ahead.

In February, 1953, another major study report concerning religion and public education was published: The Function of the Public Schools in Dealing with Religion. This was a report of an exploratory study made by the Committee on Religion and Education of the American Council on Education, directed by Dr. Clarence Linton, and it supplemented the major 1947 report by American Council on Education, The Relation of Religion to Public Education: The Basic Principles. This 1953 study inquired through
questionnaires about the actual practices dealing with religion in public schools in America. And the basic, fundamental conclusion of this study was succinctly stated: "We have affirmed our belief that the findings of this inquiry point to a factual study of religion as the best approach to a solution of the problem confronting public education in dealing with religion." As elaboration of its position, the Committee affirmed:

All public schools . . . can provide for the factual study of religion both as an important factor in the historical and contemporary development of our culture and as a source of values and insight for great numbers of people in finding the answers to persistent personal problems of living. Religion can . . . be studied in the same way as the economic and political institutions and principles of our country should be studied—not as something on which the American public school must settle all arguments and say the last word, but as something which is so much a part of the American heritage and so relevant to contemporary values that it cannot be ignored.

Dr. Clarence Linton, director of the American Council on Education (ACE) study, added further clarification about this position of "factual study of religion," in a related article in Religious Education. He wrote:

Factual study of religion is characterized by deliberate aim and definite plan to deal directly and factually with religion wherever and whenever it is intrinsic to learning experience in social studies, literature, art, music, and other subjects. The aims of such study are religious literacy, intelligent understanding of the role of religion in human affairs, and to develop in students a desire to explore the resources of religion for achieving desirable convictions and personal commitments. These aims arise from the requirements
of general education which, to be effective, must view culture, human life, and personality whole.  

Thus, the distinction made in the 1947 ACE report between "the study of religion" and "teaching about religion," re-emphasized again and again by William Clayton Bower, is refined even further in this 1953 ACE report, to the factual study of religion—as the best approach for including studies of religion in public schools.

Significantly, in the same article, Linton pointed to some basic issues with the "factual study of religion" approach. One basic issue concerned the qualifications of teachers for guiding students in such study, and a second basic issue involved attaining community assent for demonstrating the desirability and feasibility of this kind of study in the public schools. And, Linton concluded, the resolution of both of these issues was dependent in large part upon the commitment of both educational and religious leaders within a community. Importantly, these same basic issues would be raised again and again during the remainder of the decade of the 1950's—especially the matter of training public school teachers for guiding the factual study of religion.

The responses of many religious educators to this 1953 ACE report were supportive and enthusiastic. Paul Vieth, Horace Bushnell Professor of Christian Nurture at the Divinity School, Yale University, and a member of the
Committee which made this study and report, asserted:

As the definition of this study implies, it is the function of the public school to assist youth to have an intelligent understanding of the historical and contemporary role of religion in human affairs. This means all youth—not just those who relate themselves to church religious education.30

Yet, on the other hand, Vieth cautiously reminded both public schools and churches of their respective functions and responsibilities in dealing with religion:

Any such plan for religion in public education will not take the place of what churches and synagogues have been doing in religious education. About all that can be expected is that this will create a favorable climate for religious education and provide foundations on which more specifically Christian teaching and evangelism may be based.31

Finally, in his evaluation of the 1953 report, Vieth joined Linton and many others in emphasizing the extreme importance of teacher education in this whole approach to the factual study of religion in public schools:

... throughout the study, again and again, the question of the place of religion in the curriculum of teachers colleges had to be raised, because if teachers do not themselves go through the process of getting an intelligent understanding of the historical and contemporary role of religion in human affairs there is little likelihood that they can function effectively as teachers in a school system which has this intention.32

In a concurring yet even stronger viewpoint, William Clayton Bower commended the report especially for its clear and deep conviction regarding the necessity for the careful preparation of teachers for such factual study
of religion,

... involving competent understanding of the function of religion in historical and contemporary culture and the ability to view and deal with religion objectively and on the basis of study rather than inculcation. The experiment will succeed or fail at this point [emphasis added].

In retrospect, perhaps we did not take Bower, Vieth, Linton, and others seriously enough on this crucial point, because even now in 1976, this matter of teacher education still seems to plague many serious efforts for including studies of religion in public schools. Certainly, this basic issue would be raised frequently in the remaining years of the 1950's.

By the mid-1950's, religious educators were refining and clarifying their views with respect to studies of religion in public schools, as well as continuing to focus on several related basic issues. Two key leaders in Protestant Christian education during this period expressed their views on these matters in their respective monographs. In 1954, Dr. James D. Smart, Professor of Biblical Interpretation at Union Theological Seminary, New York, and an active writer in the field of Christian education, published his influential book, *The Teaching Ministry of the Church: An Examination of the Basic Principles of Christian Education*. In writing about the relationships between the church and public education, Smart succinctly stated his position, with which other religious educators agreed:
"First, then, let the Church set its own house in order, so that within its own gates education in the Christian faith may be of a character that commands respect from educators and theologians alike." Then, and only then--after the Church first attends to and improves its own educational programs--perhaps the Church, . . . will have the strength and competence to take a more active part in the field of public education, not attempting to gain direct control of its processes, but taking infinite pains to make clear, point by point, in the culture of our time the implications of the Christian faith for every aspect of the life of man.

Dr. Randolph Crump Miller, Professor of Christian Education at the Divinity School, Yale University, agreed with Smart that the chief responsibility for religious education rested with the churches and the homes. In fact, Miller was even skeptical about the status of religious instruction in public schools in the mid-1950's. In his book, Education for Christian Living (1956), Miller claimed:

Except for Bible reading and occasional carols and pageants, there is little to suggest that the public schools are concerned with religion. . . . little of significance is accomplished through the recognized curriculum, and mention of religion is avoided in many textbooks.

Therefore, claimed several religious educators, such as Smart and Miller, the real work of religious instruction must be accomplished by the churches themselves, in connection with the homes--and not by the public schools.
Nevertheless, during the mid-1950's other religious educators continued their efforts to expand programs of studies of religion in public schools. One of the most active leaders within this movement was Dr. Rolfe Lanier Hunt, Executive Director of the Department of Religion and Public Education of the NCC. In dealing with the issue of studies of religion, Dr. Hunt provided the following helpful guideline for religious educators—which also served as a unique commentary on the history of American education:

In the traditional pattern of American education, decisions regarding the public schools and what shall be taught therein are kept as close at home as possible. We look for no national plan of action. Decisions as to what the local schools shall do should be hammered out in discussions locally, with decisions made finally by the legally constituted authorities, the public school trustees.37

There was certainly much merit in Hunt's guideline concerning the decision-making process at the local level regarding studies of religion in public schools. And with this suggestion many religious educators agreed. Yet, at the same time, organized national efforts and concerns continued to be manifested with respect to studies of religion. For example, at the Golden Anniversary Convention of the Religious Education Association (REA), held on November 8-10, 1953, at the University of Pittsburgh, the seminar report on "The Public School and Religious Education" made the recommendation,
... that the Religious Education Association take appropriate steps to have prepared a handbook for teachers in public school, indicating (1) actual classroom situations in which facts and implication of religion have been taught by teachers to be intrinsic to school experience, and (2) how these teachers have dealt with these situations in different disciplines as at different age levels. 38

Furthermore, significant national efforts and concerns continued to be expressed regarding teacher education programs and their relationship to studies of religion in public schools. During the mid-to-late 1950's, considerable attention was given by religious educators to a major endeavor, the "Teacher Education and Religion Project" undertaken by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, supported by a grant from the Danforth Foundation. This project, extending from 1953 to 1958, focused primarily on three areas: (1) religion in general education, (2) special courses in religion or units within courses in which the primary concern was religious literacy, and (3) religion in professional education. 39 At the midpoint of this project, in 1956, the current director of the project, Dr. A. L. Sebaly, provided the following capsule orientation to the nature and scope of this significant study:

The project is one which examines curriculum, enriches curriculum, and encourages instructors to make reference to religion where it is relevant to content. It is one which aims to teach objectively about religion without advocating or teaching a religious creed: It is one where
the approach is through the integrity of the discipline which a faculty member teaches. The project then is interested in seeking what religion can do for education and not what education can do for religion.40

This project would culminate in 1958 with a book edited by Sebaly, referred to later in this chapter.

Concurrently, the NCC continued to provide organized leadership and support for studies of religion in public schools. On November 6-8, 1955, the Committee on Religion and Public Education of the NCC sponsored "The National Conference on Religion and Public Education," held in St. Louis, Missouri. This conference, first recommended by the report of the Committee on Religion and Public Education adopted in 1949 by the former ICRE, was the first such conference at which the major leaders of American liberal Protestant religious education—166 persons—convened for the specific task of dealing with the issues of religion and public education. Dr. Rolfe Lanier Hunt, Executive Director of the Department of Religion and Public Education of the NCC, edited a major study document for churches concerning this conference, which appeared in the March, 1956, issue of the International Journal of Religious Education.41

Ten different reports were made by this study conference on a variety of issues dealing with religion and public education. Most pertinent to this present study was report No. V, "Treatment of Religious Viewpoints within the Curriculum." Importantly, this report group noted the
following points with respect to studies of religion within public school curricula:

1. There can be religious emphasis within the course of study, as, for example, with the treatment of the historical development of America. The schools should deal with religion intrinsic to the course of study as it is related to the course content.

2. Religion is best integrated with other subjects, not handled as a separate subject.

3. The teacher's attitude and awareness of community sensitivity, and the teacher's personality, may determine approach and treatment of religion within the curriculum.

4. It is necessary to recognize the pluralistic religious atmosphere in many communities and the religious pluralism of the American society.

5. Greater teacher preparation and education directed toward further competence in the area of religion is necessary. The purpose of this is to sensitize teachers to the various religious backgrounds within the school and community, that they may better handle the religious emphases within the curriculum.  

These suggestions by this conference received additional support on December 1, 1955, when the General Board of the NCC, meeting in session at Omaha, Nebraska, adopted a major resolution, which referred specifically to the important role of public schools in teaching about religion:

It is expected that they shall teach that religion is an essential aspect of our national heritage and culture, that this nation subsists under the governance of God, and that our moral and ethical values rest upon religious grounds and sanctions. To do otherwise, would be to distort history.

Thus, with these and similar policy statements, the NCC continued during the 1950's to provide national leadership in efforts to promote studies of religion in public schools.
Individual religious educators also continued their efforts supporting studies of religion in public schools. Notable among them was Dr. William Clayton Bower, Professor Emeritus of Religious Education, University of Chicago. In an article in the July-August, 1956, issue of *Religious Education*, Bower carefully distinguished among three different approaches in dealing with religion in the public schools that had developed in the last decade: viz., "teaching about religion," the "factual study of religion," and "taking account of religion." Concluding that these three formulations revealed important differences in educational philosophy, in the manner of conceiving the nature of religion, and in methods of dealing with religion in the public schools, Bower strongly preferred the third of these formulations. For Bower, teaching about religion and the factual study of religion tend to place the emphasis upon religion as subject-matter rather than as an integral part of human experience. What he much preferred was a more dynamic concept, which expressed the functional aspect of man's religious experience. Thus, for Bower, taking account of religion is the preferred concept in dealing with religion in the public schools, because this concept

... rests upon the assumption that religion is an integral and irreducible part of man's interaction with his natural, social, and cosmic world. Consequently, it need not be introduced into the curriculum from some outside source. As a phase of culture it is already there, and needs only to
be identified and understood as an inescapable aspect of human behavior. . . . As such, it is a going concern of an evolving personal and social experience. It is a quality of man's responses to the actual situations encountered in the process of living, both in the historic past and in the present. In this functional aspect it is, as John Dewey pointed out in *A Common Faith*, adjectival (religious) in contrast to the cumulative and organized end-product of past religious responses, in which case it is substantive (religion).44

Apparently, this concept of "taking account of religion" reflected an evolutionary change in Bower's philosophical approach to studies of religion in public schools, because earlier in the study, it was noted that Bower strongly advocated the "study of religion" concept over the "teaching about religion" formulation.

By the late 1950's, four major viewpoints and basic issues with respect to studies of religion in public schools dominated the thinking of religious educators: (1) the academic study of religion in public schools; (2) weekday religious education programs, on dismissed or released time; (3) religion in the curriculum of public schools; and (4) teacher education and religion.

On the first matter, the academic study of religion in public schools, the ACE sponsored a "Conference on Religion and Public Education" on March 10-12, 1957, at Harriman, New York. Participants at this distinguished conference included the following leaders of liberal Protestant religious education: Dr. Foye G. Gibson,
This helpful statement by Dr. Johnson expressed for many religious educators late in the 1950's their basic position with respect to the academic study of religion in public schools.

On the second matter, weekday religious education programs on dismissed or released time, support continued
late in the 1950's by some religious educators. One advocate of this approach was Dr. Walter D. Cavert, Professor of Religious Education at McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago. Writing in the December 4, 1957, issue of The Christian Century, Dr. Cavert sharply and critically assessed the current status and future potential of this approach:

Weekday religious education in most areas has been carried on by a resolute minority in the face of the apathy of the church as a whole. Most denominational boards have failed to give enthusiastic leadership to this aspect of their educational work. The National Council of Churches has never provided an adequate budget for this department of its program. Neither have most state and city councils. If the time ever comes when a determined Protestantism pours time and money and energy into released-time weekday religious education, it will play an important part in revitalizing the religious life of our nation.46

Later, in a 1959 editorial, The Christian Century itself supported Cavert's analysis: "Law and principle dictate that improved religious instruction shall have to be provided through the home and by the churches in 'released time' and church schools."47 This position, then, remained a major option late in the 1950's for some religious educators, with respect to the relationship between religion and public education.

On the third matter, religion in the curriculum of public schools, Dr. Philip H. Phenix, Dean of Carleton College, Northfield, Minnesota, and later Professor of
Education and Religion and Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, provided a number of important perspectives through several monographs late in the 1950's and on through the 1960's. In the first of these volumes, *Religious Concerns in Contemporary Education: A Study of Reciprocal Relations*, published in 1959, Phenix emphasized the important role of religion as a dimension of other studies in the public school curriculum:

Every subject in the curriculum has its religious dimensions, because by definition of ultimacy there is no human activity which in principle lies outside the domain of ultimate concern. Each department of academic study reflects in its own way the spiritual situation of those who pursue it. History, language, the arts, natural and social science—all of the disciplines—manifest fundamental beliefs and values in characteristic ways. It is the function of a deeply religious approach to these studies to point to the possibilities of realizing ultimate meanings in them rather than remaining satisfied with a limited and conventional perspective.48

In this rather theoretical, philosophical-theological language, Phenix offered a very helpful perspective and challenge for some religious educators concerning religion in the curriculum of public schools. Then, in a slightly more concrete manner, Phenix voiced his support for both the study of religion as a dimension of other studies and the study of religion as a separate organized discipline within the public school curriculum: "The implicit concern for religion throughout the curriculum does not diminish but rather enhances the significance of the systematic
study of religion as such. Each approach serves to enrich and confirm the other." In the years ahead, Phenix would prove to be one of the most constant advocates of including studies of religion in public school curricula.

On the fourth matter, teacher education and religion, great interest and concern continued among religious educators late in the 1950's. Particularly, the AACTE Teacher Education and Religion Project culminated in 1959 with the publication of a book edited by Dr. A. L. Sebaly, Teacher Education and Religion. This book served a dual function: (1) it provided a discussion of where materials about religion are intrinsic to various disciplines important to the preparation of prospective teachers; and (2) it provided a report on some of the outcomes of the Teacher Education and Religion Project. Dr. Evan R. Collins, in his summary of this book, elaborated on each of these two purposes: First,

This concern with the materials of religion as they are intrinsic to the subjects taught in the classroom is simply stated: the teacher's responsibility is to purvey the culture. Religion is a part of culture. To omit the religion intrinsic in the subject field taught is to teach incompletely, and therefore falsely. . . . In short, the education of a teacher is incomplete if it avoids or ignores the materials drawn from the field of religion that are implicit in the academic subject matter field and intrinsic to it. The teacher, as purveyor of the culture, must be prepared to convey more than a partial view.50
Then, with respect to the Teacher Education and Religion Project itself, Collins wrote:

... this book is first and foremost an account of a project centering on the curriculum for teacher education. ... The basic motivation for the Project lay in the AACTE's concern that the teachers being prepared for the country's elementary and secondary schools be themselves as well educated as possible. There seemed reason to believe that a substantial portion of these teachers were beginning their work incompletely informed in the field of religion and that this inadequacy would show itself in the teacher's own classroom.51

As outcomes of this Project, three problems of major importance were identified for further discussions, study, and solution:

1. It is the role of a liberal college or university preparing teachers to teach in a free society to see that prospective teachers have a knowledge of the role which religion has had and is having in that society.
2. Workable inter-disciplinary structures are needed on the university and college campus which will allow teacher educators to work comfortably and effectively to improve teacher education.
3. Research is needed in the area of teacher education and religion.52

Finally, Collins concluded with this challenge—both to secular educators and to religious educators: "The Project described in this book is a mere beginning. Perhaps its most important product is the conviction that the potential results are so far-reaching as to demand and to justify the best efforts of us all."53

The Teacher Education and Religion Project of the AACTE gave encouragement to religious educators that secular
teacher educators were indeed aware of the need for
definite action with respect to the important role of pro-
fessional teacher education in dealing with studies of
religion in public schools. During the last two decades,
these religious educators had called for significant action
on this basic issue. And, the Project by the AACTE during
the 1950's appeared to be a major, positive response in
that direction. However, perhaps the most curious aspect
of this entire AACTE Project was the fact that—as best as
can presently be determined—very little more, if anything,
was ever done with the Project, nor with Collins' challenge
noted above, after the publication of the book in 1959.
Throughout the entire present study, this very disappointing
fact about the AACTE Project stands out as a major, perplex-
ing, unsolved enigma.

As the decade of the 1950's drew to a close, the
four major viewpoints and basic issues treated above were
most prominent for religious educators with respect to
studies of religion in public schools. As a summary of the
general status of matters on this issue by the end of the
1950's, Dr. Lawrence C. Little suggested that, although no
general consensus was yet in sight, there seemed to be
increasing agreement between churches and public schools on
the following points:

(1) The public schools should teach moral and
spiritual values.
(2) Religious orientation is essential in complete moral and spiritual development.
(3) Knowledge of religion is necessary for a full understanding of our cultural heritage.
(4) The schools should maintain a climate friendly toward religion.
(5) References to religion may properly be made when these belong naturally in the subject matter being considered.54

With the four basic issues treated above in this chapter, and with these five points suggested by Little, much further discussion and writing would continue by religious educators during the 1960's.

Finally, Dr. Eugene E. Dawson, an educator greatly concerned with the issue of religion in public education, and a member of the American Council on Education Committee on Religion and Education, provided a fitting conclusion for the decade of the evolving 1950's with this stinging challenge:

I need not tell you that we are not expecting to see these problems completely resolved; rather, we are hopeful that productive explorations may be started so that we might at least experience some small gains or minor successes. As one views the prolific amount of research under way in all other areas of education—the sciences, the humanities, and the social studies—and in the various phases of teacher education, and the consequent gains in the discovery of new insights and skills in such disciplines, he cannot but speculate over possible outcomes if we were to free ourselves to attempt parallel research efforts in religion in public education. Can we afford to wait much longer? [Emphasis added.]55

Indeed, Dr. Dawson, can we afford to wait much longer—for the needed research and experimentation relating to studies of religion in public schools?? During the
decade of the 1960's, considerable effort was made by liberal Protestant religious educators to provide the needed research and experimentation with respect to studies of religion in the public schools. To these efforts we shall now turn in the next chapter of the study.
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CHAPTER V

THE DECADE, 1960-1969

The Liberating Years

In the 1960's, there was important expansion, further refinement, and a liberation of ideas, efforts, and programs developed during the 1950's by religious educators. In addition, at least one new, major option for dealing with studies of religion and public schools emerged during this decade. Perhaps these words of Dr. Paul Vieth, Acting Editor of Religious Education early in 1960, best express the mood of the situation and set the tempo for this decade:

The relation of religion to public education has been a subject for discussion, debate and pronouncements for many years. No neat solution which is acceptable to everyone is likely to emerge in the near future. The discussions must go on.1

Furthermore, as preface guidelines for this decade, Vieth importantly noted two tendencies that had hindered past efforts at finding a viable relationship between religion and the public school. The first tendency he noted was to look too much to the past for guidance. Vieth said,

Of course, the basic principles established by the Constitution, and court decisions in interpretation thereof, must be maintained. But some of these have been unduly stretched to cover a
situation today which could not possibly have been imagined when this Government was founded. Each generation must confront reality as it exists in its day, and is competent to establish in law such practices as best serve the needs of the people.2

Perhaps, in a strangely prophetic way, Vieth foresaw the paramount legal decisions of the 1960's, in the Engel v. Vitale and Abington v. Schempp/Murray v. Curlett cases, as related to religion and public education. Then, secondly, Vieth noted the hindering tendency to try to find a solution which applies uniformly to every community. In defense of seeking local solutions to the problem of religion and public education, Vieth said: "America has a tradition of state and local control in educational matters. The religious composition, attitudes, practices and desires of communities play an important role in school policy."3 In short, Vieth challenged religious educators in the 1960's to develop contemporary, local-level solutions to the problem of the relation of religion to public education.

Response to this kind of challenge for the 1960's was immediate. Early in 1960, the Committee on Religion and Public Education of the NCC prepared and published for mass distribution a major, extensive study document, Relation of Religion to Public Education.4 This document was the first official, comprehensive publication on this issue by the NCC since its formation in 1950. The core of the document contained a detailed statement of convictions.
which influenced the thinking behind the document, as well as treatment of some specific problems in the relation of religion to public education.

Of special significance to the present study were two major viewpoints expressed in the document. One was the definition of respective roles for the home, the church, and the public school in matters of educating children and youth:

Ordinarily Christian parents in the United States prefer to meet their responsibility for the general education of their own children and all children through support of a common school. There is thus assigned to the public school major responsibility for general education, including the skills of literacy, and for certain basic preparation for competent citizenship. The public schools are assigned a shared responsibility for many other things, such as vocational training and education in manners and morals. The home and the church instruct in religious faith and practice.  

Nevertheless, the document also emphasized the role of the public school in teaching facts about religion through regular school subjects. On this point, the document stated, in part:

The Judeo-Christian heritage supplies the major context in which the American vision arose, and theistic belief remains a predominant, though often inarticulate, commitment of most Americans. Belief in God and in inalienable rights stemming from God is taken for granted in our cultural life, and in our public institutions. The historical religious assumptions and foundations of the American heritage should be explicitly recognized and factually presented as the regular school subjects are taught in the public schools, with no person compelled to agree with any assumptions of faith. So also should be taught the historical facts about religious conflict and persecution.
With these statements based upon clearly theistic assumptions, similar to those of the controversial 1949 Report of the Committee on Religion and Public Education of the ICRE,⁷ the NCC affirmed its continued support for studies of religion in public schools. As Dr. John C. Bennett, Professor of Applied Christianity at Union Theological Seminary, New York City, concluded about the study document:

The emphasis in the report is, as it should be, on various forms of teaching about religion, especially as religion appears within such subjects as history, literature, art, music. The religious context of the American tradition needs to be understood by all American children.⁸

At nearly the same time, the Executive Board of the Division of Christian Education of the NCC also officially supported the approach of weekday religious education. On February 18, 1960, at St. Louis, Missouri, the board adopted a statement of the purpose of Weekday Religious Education, which read, in part, as follows:

... by the very nature of our tradition and our present pluralistic culture, and for reasons determined by society as a whole, our public schools have not been in a position to deal adequately with that portion of human experience commonly called religious.

We, therefore, affirm that the churches have an urgent responsibility to bear witness to the revelation of God within the totality of man's experience. There is special need to help children and young people to interpret their public education in this perspective. Bearing this witness in relation to public school education is the specific central purpose of the Division of Christian Education's program of weekday religious education on released, reserved, or dismissed time.⁹
In the summer of 1960, Alice L. Goddard, Director of Weekday Religious Education with the NCC, elaborated on the statement of purpose in an article in Religious Education. Leaders of the movement, she wrote

... saw in weekday religious education on released time an effective way for the churches to maintain their support of the public schools and, at the same time, to supplement general education with necessary religious teaching.10

Furthermore, as a first step toward implementing a more complete program of weekday religious education, Ms. Goddard reported on the interdenominational development of appropriate new curriculum materials for these weekday programs. These weekday church school curriculum materials, for grades one through twelve, would "assist church leaders in their task of supplementing the public school studies of pupils whose parents desire them to attend the released time classes of the Protestant churches."11

Therefore, in 1960, the influential NCC clearly expressed its support for both (1) studies of religion in public schools, especially when the facts about religion were treated through regular school subjects, and (2) programs of weekday religious education on released, reserved, or dismissed time. Thus, as had been true in the late 1940's and throughout the 1950's, these two major options remained predominant at the beginning of the 1960's as religious educators continued to deal with the relationship between religion and public education.
Meanwhile, questions were being raised concerning the extent of religious influence in American public schools through actual existing policies and practices. In an effort to seek answers to these questions, Dr. R. B. Dierenfield, Associate Professor of Education at Macalester College, St. Paul, Minnesota, conducted a study designed to give a general picture of the policies and practices in a large number of varied elementary and secondary schools in the United States. In the first of several such studies by Dierenfield, during 1960 he constructed and mailed out to 4,000 school superintendents a questionnaire designed to obtain information on how the public schools in the United States were then dealing with religious influences in their curricular and extracurricular activities. For purposes of the present study, conclusions in only two areas studied by Dierenfield will be noted here. One, in the area of religion and the curriculum, Dierenfield concluded, generally:

It seems evident . . . that religious influence cannot be ignored as a factor in the public school curriculum. Spiritual values are listed as aims in a majority of school systems. In many communities teachers are provided with materials to assist in the instruction of these values. Results of the survey also indicate that organized units on the part religion has played in shaping our culture and society are seldom found in elementary schools. In secondary schools such units are found most often in World History (51.53% Yes) and in high school literature courses (32.02% Yes).

Instruction in the Bible is provided in only a small proportion of the public school systems. Religious emphasis appears centered around general spiritual values and religion as a cultural and historical influence.12
Second, from the same study, Dierenfield made the following conclusion regarding released time programs of religious instruction as related to the public schools: "Released time religious instruction appears to be growing slowly but as yet does not seem a satisfactory solution to the problem." Thus, quite early in the 1960's, Dierenfield had provided religious educators with some concrete facts and figures to replace surmise and uncertainty about what public school systems were actually doing in handling religious influence. Some were surprised, others were greatly disappointed as to the limited extent of religious influence—especially in the area of religion in the public school curriculum. Still others were encouraged by other related developments with respect to studies of religion during the early 1960's.

One very notable sign of encouragement came in 1961 with the founding of the Religious Instruction Association, Inc. (RIA), in Fort Wayne, Indiana. Although originated by an individual public school teacher, Mr. James V. Panoch, the work of the RIA helped to express the concerns of many religious educators with respect to studies of religion in public schools. The RIA served as a clearing house and consultant service on matters pertaining to the relationship between religion and public education—with major emphasis upon methods and materials designed to include the study of religion in the public school curriculum. The stated
purpose of the RIA was to promote the legal, proper, and significant study of religion in the public school:

*Legal* study is that which the continuing process of litigation and court decision determine to be within the framework of existing law at a given time. *Proper* study is that which produces an understanding of religion commensurate with the abilities of the student and goals of the curricular unit. *Significant* study is that which is in the curriculum as part of what the student is required to study and know, and upon which he is tested and graded.14

Perhaps the most important function of the RIA was as a clearing house in the collection and distribution of reprints of original materials from books, magazines, newspapers, reports, and scholarly papers, selected to represent a wide variety of opinions and activities. These reprints were used to (1) investigate the relationships between religion and public education, (2) indicate what relevant curricula were being developed, and (3) issue materials adaptable for public school classroom use.15

Through the efforts of Mr. Panoch and others, this organization developed very rapidly, to the extent that probably, during the mid-1960's and early 1970's, the RIA served as the most effective center for current information on the subject of religion and public education in America. In 1973, the RIA's functions were absorbed by the newly created Public Education Religion Studies Center (PERSC), at Wright State University, Dayton, Ohio, with Mr. Panoch becoming the Field Coordinator of PERSC. It is clear,
though, that the RIA made a significant breakthrough early in the 1960's in the area of curriculum for studies of religion in public schools. For this leadership, alone, liberal Protestant religious educators could be grateful.

Early in 1962, a new proposal for the education of children and young people in American public, religious, and private schools emerged. Identified as "shared time," this proposal was the first major viewpoint in nearly a decade to attract the attention of religious educators as a viable option in dealing with the relationship between religion and public education. Dr. Harry L. Stearns, Superintendent of Schools in Englewood, New Jersey, originator of the shared time concept, described his new proposal in the January-February, 1962, issue of Religious Education:

In simplest terms the proposal consists of a sharing of the school time of children between state supported schools, which provide general education in a denominationally neutral context, and church supported schools which proceed with a specific denominational religious emphasis. . . . The concept of shared time has developed as a proposed means of bringing the state and the church into a sharing of the time of all children at the discretion of the parent, and it constitutes a revision of the concept that there shall be church schools which claim all of the time of some children and public schools which claim all of the time of others.16

Then, for the benefit of both proponents and opponents of this new proposal, Stearns carefully distinguished between released time and shared time concepts:
"Released time" seems to imply that the state does control all of the schooling of the child in the public school, but may "release" some portion of it to the church. The concept of "shared time" implies in a much stronger degree the basic principle . . . that the child is much more the child of the parent than of the state, and that, under parental judgment, the time for formal education shall be apportioned to the school and/or the church or other recognized agency on a basis of dividing or sharing the responsibility of the child's total education.

Finally, in support of his proposal for a shared-time plan for education, Stearns offered this warning and challenge:

There is great urgency to this matter. The present trend of affairs, breeding divisiveness and distrust, and the undermining of our school system at a time when its potency is sorely needed cannot continue if our free western civilization and our Judeo-Christian tradition are to survive. The situation is critical. If sharing of time will offer a solution for those who want religious education at the hands of the church and at the same time will preserve the separation of church and state, it is worthy of full exploration.

As might be expected, response to Stearns' proposal of shared time by religious educators was immediate--and divided. Among the supporters of the shared time approach was the Rev. Richard Upsher Smith, Associate Rector of St. John's Episcopal Church, Norwood Parish, Bethesda-Chevy Chase, Maryland. A major advantage of the approach, Smith said,

... would be a new commitment of the whole community to total education in which public schools could reach all the children in the community and do their share better than they can do now. We would free them to do well what is within their province and not expect them to deal with necessary
but divisive or controversial religious questions.19

Then, in support of this approach, Smith concluded:

Neither the Church nor the home can give adequate religious instruction nor do so unrelated to day school learning experiences. Ways must be found for integrating the religious and secular. Shared time is the most promising proposal to date.20

Thomas J. Van Loon, Director of Staff Services, General Board of Education of The Methodist Church, Nashville, Tennessee, added support to the proposal of shared time when he wrote about its timeliness:

The proposal seems potentially to offer relief for a variety of current concerns. The old alternatives, "all public" or "all parochial" school experience would be supplemented by another option—an arrangement providing responsible cooperation between home, school and church.21

More critical of the shared time concept were a number of religious educators who raised some significant, probing questions with respect to this approach for dealing with religion and public education. For example, Dr. Gerald E. Knoff, Executive Secretary of the Division of Christian Education, NCC, wrote, regarding shared time:

The public schools are here to stay. Parochial elementary and secondary education is here to stay. Rising costs, alas, seem likely to be with us for the observable future. Does this plan preserve the integrity of both school systems? Does it provide adequately for religious instruction during the week? Does it preserve adequately the separation of church and state? Can it be worked out in actual administrative practice?22

Dr. Ray J. Harmelink, Associate General Secretary of the Board of Education, United Presbyterian Church, USA,
believed that the shared time proposal challenged Protestant churches to carefully re-examine their educational philosophies. Questioned Harmelink,

Are there certain subjects now taught in the public schools, which they believe should be taught under church auspices? If so, what are those subjects and why should they be taught under church auspices? If not, do they believe that the present status should be continued?23

Even more searching and pertinent to the present study were two very serious questions of philosophy of curriculum, related to the shared time approach, raised by Dr. Paul H. Vieth, Horace Bushness Professor of Christian Nurture at the Divinity School, Yale University. Queried Dr. Vieth:

(a) Can any school, whether public or parochial, achieve the desirable correlation within the whole curriculum, when the unity of that curriculum is sundered by having some subjects given in one school and some in another? (b) If the religious school is given the responsibility for introducing the pupil to his culture in such major areas as history and literature, will it do this as broadly as would be done in the public school, or will there be inevitable narrowing and slanting toward the particular interests and viewpoints of its denomination?24

Then, after pointing to additional problems with the shared time proposal such as staff, buildings, interdenominational cooperation, program and time schedule for the public school, Dr. Vieth concluded that it was his impression that most Protestant churches were by and large "fairly well satisfied with things as they are."25 In retrospect, Dr. Vieth's conclusion seems well founded, because, with a
few minor exceptions, the shared time proposal for dealing with religion and public education was never widely accepted during the remainder of the 1960's, nor has it been so far during the 1970's. But it was seriously offered in 1962 as a viable option for religious educators to consider with respect to studies of religion.

On the legal front during the early 1960's, the U.S. Supreme Court, on June 25, 1962, ruled 6-1 in the Engel v. Vitale case that the recital of a prayer in public school classrooms, composed by the New York State Board of Regents was unconstitutional, in violation of the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment. The decision, although not directly related to studies of religion in public schools, prompted many religious educators to re-examine their views and understandings with respect to religion and public education in general. Among the results of such re-examination was a new policy statement, The Churches and the Public Schools, adopted on June 7, 1963, by the General Board of the NCC, meeting in New York City. This statement reaffirmed the position that teaching for religious commitment was the responsibility of the home and the community of faith--such as the church or synagogue--rather than the public schools. Yet, at the same time, it stated clearly the place of religion--especially as part of regular school subjects--in the public schools:
The public schools have an obligation to help individuals develop an intelligent understanding and appreciation of the role of religion in the life of the people of this nation. . . . No person is truly educated for life in the modern world who is not aware of the vital part played by religion in the shaping of our history and culture, and of its contemporary expressions. Information about religion is an essential part of many school subjects such as social studies, literature and the arts. The contributions of religious leaders, movements, and ideas should be treated objectively and broadly in any presentation of these subjects.26

In a related matter, a significant organizational change occurred in 1963 within the Division of Christian Education of the NCC. This notable action was the merger of two departments—the Department of Religion and Public Education and the Department of Weekday Religious Education—into one single unit, to be known as the Department of Church and Public School Relationships. The new Executive Director of the combined department was the Rev. J. Blaine Fister, with Dr. Rolfe Lanier Hunt as Associate Executive Director. Was this structural change purely an organizational matter within the NCC? Or, was the "handwriting on the wall" for weekday religious education—as many observers conjectured? What would become of weekday religious education—an approach strongly advocated during the 1940's and 1950's, especially under the vigorous national leadership of Dr. Erwin L. Shaver? The Executive Secretary of the Division of Christian Education, Dr. Gerald E. Knoff, seemingly answered the latter question
in the September, 1963, issue of the International Journal of Religious Education:

The answer is that weekday religious education will be cared for and will be directed in an even more vigorous way than before in this merged department, which will concern itself with every aspect of the church's life and ministry as they affect the relationships of the churches in the United States with its public schools.27

Why, though, the change? What factors led to this organizational merger? Again, Dr. Knoff replied obliquely:

In the decade since the establishment of the Department of Religion and Public Education there developed a transition from the specialized interest of the relationship of religion to public education to a concern for the whole enterprise of the public education system. In these latter years the pressing needs of the public schools, the severe attacks made upon them, and the historic interest of Protestantism in the American public school system all pointed to a need for some recognizable and unified establishment in the National Council of Churches to deal as a unit with our increasing relationships and involvements with public schools.28

Nevertheless, this merger, and these statements by Dr. Knoff, would possibly be interpreted by some advocates of weekday religious education as a de-emphasis upon these programs as an option in dealing with religion and public education. But, as usual, only time would tell the actual results of this organizational merger within the NCC.

In the history of the development of studies of religion in public schools, June 17, 1963, will likely be recorded as one of the most significant dates of all time. It is certainly one of the most significant dates in the
purview of the present study. On that date, the U.S. Supreme Court rendered its monumental decision in the twin cases of Abington School District v. Schempp/Murray v. Curlett. In its 8-1 decision, the Supreme Court declared that the practices of Bible reading and prayer in public school classrooms complained of in these two cases were unconstitutional, under the terms of the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment, as applied to the states through the Fourteenth Amendment. For purposes of the present study, concerned primarily with studies of religion in public schools, the major issues of this decision are quite incidental. But, as suggested in Chapter II of the study, the written opinions of three Justices in this decision also contained statements very strongly advocating the academic study of religion in public schools. And, it may be noted, this important aspect of the 1963 decision is frequently overlooked, neglected, or omitted in many discussions, both pro and con, about the decision. Therefore, the decision of June 17, 1963, is of vital importance to the development of studies of religion in public schools, from 1963 through the end of the present study, 1974. That is, this Supreme Court decision gave the legal sanction and impetus for the development of academic studies of religion in American public schools, 1963-1974. By so doing, religious educators received the stimulus necessary to thrust forward with this major approach to dealing with
religion and public education. The results in this direction since 1963 have been nothing less than astonishing.

In particular, these words of Justice Clark, in delivering the majority opinion in the decision, have served since 1963 as the motto, watchword, and guiding beacon for advocates of studies of religion in public schools:

... it might well be said that one's education is not complete without a study of comparative religion or the history of religion and its relationship to the advancement of civilization. It certainly may be said that the Bible is worthy of study for its literary and historic qualities. Nothing we have said here indicates that such study of the Bible or of religion, when presented objectively as part of a secular program of education, may not be effected consistent with the First Amendment.29

Although there was much adverse public response to the main aspects of the 1963 decision, i.e., that the practices of Bible reading and prayer in public school classrooms were unconstitutional, an overwhelming majority of religious educators responded immediately with enthusiastic support for the Court's position with respect to studies of religion in public schools, so succinctly summarized above by Justice Clark. For example, Dr. Rolfe Lanier Hunt, long-time leader in the movement for studies of religion in public schools through his work with the NCC, editorialized in the October, 1963, issue of the International Journal of Religious Education:
Such a decision from the U.S. Supreme Court constitutes a charter for the public schools to do a better job of educating for life in the pluralistic culture of the United States. This redefinition by the Court of the functions of the public school offers new opportunities to give the Bible its due place in the content of public school teaching.  

In a related article in *Religious Education*, relative to the 1963 decision, Dr. Hunt concluded with the following challenge to both public school and church school leaders:

> Those who plan public schools have a responsibility to build into the program of the public school opportunities for children who attend public schools to learn during efficient working hours the religious portion of the cultural heritage from the agencies competent to teach religion. Those who plan church and synagogue schools owe it to children in public schools to provide such opportunities.

During the next several months following the 1963 Supreme Court decision, many religious educators expressed their avid support for this legal sanction for studies of religion in public schools. Most notable in this regard was the November-December, 1964, issue of *Religious Education*, which contained the reactions of nineteen religious and educational leaders to the statement by Justice Clark, quoted above from the 1963 decision. Among these several position statements by outstanding religious and educational leaders in America, the following will be noted briefly.

The Rev. Richard Upsher Smith, an Episcopal clergyman and a member of the Executive Committee of the NCC's Committee on Church and Public School Relations, first noted the distinctive importance of the 1963 Supreme Court
decision:

The true importance and significance of the most recent decision of the United States Supreme Court affecting the teaching of religion in public schools can hardly be exaggerated. Far too many people have bemoaned the ban on compulsory prayer and Bible reading and have missed altogether the positive elements in the decree—what the Court specifically endorses and encourages, namely, the objective teaching about religion in the regular classroom subjects and elective courses in religion.32

Smith suggested some very positive educational implications of this decision for our religious pluralism in America:

From such broadened and deepened teaching about religion will come greater knowledge and better understanding of the faith and contributions of other religions. Anyone who works with young people today knows their universal cry, "What do other churches believe?" If the Court's admonition is heeded, children will be free to ask religious questions and teachers will be free to respond to these questions without evasion or fear of reprisal. There should be much greater respect and appreciation for all religions and for each individual's conscientious beliefs and practices.33

In response to the 1963 decision, W. Astor Kirk, Director, Department of Public Affairs, Board of Christian Social Concerns, The Methodist Church, emphasized that formal education is essentially a process of open-ended inquiry, and that this process related to studies of religion in public schools:

The task of an educational system, public or private, is to provide opportunities for students to examine, in an intellectual atmosphere and under the leadership of professionally competent teachers, the whole range of forces which shape human society and culture. It is a plain fact of history
that society and culture are the product of a confluence of both religious and non-religious forces. . . . A public school system that does not reflect this historical fact in its curricula and instructional processes is simply not a good system of formal education. Moreover, a curriculum that ignored religious forces entirely or provided only token opportunity for their consideration, would by implication give the impression that such forces have not been as real in men's lives as economics and politics.34

After the 1963 decision, some persons questioned whether or not high school students would be mature enough to deal with the complex set of issues related to academic studies of religion. Dr. Gerald E. Knoff, Executive Secretary, Division of Christian Education of the NCC, suggested that

Such learning is not beyond the competence of high school youth. . . . They are accustomed to dealing with division of opinion on social issues. They are equipped to deal with abstract ideas, certainly in their Junior or Senior years. A study of religious and historical development of the Hebrew people, or of the growth of the Christian Church, or of the interplay among religions of the world can be presented to them in a manner which will encourage intellectual growth.35

Then, on a related issue of debate, i.e., the matter of adequate preparation of teachers for studies of religion in public schools, Knoff offered these thoughts:

Admittedly, high school teachers are not prepared now to teach well biblical history, church history, or the history and meaning of the religions of the world. Once upon a time they were not well equipped to teach economics, agriculture and the new mathematics. They did become prepared to teach these subjects and they can find preparation for the teaching of these religious studies.36
Finally from this 1964 symposium in Religious Education, Dr. Paul H. Vieth, Horace Bushnell Professor of Christian Nurture, Emeritus, at the Divinity School, Yale University, emphasized that a fundamental reorientation of the curriculum with respect to religion was now required as a result of the 1963 Supreme Court decision. In particular, Vieth pointed to (1) the need for textbooks which would give a proper foundation for the teaching of religion as a phase of the culture, (2) the need for both pre-service and in-service teachers to be trained adequately for this new approach to religion, including preparation with the necessary resources, (3) the need for methods of teaching appropriate to the subject matter and purposes, and (4) the need for extensive community education, so that citizens would understand what the public schools were doing with studies of religion, and thus give their intelligent support to these programs. Furthermore, as a deeply committed religious educator, Vieth clearly noted the need for continued religious education by the churches and synagogues:

Objective teaching about religion, intelligent understanding of the role of religion in human affairs, does not necessarily make persons religious. The efforts of the churches and synagogues in religious education in the full meaning of that term will need to continue.

Nevertheless, Vieth said, there is a complementary relationship between these two educational efforts, because the
work of the churches and synagogues "will be greatly enhanced when pupils come to it from the public schools with the knowledge, understanding, and appreciation of the importance of religion in life and culture which it is possible to give through objective teaching."  

Additional support for academic studies of religion in public schools came from the powerful American Association of School Administrators. In 1964, its Commission on Religion in the Public Schools reported with suggestions for public school administrators in dealing with a variety of religious problems and practices they confronted each year. But in the area of curriculum the Commission rigorously asserted:

The desirable policy in the schools . . . is to deal directly and objectively with religion whenever and wherever it is intrinsic to learning experience in the various fields of study, and to seek out appropriate ways to teach what has been aptly called "the reciprocal relation" between religion and the other elements in human culture. The implementation of that policy calls for much more than an added course, either for teachers or for the high school curriculum itself. It requires topic-by-topic analysis of the separate courses, and cooperative efforts by the teachers to give appropriate attention to these relationships.

Therefore, by the mid-1960's, there was very active support by both religious education and secular education leaders for the development of academic studies of religion in public schools. But at the same time, two earlier viewpoints were also receiving attention: (1) "shared time," a concept initiated in 1961-62, and now called "dual school
enrollment" by some persons, and (2) weekday religious education. Regarding the former of these two viewpoints, on June 4, 1964, the General Board of the NCC adopted a policy statement with respect to dual school enrollment, a term chosen in preference to shared time, as a possible solution to unresolved differences between public and parochial schools. This statement defined the concept as follows:

Dual school enrollment is here defined as an administrative arrangement in which the school time of children is shared between public school and church day school. Students who are enrolled in a church day school are also enrolled in a nearby public school for part of their general education.41

Then, in support of this approach, the statement concluded:

It is our hope that dual school enrollment may prove to be a means of helping our nation maintain the values of a general system of public education, yet at the same time meeting the needs of those who desire a system of church-related education, while upholding the historic American principle of the separation and interaction of church and state.42

As noted earlier in the chapter, this approach to dealing with the relationships between religion and public education, even with this official support from the NCC, never really gained much widespread implementation in the United States.

At the same time, other religious educators were still promoting weekday religious education as a viable option in religion-public education relationships. In June, 1964, on the fiftieth anniversary of the first
released-time classes in religion in Gary, Indiana, a number of religious educators evaluated this Protestant approach to education—past, present, and future. Optimistic was the viewpoint of Wayne M. Lindecker, Jr., on the staff of the Division of the Local Church, The Methodist Board of Education, Nashville, Tennessee:

*Weekday education is one method of incorporating religion in the general educational scheme that has proved to be entirely feasible. At the same time it permits continued support of the public school as an undergirding foundation of the democratic system. With adequate sponsorship, adequate budget, and adequate leadership, weekday religious education has proved it can reach great masses of children, including those who are not being reached by the local churches of any faith.*

Much less optimistic about weekday religious education programs was the conclusion of Lillian E. Comey, Director of Weekday Religious Education, Ohio Council of Churches:

*Some communities have become afraid that any program of religious instruction related to the public schools may be declared unconstitutional, in spite of the Zorach Decision upholding released time. Under the pressures of criticism from opposition groups and the problem of expanding operating costs and limited finances, some weekday programs are being discontinued and others have been curtailed.*

In June, 1965, the General Board of the NCC, in a message to the churches, declared its support for public education, public school teaching about religion, and weekday programs of Christian education with a strategy which called for cooperative work among all three of these varied educational programs. This clustered concept emphasized
comprehensive Christian responsibilities for education through the week in all three of these areas. This official policy statement read in part:

In supporting church-sponsored through-the-week programs we affirm our heritage of separation of church and state as institutions. However, our heritage also recognizes the propriety of communication and cooperation between church and state in the discharge of their joint responsibility for the complete education of children and youth.\(^{45}\)

Subsequently, Richard Upsher Smith published through the NCC a concise guidebook which detailed several options for through-the-week Christian education programs, including released time, dismissed time, after-school or "free time," and dual-school enrollment programs.\(^{46}\)

Another insight into Protestant strategies in education was that of Dr. Robert W. Lynn, Professor of Religious Education and Dean of the Auburn Program at Union Theological Seminary, New York. In a perceptive historical analysis, Lynn postulated that American Protestantism, for the last four generations, has supported a dual system of education, i.e., the parallel institutions of the American public school and the Sunday school, designed to educate children in secular and religious subjects, respectively. And, Lynn claimed, for the last century there has been little challenge to this fundamental "typical Protestant parallelism" of public school and Sunday school.\(^{47}\) But, Lynn asserted, a turning point had come in American
religious pluralism for Protestantism to take a second look at its educational strategies, and to gain a new vision for the future. Thus, Lynn advocated a strong Protestant emphasis upon studies of religion in public schools, but with a new emphasis and for a more comprehensive reason. In referring to the usual distinction made between normative and objective teaching as a requirement for studies of religion in public schools, Lynn suggested that the distinction was a dubious contribution to good educational policy. More importantly, he said, the truly critical problem with studies of religion in public schools "is not the presence of normative teaching, but rather the absence of the freedom of intelligent dissent by both teacher and student. The health and vitality of any school depends upon its ability to deal with controversy without fear of reprisal." Therefore, in seeking to gain a new, more inclusive vision for future relationships between religion and public education, Lynn proposed the following theoretical test for gauging the maturity of Protestant churches in the matter of studies of religion in public schools: Do their attitudes and actions with respect to studies of religion in public schools encourage public school leaders to deal with controversy wherever it may be found in the curriculum? As Lynn concluded:

Some day, one can hope, Protestants will be just as concerned about protecting the rights of an
English teacher to interpret J. D. Salinger's *Catcher in the Rye* as they are about the scope of his freedom in speaking explicitly of the religious convictions of John Milton. Both are skirmishes in a larger battle—the fight to preserve and extend the school's capacity to reflect critically and responsibly upon the full range of human experience. 49

Thus, in the mid-1960's, Lynn provided a new, unique perspective on an old issue for the consideration of religious educators.

Another unique perspective and insight with respect to studies of religion in public schools during the mid-1960's came from Dr. Philip H. Phenix, Professor of Education and Religion and Education, Teachers College, Columbia University. In 1966, Phenix expressed in his book, *Education and the Worship of God*, his reverential understanding of the aim of education:

> The aim of education is to guide persons in their quest for fulfillment. If the chief end of man is to know God and live in his presence, then nothing is more important than for teachers and students to be aware of the religious dimensions in all areas of the curriculum and to know how to find in the various studies the means of worshiping God in spirit and in truth. 50

Further, in his concern for studies of religion in public schools, Phenix emphasized the need for developing closer interrelationships in such efforts among elementary, secondary, and higher educational institutions. In this regard, a special concern of Phenix was the development of suitable, adequate curriculum materials for studies of religion in public schools:
In the new era of religious understanding that may well be indicated by the emergence of religious studies as a full-fledged autonomous discipline within the scholarly community, well-educated teachers in the elementary and secondary schools are going to demand and be able to use first-rate curricular materials on religion, not only to enable them to deal with the cultural heritage comprehensively and deeply, but also to enable them to prepare students adequately for the mature approach to religion and religious perspectives that they will probably encounter in college and university.

Thus, in a very sophisticated way, Phenix—himself a distinguished religious educator—provided significant understanding and support for studies of religion in public school curricula.

Those religious educators who expressed a much more general concern with moral and ethical values as related to the functioning of the public schools received a significant contribution to their viewpoint with the publication in 1966 of *Values and Teaching: Working with Values in the Classroom*, by Louis E. Raths, Merrill Harmin, and Sidney B. Simon. Although not an entirely new concept in educational theory, the approach of these three educators—known as values clarification—did offer a contemporary theory of values and a unique methodology for the clarification of values. To these men, a major problem in present American society was too abundantly clear: viz., there are legions of persons in our increasingly affluent society who suffer from unclear sets of values.
Such persons seem not to have clear purposes, to know what they are for and against, to know where they are going and why. Persons with unclear values lack direction for their lives, lack criteria for choosing what to do with their time, their energy, their very being.  

And of special concern to these men in this regard were the children and youth of America—our nation's future leaders. Thus, their purpose in writing this very helpful book with both theory and methodology:

It shows how to work with others so as to help them clarify their own values. It should be useful to persons of all ages and walks of life, but is directed most specifically to those who work professionally with children, such as teachers. It is an eminently practical book in that it shows how the theory of values operates and how procedures grow from theory.

Therefore, through this unique book and several subsequent publications, Raths, Harmin and Simon and several other concerned educators have provided for American education a significant process of valuing and helping others to value, plus innumerable specific instructional strategies which ably implement this theory. And, for religious educators, the values clarification approach offers an educationally sound introduction to the whole scope of values and valuing adaptable for church education, while at the same time providing a unique approach to a broad range of possibilities as one aspect within studies of religion in public schools.

As the decade of the 1960's entered its latter years, two major types of considerations remained at the forefront of the thinking of religious educators with
respect to studies of religion in public schools. For some of these leaders, there were theoretical and lingering legal considerations that needed to be clarified. Then, secondly, there were a number of crucial practical considerations—such as the development of viable curriculum materials and teacher education programs—that needed great attention and work with respect to studies of religion in public schools.

On the first matter of theoretical and legal considerations, a major "Conference on the Role of Religion in Public Education" was held in May, 1966, at Harvard University, sponsored by the National Conference of Christians and Jews and the Faculties of Education and of Divinity at Harvard. At this widely interdenominational, interdisciplinary meeting, over eighty of the top American leaders in both religion and education discussed a variety of viewpoints concerning the role of religion in public education. The relevance of this conference at that point in American history was perhaps best described by Dr. Theodore R. Sizer, Dean of the Harvard Graduate School of Education, and editor of a volume containing seventeen of the papers presented at the conference:

Few issues in American society have been argued more irrelevantly and more misleadingly than that of the place of religion in public schooling. Few issues have been argued for so long or so passionately. And few issues have come to so little resolution.55
In the face of this situation, then, the Harvard Conference attempted to improve our understandings of the significant contemporary relationship of religion and public schooling. Contributors of papers to this important conference included: Harvey G. Cox, Associate Professor of Church and Society at Harvard Divinity School; Samuel H. Miller, Dean of the Harvard Divinity School; George R. LaNoue, Assistant Professor of Government and Education, Teachers College, Columbia University; Lawrence Kohlberg, Associate Professor of Psychology and Human Development, University of Chicago; Neil G. McCluskey, S.J., Visiting Professor of Education at the University of Notre Dame and at Teachers College, Columbia University; Talcott Parsons, Professor of Sociology at Harvard University; and Rabbi Eugene Borowitz, Professor of Education and Jewish Religious Thought at the New York School of the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion. The range of theoretical and legal topics discussed by this most impressive array of scholars with respect to religion and public education included: teaching about religion in the public schools, the concepts of neutrality and impartiality, and the legal concept of religious neutrality; challenges of religion to our educational system, oppositions between religion and education, and a developmental view of moral education, religious education, and the public schools; secularism, pluralism, and
religion in our society; theological perspectives on public education; and the concept of the religiously neutral school. In retrospect, and in relation to subsequent events and developments, it would appear that this distinguished Harvard Conference both sparked and deepened the debate on religion in public education, especially regarding some of these important theoretical and legal considerations.

An example of continued debate in this matter among religious educators is indicated in the report of the seminar on "The Public Schools and Ecumenical Religious Education," at the National Convention of the Religious Education Association, meeting in Chicago, Illinois, November 20-22, 1966. In referring to teaching about religion in the public schools, the reporter for the seminar pertinently noted:

There were some sharp differences in the group about the value and possibility of objectivity. It was pointed out that no teacher or educational system can be neutral, and that any presumably objective study of religion does communicate certain superordinate values, such as that of academic excellence. It was pointed out that there is a difference between the sacred and the profane, that the church cannot simply be a complement to what the school does, and that the community of faith through the family may need to challenge certain latent values in education. The question is not what religion we should teach but how we are to teach the true meaning of value. Religious values are not to be taught in public schools by devising isolated courses but by helping the student to define his basic life-commitments.
With respect to the second major type of considerations, i.e., the practical, which religious educators dealt with in the late 1960's concerning studies of religion in public schools, Dr. R. B. Dierenfield conducted another empirical study similar to his 1960 investigation, treated earlier in this chapter. During 1966, Dierenfield took a poll among more than one thousand American school systems to attempt to determine the impact of the 1962 and 1963 U.S. Supreme Court decisions on religion in the public schools. Again, as earlier, Dierenfield studied a variety of matters in the relationships between religion and public education. But most pertinent and most revealing for the present study was Dierenfield's general conclusion concerning the status of religion in the public school curriculum, as he surveyed the situation in 1966:

The formal curriculum of the public schools contains less involvement with religion now than it did six years ago. Spiritual values are not as often included as aims of education and fewer organized units on religious influence on past and present culture are taught. This is true despite a widespread school policy of allowing instructors to integrate religion and subject matter when it is pertinent and objectively handled.58

As surprising and disappointing as this conclusion might have been for advocates of studies of religion in public school curriculum, Dierenfield did offer a final bit of encouragement: "It remains to be seen how great the 'teaching about' religion approach will become, but for the present, although somewhat lessened in extent, religious
influence remains a substantial factor in American education." 59

Dierenfield's rather distressing conclusion with respect to the status of religion in the public school curriculum was received with great concern by many religious educators late in the 1960's. One major figure in calling for immediate action to develop and implement studies of religion in American public schools was Dr. Robert Michaelsen, Professor and Chairman of the Department of Religious Studies, University of California, Santa Barbara. On February 18, 1966, in Chicago, in a paper prepared for presentation to the meeting of the History of Education Society, "Moral and Spiritual Values Revisited," Michaelsen challenged both secular and religious educators with this call to action:

Men have affirmed our commonly held moral and spiritual values and have looked to these values as offering a way out of the dilemma of differences on ultimate questions. But even such an elemental virtue as honesty has philosophical and theological implications. As Professor (Paul A.) Freuden has suggested, "A serious dialogue on problems of moral conduct will soon reach an essentially religious core." Must the public school always shy away from that core? Why not bring the dialogue into the classroom itself? Teaching about religion may be only a step in that direction, but it seems to be a step worth attempting. 60

Late in the 1960's, a number of publications and efforts by American educators, religious and secular, affirmed Michaelsen's viewpoint. Positive action towards the development and implementation of studies of religion
In public schools came from a variety of sources. In 1968, James V. Panoch and David L. Barr, the Executive Secretary and Associate Executive Secretary, respectively, of the Religious Instruction Association, Fort Wayne, Indiana, published a most helpful book, Religion Goes to School: A Practical Handbook for Teachers. A basic thesis of these authors was that

The school teaches religion whether it teaches religion or not. The school teaches in one way by what it includes, and teaches in quite another way by what it excludes. But one way or the other, it teaches something about religion.

Furthermore, in stating the purpose of the book, Panoch and Barr asserted:

There are right ways and wrong ways for a school to handle religion, but confusion persists over which is which. In the resulting confusion both religion and education suffer. The purpose of this book is to identify and implement what may be done with religion by a public school.

After carefully examining the legal aspects of the problem, with special emphasis on their meaning for the public school classroom instructor, the authors discuss, in a question-answer section, the many practical issues frequently raised in public schools. Finally, the major sections of the book describe the myriad resources and enrichment materials currently available for studies of religion in public schools, as well as examples of how educators around the country were using these resources in their own programs. For the first time, in this book, practical, useful,
comprehensive help was offered for teachers in dealing with actual situations involving studies of religion in public schools. Certainly, the book by Panoch and Barr was a landmark publication for advocates of academic studies of religion in public school curricula.

Further practical development of program and curriculum resources for studies of religion in public schools emanated late in the 1960's with two major publications. One, Religious Literature of the West, co-authored by John R. Whitney and Susan W. Howe of the Department of Religious Studies at Pennsylvania State University, was the first systematic and objective high school textbook on the religious literature of the Western world. This unique text, tracing the major themes of the three great religions of the West—Judaism, Christianity, and Islam, with selected readings from the Hebrew Bible, the rabbinic writings, the New Testament, and the Koran—provided the first complete course for high school programs of studies of religion in public schools. The course was developed, produced, and extensively field-tested by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Department of Education and Pennsylvania State University after the Pennsylvania legislature passed a law in 1965 permitting the study of religious writing as literature. In his personal evaluation of this first, major experimental course in public school studies of religion, Whitney wrote:
Whether or not the course now being tried turns out well, a chance has been provided, at no mean expense, to build one, try one, and evaluate the results. Each state has its own peculiar *sitz im leben*. Each can learn much from what others have done, but finally each must develop its prevailing insights from its own investment in course-building programs for its own teachers and students. The Pennsylvania experience demonstrates at least that such course-building opportunities capture the imaginations of teachers and enlist a healthy enrollment on the part of students. 64

A second major resource for studies of religion in public schools appeared in 1969, with the publication of *The Bible Reader: An Interfaith Interpretation*, which contained notes from the Jewish, Roman Catholic, and Protestant traditions, and references to art, literature, history, and the social problems of modern man in the light of this religious literature. 65 Rabbi Arthur Gilbert, Jesuit priest Walter M. Abbott, and two Protestants, the Rev. J. Carter Swaim and Dr. Rolfe Lanier Hunt, produced this massive volume over an eight-year period with the central conviction that the preparation of American citizens for life today requires an acquaintance with the Bible. Specifically, as related to studies of religion in public schools, these interfaith editors pointed to a major value of the book when they said: "No person can be required to believe or disbelieve, but the facts all must know; if we know more about each other we can hope to live together in harmony." 66

Further support for this work came in the following year with the publication of *The Bible Reader's Guide*, prepared
This practical, useful teacher's guide, intended specifically for use with The Bible Reader, emphasized approaches to the study of the Bible through English and social studies curricula in the public schools.

Perhaps Claire Cox, in her insightful 1969 book, The Fourth R: What Can Be Taught About Religion in the Public Schools, best summarized the status of studies of religion in public schools by the end of the liberating decade, 1960-1969, with a vigorous appeal for a coordinated, organized approach to this issue. In general, Miss Cox wrote,

There is no lack of support for the idea of making religion the fourth R in the classroom. In addition to varying degrees of endorsement by a large segment of organized religion, a number of groups have accepted the principle that religion should rank with reading, 'riting, and 'rithmetic in a child's basic education.

Among such groups described by Miss Cox are Religious Heritage of America, the Laymen's National Bible Committee, the American Bible Society, the Religious Instruction Association, the National Conference of Christians and Jews, and the Religious Education Association. Nevertheless, charged Miss Cox, none of the supporters of the cause for studies of religion in the public schools had produced what was most needed: viz., curriculum materials and adequate teacher-training programs. Toward this objective of a unified, coordinated, organized approach for meeting the needs of
curriculum materials and adequate teacher-training programs for studies of religion in public schools, Miss Cox issued a sharp challenge to religious educators for the decades ahead:

If the time, energy, and money used to discuss religion in the schools and to prepare the jumble of programs now in force could be harnessed into one comprehensive effort, the subject of religion in the schools might no longer be cause for concern, debate, or battles in the courts. It could finally, after centuries of dissension, take its place as the Fourth R, along with reading, 'riting, and 'rithmetic, as a standard, accepted topic for study in the schools and provide one more step toward producing better-educated, increasingly cultured, and more ethically motivated young Americans.69

This kind of challenge by Miss Cox would receive significant response during the period 1970-1974, by many American religious educators deeply concerned about studies of religion in public school curricula. In particular, the two most needed areas of curriculum materials and teacher training programs would receive considerable attention, as we shall soon discover in Chapter VI.
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CHAPTER VI

THE PERIOD, 1970-1974

The Innovating Years

As the decade of the 1970's began, the status and prospects of studies of religion in public schools remained in doubt, despite obvious legal gains during the 1960's in support of such studies. And, for many American liberal Protestant religious educators, it was viewed that much further work was needed in this uncertain yet significant area of study in public schools. Perhaps Mr. David L. Barr, Associate Director of the Religious Instruction Association, Fort Wayne, Indiana, provided the best overview of the situation of studies of religion as it existed early in the period, 1970-1974:

Overwhelmingly, the present scene reflects the pattern of the past: only a shallow, token study of religion, often only mentioned in passing and generally without any printed curricular materials.

Gradually, however, we see the emergence of a new kind of religion study: a study which aims at completeness, objectivity and balance. We see a few state projects, several curriculum development attempts, and a host of individual teachers and schools attempting to include religion significantly within the curriculum.

Whether the inertia of the past or the innovation of the present is the true portrait of the future is not yet decided [emphasis added].

187
During this period, 1970-1974, religious educators expressed their views with respect to studies of religion in public schools around five major topics, which will also serve as the basic structure for this chapter. These five topics or areas of concern were: (1) theoretical, including legal, considerations; (2) practical considerations, especially with respect to the development and expansion of teacher education programs and curriculum materials for studies of religion; (3) organizational developments; (4) the roles and functions of religious educators and local churches in promoting studies of religion in public schools; and (5) a serious and realistic assessment of the future of studies of religion beyond the mid-1970's.

As related to this five-point structure, a major development within the period, 1970-1974, must be noted here at the outset of the chapter. Namely, during this period much of the leadership in the development of studies of religion came from a small group of religious educators, with theological training, who worked professionally within public institutions of higher education in the United States, especially through religious studies departments. Most notable in this group were: Dr. David E. Engel, University of Pittsburgh; Dr. Robert Michaelsen, University of California at Santa Barbara; Dr. Nicholas Piediscalzi, Wright State University, Dayton, Ohio; Dr. Robert A. Spivey, Florida State University; Dr. James S. Ackerman, Indiana
University; and Dr. John R. Whitney, Pennsylvania State University. As Engel, one of these leaders, and Assistant Professor of Religion and Education at the University of Pittsburgh, most cogently surmised:

It might just be that persons with theological insight can make a contribution to the further development of education in the United States. Educational practice might benefit from some of the experience and insight of religion.

As one sharing with this notable group the common background, training, experience, and concern in both religion and education, the present writer completely and absolutely agrees with Engel's insightful perspective.

In fact, it is to two of these religious-educational leaders that we turn for helpful views on the theoretical considerations during the period, 1970-1974, with respect to studies of religion in public schools. First, in an essay, "Religion, Education and the Law," Engel concisely and imaginatively summarized the legal relationships to studies of religion in public schools as follows:

I will begin by stating a proposition which summarizes the major legal constraint about religion in public schools: You can lead a person to religion, but you can't make him religious. Accordingly, you can expose meanings in religion, the history of religious developments, the content of religious literature, the relation between religious and secular phenomena, the significance of traditional days, etc. But, according to the Constitution, you cannot make a student (or anyone for that matter) be religious. That is, you cannot coerce someone to engage in some religious act or cultic practice.
Nevertheless, this legal restraint did not prevent nor prohibit a number of religious educators, including Engel, from advocating and working toward the implementation of studies of religion in public schools during the period, 1970-1974. In fact, many of these leaders recognized the fundamental importance of studies of religion to one's complete and adequate education in contemporary American society. As Engel significantly wrote later, with respect to the value of religion in general education:

Religion is not a closed discipline, any more than philosophy or the natural sciences. Religion does not supply answers in a final sense. Instead it helps us to formulate questions about experience in a particular way and point us in a direction where some provisional resolutions may be discerned. In other words, even though religion involves devotional practice, it can also be studied as a subject or as a dimension of other subjects. And it can, accordingly, be viewed as an academic discipline which contributes to man's self-understanding.

...broadly understood, the study of religion is an approach to the issues and problems of life.  

Further strong support for studies of religion in public schools early in the 1970's came from Dr. Robert Michaelsen, Professor of Religious Studies and Chairman of the Department of Religious Studies at the University of California at Santa Barbara, and former Director of the School of Religion at the University of Iowa. In a significant scholarly contribution to this field of study, Michaelsen published in 1970 a book, *Piety in the Public School: Trends and Issues in the Relationship between Religion and the Public School in the United States.* In
this careful historical analysis, Michaelsen concluded with his own personal support for a particular approach to studies of religion in public schools, not unlike Engel's position:

In am arguing for a critical and appreciative study of religion in the public schools. By "critical" I mean that the primary goal of such a study is accurate knowledge and that all available tools and resources are used to that end. I add "appreciative" since Americans often understand "critical" only in the sense of adverse criticism. What is sought is genuine understanding, a sympathetic entering into the subject with the goal in mind of trying as best one can to see it as it is. 6

Then, for clarity and comparative purposes, Michaelsen added:

The rationale and technique of this kind of approach differ sharply from those most commonly evidenced in typical public school religious practices of the past. Unlike prayer and devotional Bible reading, this approach does not require personal participation in what is in effect an act of religious worship. And unlike the released-time approach, it does not require opting for or against a particular religious position. 7

In a later article printed in Religious Education in 1973, Michaelsen again argued in favor of studies of religion in public schools, and this time he suggested an important "test of significance":

The chief educational standard which calls for the inclusion of the study of religion is the test of significance. Religion is a universal phenomenon; and in most cultures it is of massive if not determinative importance. Up until recently this has not been commonly evident in public school curricula and textbooks in this country. This is true in part because the test of significance has been: Can you prove it? And is it useful? We have come through a period of the hegemony of what
Paul Tillich called "scientism." By this he meant a tendency to regard as significant only that which can be measured precisely or proved experimentally and a propensity to elevate scientific hypotheses to the status of dogmas. In this period the rich human world of imagination, ritual, symbol, myth, and religious thought was either ignored or cast into the outer darkness of mystery and/or superstition.8

Therefore, because of the past situation and because religion is highly significant as a universal phenomenon of mankind, Michaelsen strongly stressed the need for a careful, thoughtful, informed consideration of the nature of religion and of its role in human culture, as a necessary part of public school studies.

Finally, under the heading of the first topic of this chapter, i.e., theoretical considerations, Dorothy A. Dixon, Director of the Laboratory School at Eden Theological Seminary, suggested a crucial "test of objectivity" for studies of religion, especially in the academic study of world religions. With her theory based upon practical experience, Ms. Dixon wrote:

While worship experiences are subjective and not appropriate in public schools, experiences in other facets of the religious culture can be suitably and objectively arranged, especially where they involve art forms and other related cultural practices.9

In these suitable and objective studies of religion, the crucial "test of objectivity" was this:

"Does this activity expose the learner to the culture, or does it impose the culture on the learner?" As long as the teacher can be sure that he or she is exposing, not imposing, he
is safe to go ahead. . . . The teacher therefore merely exposes the learner to the religious culture but does not ask him to adhere to that religion.10

With this kind of theoretical-legal clarification and support from Engel, Michaelsen, Dixon and others, a second major area of concern during this period, 1970-1974, for religious educators was the practical aspects of studies of religion in public schools. As was true during the late 1960's, the very practical matters of teacher education programs and curriculum materials for studies of religion occupied much of the thinking of these concerned religious educators. An encouraging yet still challenging sign in these matters was indicated in a study by R. B. Dierenfield, Professor of Education at Macalester College, Minnesota. Following two similar studies completed by Dierenfield in 1960 and 1966, the 1972 study attempted to identify trends and changes in religious influence in America's public schools through an extensive survey of school superintendents. One area that Dierenfield studied was the new stress on teaching about religion in the public schools. In particular, Dierenfield discovered that

Considerable scholarly interest has been evident regarding the objective teaching about religion, and this is gradually translated into classes in the public schools. While less than half (about 44%) of the systems teach such courses, more than half (55%) do have units on the influence of religion on literature, history, and society.11
Therefore, concluded Dierenfield, "with the availability of field tested curricula and more teaching resources, it appears likely this movement will spread ... with an interesting future ahead of it."^{12}

Additional support and challenge in these matters came from Dr. Philip H. Phenix, Professor of Philosophy of Education and Religion and Education at Teachers College, Columbia University, whose own education includes a Bachelor of Divinity degree from Union Theological Seminary, New York City (1942), and a Ph.D. in Religion from Columbia University (1950). A long-time advocate of studies of religion in public school curricula, Phenix wrote in 1972 that there was

... never a better time to take the religious question seriously as educators. There are great values in exploring the riches of meaning in the faiths of mankind. The hunger of today's young people is for the deeper realities of existence. We have before us in the schools an unparalleled opportunity. Let us make the most of it.^{13}

An even more specific assessment and challenge came at the same time from Boardman W. Kathan, General Secretary of the Religious Education Association:

The decade of the 1960's witnessed legal battles on various fronts about the relation between religion and the schools. All of these legal matters have not been resolved, but the decade of the 1970's affords us an unparalleled opportunity to move ahead in teacher education, curriculum development, and public information and support regarding this whole area.^{14}
In a very determined effort to meet these challenges for studies of religion in public school curricula, a number of very important curriculum and teacher education programs developed in the early 1970's, very interestingly located primarily in public, state-supported institutions of American higher education, and frequently in religious studies departments. In a significant 1972 publication, Religion and Public School Curriculum, the Religious Education Association provided the platform for reports and discussions concerning a number of these major programs throughout the country. In general, these programs of studies of religion in public schools are usually located in the two subject areas of literature and/or social studies, especially at the secondary school level. In the public school curriculum, these studies may take the form of (1) a unit within an existing course, (2) a special elective course, or (3) an enrichment activity in any course in the curriculum. Units within existing courses might include a unit on the Reformation in a world history course, a unit on the influence of colonial religions in a United States history course, or a unit on the Bible in a literature course. Special elective courses might include Biblical Literature, History of Religions, or Comparative Religions. Enrichment activities in any course in the curriculum would include the contingent and relevant aspects
of religion as they arise any day in any classroom at any grade level.  

In particular, a number of these major projects as discussed in Religion and Public School Curriculum will be noted here briefly. One of the earliest of these projects (1966) was the state program for Pennsylvania Religious Literature Courses, directed by Dr. John R. Whitney, Assistant Professor, Department of Religious Studies, Pennsylvania State University. The major course to be developed from the project, "Religious Literature of the West," described in Chapter V of the present study, is to be complemented with a second major course, "Religious Literature of the East," with both courses designed for secondary school level. Concurrent ventures in teacher education are being developed for these courses at Pennsylvania State University, and other schools of teacher education in Pennsylvania. A second major project in curriculum development was the Florida Religion-Social Studies Curriculum Project, initiated in 1968 through a grant from the Danforth Foundation, at Florida State University. This program, focusing on curriculum development and teacher education for religion-social studies at the secondary level, has been directed by Dr. Robert A. Spivey, Chairman of the Department of Religion, and Dr. Rodney F. Allen, Assistant Professor of Social Studies Education, both at Florida State University. Developed and carefully
field-tested over a three-year period (1968-1971) was a set of thirty instructional units, entitled "Religious Issues and Social Studies." Ten units deal with "Issues in Religion for Students of American Culture," ten units deal with "Issues in Religion for Students of Western Culture," and ten units deal with "Issues in Religion for Students of World Cultures." In an assessment of these materials, Dr. Edwin Scott Gaustad, a noted historian of American religion, and a consultant to the project, importantly emphasized that these studies of religion utilized primary source materials, thus to seek student involvement through his own inquiry and discovery. Gaustad asserted,

For that reason, the phrase, "learning about religion," is preferred to the more familiar one, "teaching about religion." The emphasis is not on the lecture which can more easily slide down from education into indoctrination, but on the analyses and discussions in which teacher and student jointly participate.

Other significant projects and programs in curriculum development and/or teacher education with respect to studies of religion in public schools include the following: studies of religious writing in Nebraska elementary and junior high school curricula, prepared through the Curriculum Development Center at the University of Nebraska; religious studies programs for teachers and prospective teachers through the University of California state-system, especially through the Institute of Religious Studies at Santa Barbara (U.C.); in Indiana, programs in teaching the
Bible in secondary English have been developed at both Indiana University and Ball State University; and in Michigan, the study of religion as an academic discipline has been emphasized for public schools, especially at Western Michigan University.  

In addition, further encouragement for studies of religion in public schools is found in the fact that three states, California, Michigan, and Wisconsin, now grant accreditation or state approval to academic concentrations in religious studies as an area in which teachers may be certified for public school teaching. Programs in six teacher-preparing institutions in these three states have been approved, as follows, in chronological order of approval: University of Wisconsin, Whitewater (March 5, 1971, minor); Edgewood College, Madison, Wisconsin (July 1, 1971, major and minor); Calvin College, Grand Rapids, Michigan (April 25, 1972, minor); University of California, Santa Barbara (June 9, 1972, major and minor, plus graduate programs through the Ph.D.); California State University, Northridge (June 9, 1972, major and minor, plus graduate programs through the Ph.D.); and Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin (November 21, 1972, major and minor). Applications for state approval are pending for one institution in California (College of Notre Dame, Belmont) and for four more in Michigan (Michigan State University, East Lansing; Hope College, Holland; Western Michigan University,
Kalamazoo; and the University of Detroit, Detroit). Also, Regis College, Denver, Colorado, is developing a major in religious studies for teachers, and will propose it to the state for consideration. In an analysis of these programs, Dr. Frank L. Steeves, Dean of the School of Education, Marquette University, encouragingly concluded:

The approved programs as well as those under consideration appear to be academically interdisciplinary and non-sectarian. Each reflects the normal concerns on its campus for general education and professional teacher preparation. Each includes concerns for the legal positions of the teacher of religion and lays stress on the sensitive nature of religious experience.

In all of these early 1970's efforts to develop and implement studies of religion in public schools, with very critical attention to curriculum development and teacher education programs, perhaps the most comprehensive and intensive leadership has come from the Public Education Religion Studies Center, established in September, 1972, at Wright State University, Dayton, Ohio. Originally supported by grants from Religious Heritage of America, Inc., and the Lilly Endowment, Inc., PERSC, as it is commonly known, is codirected by Dr. Nicholas Piediscalzi, Chairman, Department of Religion, and Dr. James K. Uphoff, Professor in the College of Education, both at Wright State University. The Field Coordinator of PERSC is James V. Panoch, former Director of the Religious Instruction Association, whose functions were absorbed by PERSC in 1973. The clearly
stated purpose of PERSC is "to encourage and facilitate increased and improved teaching about religion within constitutional bounds, mainly in elementary and secondary public schools and where applicable in relevant areas of post-secondary education." More specifically, PERSC

... emphasizes the natural inclusion of study about religion within regular curricular offerings such as history, art, English, music, and geography; the addition of specific courses or units such as "Religious Literature," "World Religions," and "Religion and Literature"; and the improvement of pre- and in-service training for teachers.

Dedicated to a comprehensive and nonsectarian study about religion as one of the significant areas of man's life and thought, PERSC makes a very clear distinction between the academic study of religion, as is advocated for inclusion within public schools, and the practice and propagation of religion, as is the function of churches and synagogues:

The public school is not a church or a religious institution. It is a place of academic pursuits, a community where the student is invited by his instructors to join them in an objective study of historical events, beliefs, practices, and issues so as to achieve a deeper understanding and appreciation of these aspects of his own life and in the lives of others. The goal is a lucid understanding of religion and its relationship to mankind [emphasis added].

A further viewpoint of PERSC is that the academic study of religion in public schools may also help to "dispel the stereotypes that encourage religious prejudice and discrimination and, thereby, contribute to establish a sense
of human community and an appreciation of our common humanity in the midst of our diversities." ^26

As the means for fulfilling its stated purposes and objectives, PERSC is very actively involved with a number of extremely important activities and services, in promoting and implementing studies of religion in public schools. Among PERSC's activities and services are the following: serves as a resource center on available curriculum materials; encourages and initiates responsible review and evaluation of existing curriculum materials and programs and the development of necessary new materials; conducts and recommends workshops, seminars, and conferences throughout the nation; makes its staff and/or other nationally recognized experts available for consultation with governmental, educational, and community groups or with individuals; makes available through Wright State University, Dayton, Ohio, a master's degree program in education (M.Ed. or M.A.T.) which can be designed to meet the candidate's individual needs for training in religion studies and education; provides a research center for scholars studying religion studies in public education; and PERSC publishes a quarterly newsletter. ^27 Guided by a Professional Advisory Council of national leaders from a variety of fields and occupations, PERSC functions today as the primary leadership in the development and implementation of studies of religion in public schools—dealing comprehensively with
the multitude of issues related to the academic study of religion in American public schools today. Religious educators who support studies of religion in public schools can be grateful for the work of PERSC, and hope that PERSC will continue to function in this leadership role long into the future.

With respect to the third major aspect of this chapter covering the period 1970-1974, viz., organizational developments, two important organizations were formed during this period to deal with relationships between religion and public education. Late in the fall of 1971, The National Council on Religion and Public Education (NCRPE) was formed in an attempt to organize the proliferation of efforts by scores of individuals and organizations to introduce courses about religion in the public schools within the guidelines set forth by the U.S. Supreme Court. Under a grant from the W. Clement and Jessie V. Stone Foundation of Chicago, and through a meeting of educators, religious leaders, and laymen sponsored by the Religious Education Association in New York City on November 30-December 1, 1971, the NCRPE was formed in response to the need for an organized approach to studies of religion in public schools, such as the appeal of Claire Cox in her 1969 book, The Fourth R, discussed in Chapter V of the present study.

The stated purpose of the NCRPE is "to provide a forum and means for cooperation among organizations and
Institutions concerned with those ways of studying religion which are educationally appropriate and constitutionally acceptable to a secular program of public education.°

To accomplish this purpose, five functions of the NCRPE have been established, as the Council works with and through its member organizations:

1. to establish liaison with professional and lay educational organizations and other appropriate groups concerned with the purpose of this corpora-
tion . . . ;
2. to provide a forum for continuing dialogue on issues, programs, and projects which deal with the academic study of religion in public education;
3. to create public and professional awareness of and support for the objective study of religion in public schools;
4. to increase the awareness on the part of both educational and religious groups of the limita-
tions of such study as well as its permissibility and desirability;
5. to gather and provide information about resource persons, programs, projects, curriculum materials, teacher education opportunities, and legal decisions related to religion and public education.29

In view of their highly complementary efforts, PERSC, an academic structure, and the NCRPE, an organizational struc-
ture, clearly stand out today as the two most visible, active leaders in the field of studies of religion in American public schools.

A second organization which emerged during this period was called United Ministries in Public Education (very recently changed to Ministries in Public Education). Originally constituted in 1970 by four Protestant denominations to call the American Protestant church to accept its
accountability for education as a major dimension of public life, United Ministries in Public Education (UMPE) has been supported by the following national church bodies: The American Baptist Churches in the U.S.A., The Episcopal Church, The Presbyterian Church in the U.S., The United Church of Christ, The United Methodist Church, The United Presbyterian Church U.S.A., and the Division of Christian Life and Mission of the NCC. Prior to this time, it was maintained, many religious educators were by and large primarily concerned with explicitly religious instruction in religious institutions—evidence to the contrary discovered in the present study notwithstanding. Thus, UMPE was formed in response to a concern by some liberal Protestant religious educators, including Robert Lynn at Union Theological Seminary, that religious education be re-conceived and, in part, redirected to help in sustaining the public ventures in education. The more broadly conceived venture of UMPE included, as part of its concern, support for academic studies of religion in public schools. But, as David E. Engel, Chairman of the UMPE Policies and Planning Committee, wrote in 1972, calling for a wide focus of concern by religious educators:

Religious instruction in churches and synagogues and the objective study about religion in public schools continue to be valid concerns. But the religious educator today can also include concerns for the effective education of the public in his outlook and his responsibility.
And thus, toward this end, Engel concluded that UMPE "represents a model by which the systems for public education might be engaged and affected by persons with religious concerns." 31

In this broadly conceived approach, UMPE has supported in a general way studies of religion in American public schools during the 1970's. And, another organization to offer general support to academic studies of religion in public schools, especially in its efforts since 1972, is the American Academy of Religion (AAR), under the direction of its Executive Director, Dr. Robert A. Spivey, Chairman of the Department of Religion, Florida State University. The AAR is composed primarily of professors and researchers in religious studies throughout American higher education, and thus the AAR has provided some helpful academic support to studies of religion programs in American elementary and secondary public schools. At the present time, it can be anticipated that both UMPE and the AAR will become even more active in future endeavors in support of studies of religion in public schools.

With respect to the roles and functions of religious educators and local churches in promoting studies of religion in public schools, during the period 1970-1974, three religious educators have offered helpful insights and suggestions. The three are Philip H. Phenix, J. Blaine Fister, and George E. Koehler. Phenix, Professor of Philosophy and
Education and Religion and Education at Teachers College, Columbia University, has suggested that the responsibility for creating awareness of the issues regarding studies of religion in public schools belongs to many agencies in American society, which he divided into four groups: governmental, ecclesiastical, educational, and community. Among ecclesiastical groups, Phenix has stated that perhaps none are more important in this task of creating public awareness for studies of religion than those created by the national and regional bodies, such as the NCC, the various denominational boards, and local councils of churches. In fact, Phenix claims that some of the policy statements of these bodies have been of great weight in educating these respective religious constituencies over the past half century. "Equally important," says Phenix, "are the efforts of individual pastors and directors of religious education who can do much to guide the thought of their parishioners and pupils in this policy area."32

Dr. J. Blaine Fister, Staff Associate for Church and Public Education with the NCC, recently published a monograph, Teaching About Religion in the Schools as an Option. In this brief, helpful presentation, Fister significantly claims that,

If the public schools deal more adequately and effectively with religion and religions where this study falls naturally into the regular curricula areas, they will be laying a foundation
of religious knowledge and awareness on which the religious education enterprise of the churches and synagogues can build.33

But, reciprocally, churches—and local religious educators in particular—have a major responsibility, says Fister, for educating their constituencies about the appropriate place of religion in the public schools. In agreement with Phenix, but more specifically, Fister challenged religious educators:

We must interpret to our church constituencies the reasons why we feel that devotional exercises, including prayer and Bible reading, are not appropriate in our pluralistic public school system but appropriate for the church and the home. We must interpret to them, also, that the schools have a definite responsibility for increasing the opportunities for students to become more aware of the religions of the world and to see religion as an option for answers to the ultimate questions, such as "Who am I?" "Who are you?" "Where am I going?" "What are we here for?"34

Then, with truly perceptive insight, Fister added:

Where religion is eliminated from the regular educational program of the public schools, we leave open only humanistic options for answers to ultimate questions. This would mean indoctrination of another kind and would also be unconstitutional.35

Finally, in another appeal to religious educators, Fister urged that "because churches have a special expertise in religious matters, the door is open for dialogue with professional educators in a consultative relationship. These opportunities should be grasped."36

In an article relating to the use of Fister's monograph by local churches, Dr. George E. Koehler, Staff
Member of the Division of Education, Board of Discipleship of The United Methodist Church, suggested a number of specific, useful steps which groups of concerned citizens within local churches could take, with respect to support for studies of religion in public schools. First, these groups could study and share, thinking through together the issues raised by Fister and other related sources. Second, these concerned groups could contact other churches to discover if there are other persons in other congregations who might join them in this interest— including an ecumenical approach, which probably would carry more weight with public school officials. Third, these groups could visit with public school teachers and administrators, to find out what are the current policies and practices with respect to studies of religion in public schools locally. Also, they could determine from these public school representatives their feelings and interests in possible changes toward studies of religion. Fourth, these local church groups could consult with a local public school's action committee, if there is one, for possible combined efforts in promoting studies of religion in the local public schools. Fifth, the concerned local church groups need to help inform their own congregations in understanding the issues, what is legal and what is not, and what the values of studies of religion in public schools might be. Finally, Koehler suggests that these local church groups that advocate studies of religion
in public schools must take some type of direct action, to try and bring about the desired changes in this area of concern. As Koehler says,

This may involve approaching your local school board. It may involve a more ambitious attempt to change policies of the state department of education. It may involve trying to improve teacher education by working with schools of education and departments of religious studies in colleges and universities.37

But whatever the approach, some type of direct action must be taken by local churches concerned with promoting studies of religion in public schools, and leadership for this direct action is a major role and function of local church religious educators.

Finally in this chapter, a serious and realistic assessment of the future of studies of religion in public schools beyond the mid-1970's was a major concern of religious educators during the period 1970-1974. A major contribution toward that end was a symposium in June, 1973, sponsored by the Public Education Religion Studies Center, at Wright State University, Dayton, Ohio. The very pertinent topic of this symposium was "Religion Studies in the Curriculum: Retrospect and Prospect, 1963-1983." Held on the tenth anniversary of the highly significant—for academic studies of religion in public schools--U.S. Supreme Court decision in the Abington School District v. Schempp/ Murray v. Curlett twin cases, the symposium presented a number of papers focusing sharply on the most relevant
issues of studies of religion in public schools for the present and the future. Very notable among these papers were the cogent remarks of Dr. Robert Michaelsen, Chairman of the Religious Studies Department, University of California at Santa Barbara, concerning the future of studies of religion in public schools. Cautiously optimistic about the future in this area, Michaelsen wrote very pragmatically:

Nineteen-eighty-three is just one year short of Orwell's doomsday. Who can say what it will be like then? Institutional religion is in serious crisis today. Public education generally is under sharp attack, and the public school has been found wanting by critics from both ends of the political spectrum. I tend to assume, however, that so long as the United States continues some form of public education will also continue. And I am convinced that so long as man is man, his religious impulse and needs will not disappear.

On these ground, Michaelsen proceeded to prognosticate a hopeful future for studies of religion in public schools during the decade, 1973-1983.

In a conclusion to the symposium, Dr. Peter Bracher, Department of English, and Dr. Nicholas Piediscalzi, Department of Religion, both of Wright State University, offered a very helpful summary and some important directions for the future of studies of religion in public schools. Because of succinctness and pertinence, their conclusion is quoted here at length, thereby providing a fitting summary of the major concerns during the period, 1970-1974, as well as directions for the future:
There are, it seems, some half dozen issues and problems that should readily occupy the attention of those working in public education religion studies during the next decade—and perhaps longer. Some involve continuing clarification of problems that have already had considerable attention—the legal issues and the matter of the distinction between profession and practice of religion and study about religion. Others deal with more theoretical issues of definition—such as the meaning of terms like "religion" and "objectivity." Still others involve practical pedagogical problems having to do with identifying competent teaching and teachers of religion studies and with evaluating and developing high quality teacher training programs for pre- and in-service training as well as certification programs. Evaluation and development of effective and high quality curricular materials is also important. While this does not constitute a program for the future, it points some important directions.39

Then, as a final challenge to educators, both religious and secular, as well as to all other concerned citizens of America, Bracher and Piediscalzi wrote, in 1973:

It is not clear at this date that religion studies will continue to expand and become a new element in public education. However, it is absolutely clear that the present moment demands that all concerned with public education religion studies devote their energies and attentions to improving the quality of existing programs and curricular materials, expanding and up-grading teacher education and certification programs, and establishing sound criteria for evaluating programs, materials, and teacher education programs.40

In a later article by PERSC staff members, another important matter demanding immediate attention of persons concerned with studies of religion in public schools was elicited: viz., the critical need for educating the American public on the various issues related to studies of religion in
public schools, especially education in the legal decisions governing these studies. As noted earlier in this chapter, Phenix, Fister, and Koehler expressed the same concern for religious educators and their constituencies.

Finally, as a conclusion to this chapter on the innovating years of 1970-1974, and possibly as a concise summary-conclusion for this entire study, a few lines composed by James V. Panoch, PERSC's Field Coordinator, are offered here:

The school may sponsor the study of religion, but may not sponsor the practice of religion.
The school may expose students to all religious views, but may not impose any particular view. The school's approach to religion is one of instruction, not one of indoctrination.
The function of the school is to educate about religions, not to convert to any one religion. The school's approach to religion is academic, not devotional.
The school should study what all people believe, but should not teach a pupil what he should believe. The school should strive for student awareness of all religions, but should not press for student acceptance of any one religion. The school should seek to inform the student about various beliefs, but should not seek to conform him to any one belief.

From these eight sets of antithetical normative prescriptions, it can be generally summarized that studies of religion in public schools are legal, appropriate, and educationally valuable when they are a part of the academic program, when they do not give preferential or derogatory treatment to religion in general or to any single religion, and when they do not constitute a religious practice. It
may well be that the future of both religion and public education in America hinge upon the fulfillment of crucial ends such as these.
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CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION

The views of American liberal Protestant religious educators, 1940-1974, with respect to studies of religion in public schools, discovered and analyzed through this study, can be grouped into ten somewhat distinct, and even conflicting, positions, of which three have had much wider influence than the others. One major viewpoint expressed by these religious educators throughout the thirty-five year period covered by the study, especially after the 1963 United States Supreme Court decision in the Abington School District v. Schempp/Murray v. Curlett cases, was the view to promote, support, and help to develop and implement academic studies of religion in the public school curriculum, i.e., academic studies of religion that are objective, nonsectarian, and nonconfessional, especially as developed through regular social studies and literature curricula in the public schools. A variety of names for this approach included: objective teaching of religion, objective study of religion, teaching about religion, learning about religion, the factual study of religion, taking account of religion, studies of religion, and religion studies.

219
A second viewpoint which received much support at various times during the period covered by the study was that a legitimate area of endeavor by the public schools is to strengthen the relationship between general education and religion, through such means as character education, education for democratic living, the teaching of basic moral and spiritual values, teaching a "common core" of religious beliefs, and values clarification programs. This second major viewpoint is in harmony with both the development of academic studies of religion in public schools, and with present theories and trends in curriculum development.

A third viewpoint, of lesser influence than the first two, yet with much emphasis in the earlier years covered by the study, was support for dismissed time programs of religious education, sponsored by the churches, held in the churches, taught by church educators, and held at some time during regular public school hours—frequently at the end of a school day—when students so desiring would be dismissed from their public school to attend religious education classes at their respective churches. Some efforts would be made to correlate public school learnings with learnings from these religious education classes. Frequently, this type of program is incorrectly referred to as a "released time" program—according to the distinctions made in the 1948 (McCollum v. Board of Education) and 1952
(Zorach v. Clauson) U.S. Supreme Court Decisions on these programs.

Other viewpoints expressed by these religious educators, scattered throughout the period covered by the study, included, in decreasing order of support, the following: Support weekday religious education programs, sponsored by the churches, held in the churches, taught by church educators, and held after public school class hours; The church school and the public school are parallel, but separate, educational institutions, both of which need to be supported and strengthened by Protestants; Studies of religion and religious education are the responsibility of the churches, in conjunction with the homes of its members, and thus the public schools have no legitimate role or function with respect to studies of religion—especially in view of the historic American principle of separation of church and state; Support dual school enrollment programs, in which a student would be concurrently enrolled at both a public school, for secular subjects credit, and at a church school, for religious subjects credit; To strengthen studies of religion, Protestant parochial schools should be established as a legitimate alternative to public school education; Support theistic teaching in the public schools—which in some ways involves a form of indoctrination; Do not get involved in these complex issues with respect to studies of religion in the public schools, i.e., let
someone else, especially public school officials, deal with these matters since religious educators have enough work to do in their own domain of strictly religious education in the churches.

Of the several, varied positions taken by these religious educators, 1940-1974, the viewpoint supporting academic studies of religion in the public school curriculum was the overwhelmingly predominant view and, it would appear, the most promising position with respect to the future of studies of religion in American public schools. Further, the teacher education and curricula implications of this position are uncertain at the present time, and thus these two aspects of academic studies of religion in public schools have meanings beyond this current study.

Two additional conclusions can be made from the study. First, the work of devoted liberal Protestant religious educators in the early part of the study, 1940-1963, helped to lay a solid foundation for the dramatic work done since 1963 with respect to the development of studies of religion in public schools. Second, a significant part of the leadership in the development of studies of religion in public schools in the last decade has come from a small number of religious educators with theological training, who work professionally within public institutions of higher education in the United States, especially through religious studies departments. From this pattern, it would
appear that much of the leadership for the future of studies of religion in public schools lies with persons such as these, within departments of religious studies in state universities rather than with professional teacher educators in teacher training institutions.

Beyond the study itself, a number of related concerns are to be noted. From the viewpoints and experiences reflected by these religious educators, 1940-1974, it can be concluded that there can and should be a complementary, reciprocal relationship between objective, academic studies of religion in public schools and the educational work of the churches. That is, if the public schools deal adequately and effectively with religion where this study falls naturally into the regular curricular areas, the public schools, through academic studies of religion, will be laying a foundation of religious awareness, knowledge, and literacy on which the religious education endeavors of the churches can solidly build. Also, given our contemporary American religious pluralism, studies of religion in public schools could be very helpful in creating greater understanding, appreciation, and toleration of a variety of religious viewpoints among the heterogeneous student population of our American public school system. Finally, the most important current and future needs with respect to academic studies of religion are further development in the areas of curriculum materials, teacher education and certification
programs, criteria for evaluating these materials and programs, and in the area of community education about studies of religion in public schools. Such studies would benefit from increased dialogue among leaders in religious studies, professional teacher educators, church-religious educators, public school officials, and concerned community citizens.

It is apparent that further research is suggested by the present study. Fully as complete a study on the views of American conservative-fundamental Protestant, Roman Catholic, and Jewish religious educators, as well as the views of secular educators—such as public school teachers, administrators, and professional teacher educators—1940—1974, with respect to studies of religion in public schools, is needed. Also helpful would be a retrospective study on the views of liberal Protestant religious educators prior to 1940, especially the period 1900-1939, with respect to studies of religion in public schools.

Additional areas in need of research related to the present study include: studies of other broad areas with respect to religion and public education in America, e.g., the expenditure of public tax money for religious purposes, religious activities and ceremonies in public schools, and activities in public schools from which an individual may be excused because of religious beliefs; an historical and/or contemporary study of religion in general and studies
of religion in particular as found in American public-state institutions of higher education; a study toward further clarification of the theoretical and philosophical issues with respect to studies of religion in American public schools, such as through the methods of linguistic-conceptual analysis; an historical and contemporary study of the role of American Protestant seminaries and theological schools with respect to studies of religion in public schools, especially in the areas of curriculum development, teacher training, and community education; a study of the relationships, if any, between academic studies of religion in American public schools and recent new understandings in the area of civil religion in America; and a comparative educational study of religion and education in countries other than the United States, particularly in other English-speaking countries.

Finally, of greatest need is a study of the development of curriculum materials and teacher education and certification programs with respect to studies of religion in American public schools. Included in such a study would be an attempt to trace developments within the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education since 1959, which might help to explain why its vigorous "Teacher Education and Religion Project" of 1953-1958 was strangely abandoned after 1958, never to appear again to this date. If recent, and future, developments in the crucial areas of
curriculum materials and teacher education programs, with respect to studies of religion in public schools, are to be more fully understood, an examination of the AACTE project and its peculiar termination is warranted.
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Committee on Religion and Public Education

TO THE INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION:

The vote of the International Council of Religious Education appointing a Committee on Religion and Public Education was as follows:

"That, in view of the mounting country-wide interest in the problem of the relation of religion to public education, and the growing concern of constituent groups of the Council, the International Council set up a Committee representative of all its interests to undertake a serious study of this problem and to recommend plans whereby public school and religious leaders may face this issue together, through such means as conferences—national or regional—joint research projects and experimentation, articles in religious and educational journals, and 'other means.' " (Page 111, 1947 Yearbook)

The Committee was formed during the autumn of 1947 and has held two meetings during the year 1948—one on April 29 and 30, the other on November 11 and 12, both in New York City. In addition, three meetings of a syllabus committee were held—two at the Men's Faculty Club of Columbia University on May 25 and 29, and on August 12, and the third at Yale Divinity School on December 21, 1948. Believing that the problem is one of the greatest importance, the Committee presents herewith its report to the International Council, a report which is divided into four parts: I. The Historical Situation, II. A Proposed Policy Statement, III. Suggestions for Program Activity, and IV. Recommendations to the International Council.

I. THE HISTORICAL SITUATION

It is not necessary here to discuss at length the historic connection between religion and education. In early times the role of priest and teacher was assumed by the same individuals, and religious faith and observances were transmitted to the young by the educational processes of the tribe or community.

Judaism, the mother faith of our Christian religion, was no exception to this general rule. The precepts of Jehovah were to be taught with diligence by faithful parents, priests and scribes. As the Scriptures formed the content of the curriculum, so the teaching method of home, synagogue and temple unitedly provided the means by which that faith was passed on to new generations in the hope that they, as their elders, would come to find the law sweeter than the honeycomb.

So it was with the early days of the Christian faith. As intrepid missionaries of the new religion pushed their way into Europe, schools were established almost as soon as congregations were formed. The teacher was as important as the priest. Indeed, the teaching responsibilities of the priest were no less important than preaching, pastoral care, and the correct administration of the Sacraments.

Luther, Calvin, and Zwingli were just as convinced as the leaders of the Roman Catholic Church that education and religion should enjoy the freest association and the maximum of influence, the one upon the other. In addition the reformers brought new motives to education in the priest-
hood of all believers, the right of private judgment, and the appeal to the Scriptures as the word of God. Thus was initiated the movement toward the education of all the people and thus began the system of publicly controlled education as we know it today. The English Reformation, different from that of the Continent in so many respects, was not essentially different at this point.

When our forefathers crossed to the western shores they brought along their traditions of religion and education. The New England pastor was also the teacher of the church, and the public schools of New England gave ample place to Christian faith. The religious content of the Horn Books and the New England Primer is known to every student of the history of education.

However, traditional patterns derived from Europe were not adequate for the new social and political conditions in the colonies, soon to be states of an independent federal union. The religious loyalties of Americans were not uniform, for one thing. There were Puritans, Baptists, Anglicans, Catholics, Quakers, Lutherans, Presbyterians, Methodists, Jews and many others, all living in close association with one another, and all having contributed generously to the common life in establishing a civilization in the wilderness and in forging the principles of national independence.

Furthermore, there arose, partly as a matter of principle, partly as a matter of prudent self-interest, the concept of religious freedom, representing a distinct advance over the painful growth of religious toleration, with which European religious minorities were forced to be content. The principle of religious freedom, while variously interpreted and applied, was written into Federal and state constitutions and has become one of the treasured American principles of government.

Thus the fact of religious diversity and the principle of religious freedom contributed to the creative, new culture in America. But as is true in most areas of human experience, advances into spiritual frontiers bring resultant problems. So it was in this instance. Because of the sectarian spirit with which we have maintained our religious diversity, education in this country has been less inclined to take account of the role of the Christian religion in our national life, and less inclined to consider the place of Christian faith in the personal lives of the young. These factors might have resulted in the simple principle that public education should not provide sectarian teaching. But, in many quarters it appears to have resulted in the almost complete exclusion of religion from public education. This exclusion for the most part, has not been voted by school boards, ratified by school elections, or discussed in faculty meetings. Usually, it has been unnoticed and unintended. Generally speaking, it has not been deliberately sought or brought about, either by public school leaders or by churchmen. In this connection it should be pointed out that Horace Mann, who has often been regarded as the advocate of secularism in the public schools, was in reality opposed only to sectarian, doctrinal teaching in public education.

"Far from taking religion out of the schools, Mr. Mann sought in positive fashion to meet the situation created by the Law of 1827 and to devise a constructive, non-sectarian program of moral and religious education which would be in accordance with the terms of the law. It was largely due to his advocacy that the Bible was almost universally
used in the schools before he resigned the Secretaryship. He abhorred the idea of a purely secular curriculum."

Meanwhile a body of practice has been built up, and from time to time courts have been asked to decide what relationships were and what were not, legal between churches and public schools, and what the schools could and could not do in what is popularly called "teaching religion in the public schools."

The recent opinion of the Supreme Court in the Champaign case continues to occasion widespread discussion. While there are many uncertainties in the opinion of the court yet to be cleared up, accompanied as it was by two supplementary opinions and one dissenting opinion, there is no doubt that the public schools are forbidden to allow churches the use of their school machinery and the use of physical property to teach religion. Before the McCollum opinion, it was generally accepted that public education itself should not provide sectarian teaching, though to be sure there was wide difference of understanding about the precise point at which general religious teaching crossed the line and became sectarian indoctrination.

These factors—religious diversity, religious liberty and the forbidding of sectarian teaching in the public schools, along with other causes—led to the development by American religious communities of their own teaching institutions. Protestant, Roman Catholic, Jewish, and other religious groups, have developed their own patterns and institutions of religious instruction to supplement the work of the public school with that more direct and complete teaching which the public school system could not provide, and which in fairness to all, no one group wanted to attempt.

The Protestant churches have in general relied upon the church school, often with teaching sessions both on Sunday and through the week. It grew out of the Sunday school, and by this more popular name it is still widely known. The life of Protestantism and our country in general has been greatly blessed by the magnificent contributions of the Sunday school with its thousands of faithful Sunday school teachers. While it is truly a world institution, for many reasons it has been most effectively developed and has shown the largest numerical growth on this continent.

A more recent development has been the movement for weekday religious education which began early in the present century. The more than thirty years' history of the weekday religious education movement has demonstrated that we have in it an effective teaching arm of the church. Meeting generally on "released time"—in some instances on "dismissed time" or on time already free—the movement has reached two and one half million children, a half-million of whom would otherwise have been unreached by religious teaching. It has been strongly advocated that weekday religious education in some form, should be extended to every community.

A complete list of all the educational agencies of the church would include: vacation church schools, youth fellowships, the camp and conference movement, and many others. In addition there might be listed many ways in which religious observances have been held by the public school—daily

---

1 Culver, Raymond B.: Horace Mann and Religion in the Massachusetts Public Schools, Yale University Press 1929, pp. 236 and 237.
or weekly worship, the reading of the Bible with or without comment, and the celebration of festivals and holy days.

II. A PROPOSED POLICY STATEMENT FOR THE INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

The Committee believes that a basic policy statement will be helpful to the International Council as it seeks to inaugurate a program in the field of religion and public education. If offers the following statement with the hope that it may be helpful to the Council's boards and committees, its member agencies, affiliated city and county councils, and generally to leaders in Christian education and public education.

A. Some Basic Convictions

A disturbing question has lately been more and more insistently raised, "Has the trend toward separation between religious education and general education tended to weaken both religion and education?" The answer to that question depends upon one's basic convictions about the nature of religion and of education and their mutual relationships. We record the following basic convictions which we believe are shared by a large number of Protestant churchmen and leaders in public education circles. Because we hold to them all, our problem is difficult. For if we were able to relinquish some of those convictions, it would not be difficult to discover reasonably satisfactory solutions. We believe that religion and education are inseparably related and that any attempt to separate them does violence to both. Every educational philosophy implies certain inescapable religious presuppositions.

1. We believe that education is weakened and its usefulness impaired to the extent that it is separated from the disciplines and insights of religious faith. Whatever other religions underlie other national cultures, the Christian faith underlies the history and philosophy of American life and of its public education. Were we to depart from this foundation, all our democratic institutions and practices, including our public school system as we know it, would be imperiled. We acknowledge the insights of our forefathers and some contemporary religious groups who have provided for the frank and generous inclusion of religious materials in curricula, of the religious spirit in teaching, and of religious music, art, and architecture as teaching media.

To try to avoid religious controversy by by-passing the history and literature of the Jewish and Christian religions is as unwise as it is futile. The attempt emasculates education, which must treat life as a whole, and the effort cannot avoid religious presuppositions simply by eliminating from education, subject matter pertaining to organized religion.

2. We believe that religion is seriously weakened if it is not intimately related to general education. The three basic institutions of education—the family, the school and the church—have different roles to play, and each has its important contribution to make to the total educational experience of the child. In order for each of these basic institutions to function effectively, there must be opportunity for happy relationships between all of them. The home and the church have these opportunities. So have the school and the home. But what about the school and the church? Certain-
ly the church's religious teaching has been handicapped by the lack of contacts with the daily processes of public education. Religious education under the direct control of the church has freedom to deal with a group of children who share or whose parents share a fairly large body of common religious beliefs. Thus it is possible to deal with particular aspects of a faith, and to encourage by the processes of religious nurture, a religious response to this teaching. But along with this opportunity there is the attendant hazard that impressions will be given that, however important religious education may seem to minister, Sunday school teachers and parents, it is of little consequence as compared with general education.

3. We believe that a free American public school system is indispensable to the maintenance and development of our democratic institutions, and we believe Christian people should acknowledge the debt we owe to public education. Our nation is truly E pluribus unum. We have been fashioned out of many nations and from many tongues. The remarkable degree of unity which prevails in our life and culture is traceable to our system of free public education more than to any other single factor. Protestantism has consistently supported the principle of public education since the inception of that policy. It will continue to support that basic principle not for reasons of expediency, nor because of institutional inertia, but because of inner conviction. We do not agree with those people who in the name of religion "write off" the public schools as "godless" and who condemn them for their "pagan spirit."

At the same time we take issue with those who maintain that the schools must become completely secular and who encourage that secularism. We could not look with equanimity upon a deliberate attempt or an unconscious tendency to eliminate from the schools of the nation the faith in God held by the overwhelming majority of our American citizens. We must resist any tendency to have the schools display a lofty neutrality between religion and non-religion alike, as if there were nothing to choose between the two philosophies of life.

It is significant that even among some Protestant people who have hitherto been committed to the public school system, the inquiry is now being raised whether it would not be better to rely upon Protestant parochial schools for the education of their children. Should our Protestant churches consider seriously the building of church-related elementary and secondary schools on an increasing scale? We believe our present answer should be "No."

We defend the right of all religious groups to carry on church-related education at any level, elementary, secondary, or higher, and the right of parents to send their children to these schools if they so desire. But while we defend the right, we do not believe it should be widely exercised at the elementary and secondary levels. Public education has brought too many wide-spread gains, and Protestant parochial education would create too many problems, to justify the general adoption of such a practice. We do not believe that parochial schools are the Protestant answer. We are sure that if that proposal were universally or even widely adopted it would constitute a serious threat to public education and to our democracy.

We repeat that we are committed to the public schools. But we believe that public education can and should give more explicit recognition to the fact that its own spiritual values and democratic objectives rest upon the
foundation of the Judaeo-Christian religious tradition, and that it should seek at all times to reinforce and build upon this foundation in the life of the school. We believe that in making these provisions, public education itself will become immeasurably stronger. We are gratified that a distinguished committee of educational leaders appointed by the American Council on Education has set forth a similar conviction and shown many ways in which this achievement can be brought about.¹

B. Divergent Philosophies of Education

As we seek to reconsider the place of religion in our educational system, we realize that the possibility of establishing such a close relationship depends in part upon the philosophy of education which permeates the life and work of the schools. As we consider public education, we see it operating upon various levels of educational philosophy, sometimes explicitly, sometimes implicitly, stated:

1. Frankly materialistic and secularistic views. By materialism is meant the finding of the ultimate values of life in physical things. Secularism is the view that life can be lived and understood quite satisfactorily without any reference to God or to any religious interpretation of life. In the main these philosophies of education are only the reflection of a general culture which is itself largely materialistic and for which the churches must bear their own full share of responsibility. Yet it is also true that education creates, as well as reflects, the culture around about it. Too often educational philosophy and the general spirit of the times have put religious forces in the position of working against heavy odds, and have created unnecessary difficulties in the accomplishment of their tasks. An attempt to promote vigorously this philosophy of materialistic secularism can succeed only as the religious forces of the nation are asleep. We believe that these forces are alert and that they will oppose with determination and resourcefulness any interpretation of life which regards religious institutions as archaic and faith in God as an outworn superstition.

2. Belief in spiritual values, conceived without reference to transcendent religious faith. We acknowledge that there are already existing strong moral and spiritual emphases in public school curricula and administration, and we record our determination to strengthen these emphases in every way we can. We recognize the idealism of this point of view, and the distinct advantage that this man-centered philosophy makes over a purely materialistic interpretation of life. "The good, the beautiful, and the true," are to be cherished and pursued by all right-thinking men. But we believe that this idealism will not permanently endure unless it is rooted in the life-giving soil of theistic faith.

3. Belief in God as the Source of all spiritual values and material goods, the Determiner of the destinies of nations, and the loving Father of mankind. It ought not to be necessary to defend the legitimacy of this philosophy in western culture, for it is as old as our civilization, and the inspirer of much of it. Nothing less can nourish adequately in generations yet to come the deep spiritual values of humanity. Faith in God, the God of the Old and

New Testaments, and faith in free men as His responsible creations have inspired our life and history from the early days of the nation and in its earlier Colonial history. This faith is embodied in our laws, documents and institutions. Even those who seem on the surface most indifferent to it, acknowledge its sway in their deeper moments, as when confronted with the stark tragedies of life.

We record our belief that the first and second of these philosophies offer no adequate basis for the perpetuation and enrichment of our culture. We believe further that the source and hope of this culture is in maintenance of faith in the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. We expect that the schools will expose our children to this point of view. We go further in our expectations. As far as the school can, in view of the religious diversity of our people, judicial opinions, and our American traditions, we expect it to teach this common religious tradition as the only adequate basis for the life of the school and the personal lives of teachers, students, and citizens in a free and responsible democracy.

But can the schools legally fulfill that expectation in the light of the recent Court opinions? We believe they can. We need to recognize that the American tradition is not only one of the separation of Church and State, but also of friendly interpretation by the schools of the common religious heritage of their communities. That is to be expected in a land with as many differences as our own. There is nothing in our laws, nothing in our court decisions up to and including the opinion of the United States Supreme Court in the Champaign case, nothing in our traditions, which prevents the school, within its own program, from making provision for the religious interpretation of life.

C. A Declaration of Cooperation

As Protestants we declare our interest in and support of the public school. We are anxious to secure the best educational opportunities for all children, of whatever race or economic status. We are concerned that the best techniques and equipment of our educational system be extended to those who at present have inadequate educational opportunities. We accept the principle that the schools are the schools of all the people and pledge our best efforts to keep our Protestant church people informed about the present needs and the future hopes of our nation's schools. We are resolved that Protestants shall be alert to their schools' best interest and widest opportunities.

We recognize that the responsibility for the development of the religious aspects of our public education lies with the people, the boards of education and the administrators. We are confident that we can count on the cooperation of the educational leaders of the Protestant churches with every forward step toward adequate educational opportunities for all the children of our land. While the details of this cooperation will vary in different communities and at different times, the following broad areas should be explored.

1. Mutual study and discussion of the ways of strengthening our existing public education system;
2. Creation of a public sentiment among leaders in church, community and state with regard to the present needs and future responsibilities of public education;
3. Provisions for offering such resources of religious materials and services as teachers colleges, school systems, and departments may desire; and
4. Exploration of avenues of cooperation with Roman Catholic, Jewish and other religious leaders in discovering common grounds for dealing appreciatively with religion in the public schools.

III. SUGGESTIONS FOR PROGRAM ACTIVITY

We do not presume now to set up a detailed program of activity for the International Council of Religious Education. Much of the program, in the nature of the case, will develop as experience accumulates and opportunities open. Yet as we look at the task which needs to be assumed, we see five types of program activities ahead, as indicated by the following list, intended as suggestive rather than definitive.

A. Basic Research and Experimentation Directly Related to Public School Curricula.

1. Study and evaluation of various plans now in actual operation whereby the resources of religion are being brought to bear upon the public school curricula.

2. Development of experimentation in selected cities or school systems, where public opinion will support the project and the school administration are thoroughly convinced of its desirability, in order to discover new patterns whereby the school can give full recognition to the role of religion in our culture.

B. Cooperation with Institutions and Agencies Concerned for Public Education

1. Cooperation with selected state teachers colleges to discover possible patterns for equipping future teachers to deal adequately with the place of religion in public education. (Programs already going on are to be found at Iowa State Teachers College, Cedar Falls, at a number of state teachers colleges in Missouri, in the Illinois State Normal University and at other places.)

2. Cooperation with departments of education in liberal arts colleges, where, in many states, a great majority of public school teachers are trained and where the college is completely free to inaugurate any program of training in this field.

3. An investigation of the possibilities to be found in Protestant teachers associations, established to assist teachers to relate their Christian convictions to their professional tasks, particularly by personal example and influence, by utilizing informal learning experiences and concomitant learnings, and by giving general support to the Christian education program of the churches.

4. Cooperation with state, city and county teachers associations in annual meetings and other training enterprises in order to provide, in their year round programs, a generous place for religion in the life and work of the school.
C. Conferences and Workshops

1. Establishment, as soon as possible, of a number of regional and state conferences of religious and public school leaders in a given geographical region in order to discuss together areas of mutual concern.

2. Establishment of workshops for the in-service training of teachers, the workshops to be sponsored either by the public school system itself, or in cooperation with resident religious groups, the workshops to give assistance to classroom teachers in developing a Christian philosophy toward their work and making their Christian faith articulate and effective in the classroom.

3. Conferences with leaders of other faiths, seeking their cooperation to discover common grounds for dealing appreciatively with religion and the public schools.

D. Program of Publications

1. A brochure on the place of religious education in the life of the child, with particular emphasis upon his public school experiences.

2. Religious materials and resources to help in the teaching of history, social studies, literature, science, art and other subject areas.

3. Bulletins to deal with moral and spiritual beliefs and practices common to the great majority of American citizens to be developed by public school curriculum builders with the advice and counsel of leaders in religious education.

4. A manual, giving information to teachers regarding the major religious traditions in America.

5. Cooperation with curriculum builders and textbook publishers in order that curricular materials in preparation may give adequate recognition to the place of religion in American life.

6. A comprehensive program of publication whereby state teachers journals and educational periodicals with national circulation receive syndicated articles or specially prepared articles discussing various aspects of the problem of religion and public education.

E. Creation of an Informed and Intelligent Public Opinion Concerning Public Education

1. By creating a public opinion among Protestant church people which will support the basic principle of academic freedom and which will disavow attempts to bring economic and other types of partisan pressure to bear upon superintendents and teachers.

2. By utilizing much more extensively the opportunities we already have (e.g., American Education Week) to emphasize with Protestant church groups and others whom we may reach, the debt we owe to our American public education, and to inform our people regarding its present and future needs.
IV. RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

In view of the present situation in public education and in American Protestantism, the Committee on Religion and Public Education recommends to the International Council of Religious Education that:

A. A standing educational committee on Religion and Public Education, at least one-third of whose members shall be public school leaders, be established to guide a permanent program for Protestantism.

B. A regular educational department be established and adequately supported.

C. At least one director be employed on a full-time basis, and, if possible, two full-time persons with adequate secretarial assistance.

D. A minimum annual budget of $27,500.00 for this department be established by the Board of Trustees and the General Secretary of the International Council.

Respectfully submitted,

LUTHER A. WEIGLE, Chairman

ERWIN L. SHAVER, Executive Secretary

(For action on this report, see Minutes of The Council, page 288.)
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PUBLIC EDUCATION AND RELIGION

The National Conference on Religion and Public Education was held in St. Louis, Missouri, November 6-8, 1955.
It was sponsored by the Committee on Religion and Public Education of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., with the cooperation of the Committee on Religious Liberty of the National Council of Churches, the Missouri State Council of Churches, and the Metropolitan Church Federation of Greater St. Louis.

A study document for churches on the National Conference on Religion and Public Education

Edited by Rolfe Lanier Hunt
Story of the Conference

by R. L. Hunt

WHAT is the duty of the Christian in the United States toward the public schools?

Can the churches help the public schools do their job better? If so, through what channels?

How do we think public schools should deal with the religious portion of our cultural heritage?

To consider such questions, the National Conference on Religion and Public Education brought together in the Chase Hotel, St. Louis, Missouri, November 6-8, 1955, a total of 166 persons. They included 56 persons named by 18 denominational boards of education and the Division of Christian Education of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America; 31 persons from 18 units in the National Council of Churches, such as the Committee on Religious Liberty, United Church Men, the Department of Christian Vocation, the Committee on Children's Work, etc.; 9 persons from 7 state councils of churches; 24 persons from 7 city councils of churches; 24 observers from 10 religious groups outside the National Council of Churches; 18 observers from 14 professional education and lay groups; and 4 persons staffing the conference.

How the meeting was conducted

The opening session of the Conference on Religion and Public Education, on Sunday afternoon, November 6, 1955, was a public meeting in observance of American Education Week. In that meeting the members of the conference and visitors were given many facts on the status and needs of the public schools by national officers of the three voluntary organizations which sponsor American Education Week. (See picture on preceding page.) They heard the President of the National School Boards Association say that such a conference could be helpful if its findings were based on facts faced honestly in good will. They heard the President of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States of America, the Reverend Eugene Carson Blake of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, say, "We Care What Happens to Public Schools."

At the dinner session which followed, the conference members heard President Blake speak more directly on "Why the National Council of Churches is Sponsoring this Conference." They went then to study groups for the first of a total of ten hours in group work. At a session on Monday morning, they heard explanations of the significance of some of the documents placed in their hands for study, from representatives...
of the churches and councils from which the documents came. (For the list of materials placed in the hands of delegates, see page __.) They then met in study groups throughout the rest of the day.

On Tuesday morning and afternoon, reports from the study groups were reviewed by the conference as a whole. Some of the questions raised from the floor in discussion of the papers are reported in the pages following.

Each delegate and observer attended his or her own choice of one of ten study groups, after examining the sets of questions reported on the following pages, and participated in the exchanges of opinion from which were built the reports of the study groups which follow.

Through distribution of reports recently issued by professional education and religious organizations, delegates were introduced to a body of facts and a representative range of opinions on questions faced by the Conference. The list of materials received by the delegates will be found on Pages 51-52. All delegates had also the report on state rulings which our readers will find on pages 34 ff. of this publication.

The significance of the reports
The Conference on Religion and Public Education was a study conference. Its working papers and reports did not require, nor do they carry, approval by the National Council of Churches, nor by any of its constituents. The reports here presented are the expressions of the particular persons who were members of the respective groups, after their exchange of experience. They were reported to the general sessions of the conference, but no approval of the conference as a whole was asked or given. Procedures of the conference were thus arranged because of the committee decision that a longer process of discussion was in order, before the effort is made to crystallize an official policy for the National Council of Churches on these difficult and controversial questions.

The Conference on Religion and Public Education has made its contribution to that process by the experience of those who participated, and by the production of the papers presented in this report. The report is now transmitted, by order of the Committee on Religion and Public Education, to our constituent churches and councils.

The committee hopes that consideration of the report will assist the several denominations in determination of the policies they wish to support. Perhaps eventually, when many of our denominations have thus crystallized their preferences into statements of policy, it will be time to try to hammer a statement representing us as a whole. For the present, such statements must be limited to the points of consensus now found. The Committee on Religion and Public Education will give further attention to the effort to develop points of consensus.

It will be appreciated if copies of any statements of policy regarding any of the questions dealt with in this report, whether originating in public school or in church circles, are sent to the Department of Religion and Public Education, National Council of Churches, 257 Fourth Avenue, New York 10, New York.

What you can do
You will wish to acquaint yourself with the many aspects of church-state relationships reflected in the questions on the following pages. Teachers will wish to examine the reports for light on what they do in Sunday school, as related to what happens to children in the day school. Church leaders will wish to talk with public school leaders, to see how better they may support the work of their respective institutions. This resource book can be used as a discussion outline for the Second Series Course 116b, "Religion and Public Education," of the Standard Leadership Training Curriculum and in other adult study groups.

Program committee for the Conference.

Left: REV. THOMAS J. VAN LOON, Director of Church and Public School Relations, Board of Education, The Methodist Church, Nashville, Tennessee.

Below: DR. ROLFE LANIER HUNT, Chicago, Illinois, Director, Department of Religion and Public Education, National Council of Churches, and Chairman KENNETH E. OBERHOLTZER, representing the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. Dr. Oberholtzer is Superintendent of Schools, Denver, Colorado.

March, 1956
Report of Conference on Religion and Public Education

I. Public Schools and Christians

Questions Referred to Group I.

1. On what religious principles should be based our proposals to solve problems of how public schools deal with religion?

2. What scriptural basis is there for asking Christians to support public schools?

3. Do parents have a prior right to determine the education of their children? What is the responsibility of the church in determining the kind of education children of its members are to receive?

4. How does the organization and philosophy of the public school compare with the Christians point of view as we understand it? For example, how do public schools and churches view "drop-outs"? Are the respective assumptions in personal and vocational guidance in agreement? Are the concepts of community which children learn in public schools as part of the climate of the institution comparable to the concepts of community of the Christian church?

5. How do our religious beliefs define the responsibility of the family, church, school, and community in the religious development of children?

6. Have we faith in the power of our religion to make its way without use of secular force? What importance do we place in the promulgation of public or other institutional authority of explicit doctrines of religion?

7. If we are starting all over, what functions in the field of religion would we wish the state to perform? Does separation of church and state tend to spiritualize or to secularize the life of our people? Is there any better assurance of the vitality of the religious life of the people than separation of church and state? Do we confirm the values of separation of church and state, and clear definition of the functions of each, as applied to public schools? Is religion in our judgment a more dynamic influence in those nations in which the state performs some of the functions here reserved for the home, the church, and other voluntary agencies? Does it make the state atheistic or secularistic to have the state and its official agencies free from official responsibility for religious functions?

8. As public schools are now operated, what do they contribute to the purposes of Christian education? What contributions do educational efforts of the churches make to purposes of general education sought by public schools?

9. Should our churches now develop parochial school systems? Is our support of public schools limited or unconditional?

10. Should the churches give special support to public schools facing problems of integration of the races?

11. How can the churches be of the greatest help to public schools? What needs of the public schools are priorities for church efforts?

Group I. Report No. 1

Study Group No. 1, on "The Christian and the Public Schools," has addressed itself largely to the consideration of the first question listed for its discussion, namely, "On what religious principles should be based our proposals to solve problems of how public schools deal with religion?"

The group has agreed upon five basic principles.

First—as to the nature of the child, he is a creature of God; he is loved by God; and he is responsible to God for all of his acts.

Second—the right of the child by virtue of his divine creation to the fullest development of his faculties and capacities. This places a joint responsibility on home, church, and community to see to it that adequate facilities are provided for educating every child according to his capacities.

Third—respect for the individual conscience and faith of each child's allegiance, not forcing upon him beliefs and teachings which are offensive to his parents, if in the minority, but at the same time giving due regard to the faith of both the majority and the minorities.

Fourth—belief in community, not only in the sense of our common loyalties as citizens, but as being brothers, children of God, and as such, having equal and inalienable rights and responsibilities which transcend our differences of race, nation, and creed.

Fifth—since religious truth is a part of our heritage of truth it should be included in the child's education wherever relevant to the subject matter of public education.

We believe that the organization and philosophy of the public school system should be in accord with the principles which we have outlined, and that teachers and pupils should be made aware of them.

As Christians, we have the responsibility for helping to bring the philosophy of education as practiced in the organization and program of the schools in any community into line with this statement of principles.

Whenever there appear to be threats to these principles we should be vitally concerned. We have observed the presence of threats in certain philosophies which have intruded into the organization and program of public education in certain areas of our national life. Among them are the philosophy which sees the child's mind as only a problem-solving machine rather than as a child of God; the philosophy which accepts the categories of first and second class citizens and deals with children accordingly; and the philosophy which is economic in origin and which seeks from education an economic return without concern for the right of the child to develop to the full limit of his capacities as a child of God.
Group I. Report No. 2

In this report, the group has applied itself to legal problems of relating religion to public education. It has drawn heavily upon the statement by the Church Federation of Greater Chicago, in its tentative statement of policy on "The Relation of the Churches to the Public Schools and the Place of Religion in Public Education."

The group believes that any dealing with legal limitations must recognize the principle of religious freedom which protects the rights of individual conscience in matters of religion. Also deeply involved is the principle of separation of church and state.

Basically, the American way is to keep the churches as Institutions separate from the state. This has come to mean:

1. There is to be no established church, nor can there be any kind of preferred status or treatment for any church

2. The state must not be controlled by any church or churches as such; nor may the state control or should it give support to the ecclesiastical functions of any church or churches, in whole or in part.

3. Such separation does not preclude cooperation between the churches as free institutions and the government and its agencies in the interest of the common welfare...

"In relating these principles to the public schools, two things become clear:

"First," the American way requires public schools as institutions to be kept separate from the churches as institutions. However, the churches and the schools should cooperate in serving the total educational needs of children and youth.

"Secondly," the public schools have a responsibility to make the largest possible provision in the schools for non-sectarian religious teaching and influence...

"The schools may teach about religion or its values as a fundamental factor in our national life. They may not teach in such a way as to serve the sectarian needs of any ecclesiastical institution individually or collectively."

Group I. Report No. 3.

We believe that the church should give special support to the public schools facing problems in the integration of the races and ethnic groups:

1. By giving her Christian witness tolerantly, sympathetically, yet positively, by implementing in every way possible her divinely revealed concept of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

2. By sponsoring through state and local councils of churches, denominational agencies and local congregations, study groups of public school personnel and church leaders, also by encouraging parent-teacher groups, service clubs, labor unions and other community groups to study existing problems with the view toward finding acceptable solutions, and encourage church members to take active part therein as citizens.

3. By counsel with those who have peculiar responsibility for forming public opinion, to wit, editors, radio and TV personnel, legislators and other public officials.

We reaffirm our support of the public school system of America, at the same time taking notice of our right and obligations to helpfully criticize and seek to improve their calibre.

We also believe it to be an important function of the churches to seek to enlist young people in the teaching profession as a Christian vocation. Also, to support those local issues and tax assessments which are calculated to provide the proper financial support for the needed improvements in physical properties and salaried support of our school personnel. In these activities, churches should join with local councils which are seeking to support the cause of public education.

Federal Aid to Education

(A statement adopted by the General Board of the National Council of the Churches at Evanston, Illinois, May 15, 1954.)

Recognizing that education in the United States is in a critical situation,

Convinced that, in a number of States, the adoption of measures adequate to meet the situation is very improbable,

The General Board of the NCCCUSA, confident that it is expressing the historic and continuing concern of the churches for education,

Favors such federal contributions to education as shall be applied exclusively to the aid of tax-supported public schools, on condition that the funds be:

1) paid over to agencies of the several States, and administered by them in accordance with their several statutory educational systems;

2) allocated according to a formula that moves toward full educational opportunity in the public elementary and secondary schools, in the various sections of the States, and, within the States, in both urban and rural districts, and for groups of different racial or national origins;

3) safeguarded against the imposition of federal control in matters of educational policy.

This policy statement does not deal with the question of auxiliary services, which is different in important aspects from that of direct aid to schools and requires separate consideration.

(Editor's Note: No further statement on auxiliary services has yet been made by this body.)
II. Church Channels for Expression of Our Concern

Questions Referred to Group II.

1. What patterns of responsibility for expression of concern for public schools now exist at local church, state, and national levels in the constituent denominations?

2. At the local church level, is responsibility for keeping church people informed about needs of public schools clearly defined? Is such responsibility best vested in a separate committee, the committee on Christian education, the committee on Christian social action? What is the role of the pastor?

3. What church agencies are best charged with responsibility for keeping church people informed on issues at state levels? (Nearly half the money for public schools is now appropriated by state legislatures, according to national averages.)

4. What portion of denominational responsibility for the welfare of children in the public school is to be carried out through denominational channels, and what through planned cooperation efforts at local church, state, national levels?

5. Should church bodies make official statements on issues affecting public schools, such as tax levies, bond issues, federal aid for schoolhouse construction?

6. What specific activities can local churches engage in which would assist public schools of the community to do better their job?

7. To what agencies in the constituent denominations should be related the NCCCUSA Department of Religion and Public Education?

8. How shall churches increase in their member-citizens the sense of responsibility for public schools? Have the churches any responsibility for affecting attitudes of persons outside their membership on this issue?

9. Through what channels may public schools secure clergymen for presentation of opportunities in religious vocations in vocational guidance conferences and classes?

10. What should churches do to interpret motives of Christian vocation to their members who happen to be teachers in the public schools?

11. To what extent do, and should, churches try to recruit young people for careers in public school teaching?

12. Should we support organization of faculty Christian fellowships, Protestant teachers' associations?

13. In some cases, the only schools available are parochial schools in effect leased to the community as public schools with little modification in faculty, curriculum, religious symbols in the classroom. Through what channels should assistance to constituent members in those situations be directed? Have churches a responsibility for assuring educational opportunity on an equal basis for children of all faiths?

14. How shall Protestants relate themselves to educational television stations? How plan program participation on educational television stations under public administration when opportunity is offered? (By rules governing establishment of educational television stations, parochial schools are classed as "educational" institutions, eligible to serve as charter members for control of such stations. Protestants in most cities have no comparable spokesmen.)

Report of Group II

In contemporary American Protestantism there are many well-established channels by means of which congregations individually and in concert with others in the community and denominations acting alone or with others in the state or nation may express their concerns for and interest in public education. The same channels can be useful to teachers and public education authorities in bringing to the churches educational matters and concerns on which their guidance or support is needed.

All churches have a pastor or spiritual leader who is regarded as the spiritual and educational leader of the congregation. Most churches have a board, committee, or commission on Christian education whose responsibilities often include public school relationships. Many congregations have a committee on social action or a group with similar functions, and must have a society of dedicated women whose interests naturally and normally extend to children, their welfare, their schools, and their teachers.

Within our several states there are forty regularly organized state councils of churches constituted officially by the denominations within the area. Many of these councils are well-staffed and adequately financed. Others are less well provided for. Many of the better councils have well established departments of religious education, departments which in many instances indeed are older than the parent body. The concerns of public education have come to be within the past decade matters of great interest. These state councils, moreover, often have committees on social action, religious liberty, and racial and cultural relations all of which provide a resource of experience and convictions in their several fields.

What is said above about the state council is true also of the over 900 local city or county councils, and serving the nation is the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America with its Department of Religion and Public Education and other units such as the Department of Religious Liberty, the Department of Racial and Cultural Relations, the General Department of United Church Men and of United Church Women, and others.

Denominations themselves are organized along state or other lines and are staffed and organized in accordance with denominational polity and policy. In many...
regions or states in which there is no organized cooperative Protestant effort or only a weak expression, a single denomination or two or more acting together in concert but without a permanent organized structure may be effective in providing an opportunity for the furtherance of the best interests of American education.

Church expressions of concern have been sporadic, usually coming only when the local clergy and church leaders have been irritated by some action of the public school administration. This is partly true because there have been very few local channels for expression of concern, except the local clergy. The minister may be expected to be the primary channel, but he should not be the only channel for the expression of the concerns; in fact, the minister should try to develop representative church and community committees as channels to study the basic problems involved.

All of us need to remember, church leaders and public school leaders alike, that although the public school is the most important formal educational agency in the community, there are other agencies which have rights and responsibilities for the total education of the child.

In working out mutual relationships, both church and public school authorities need to seek the welfare of the child rather than institutional advantages. And in the community agencies all there needs ought to be provided for, but at the same time the child should not be subjected to undue emotional and physical strains.

Church people might well realize the almost impossible demands upon the public education system, and it may be in many American communities there is a need to start rethinking these demands we are making on the schools. The church, the family, and the community agencies might well cooperate with the educational authorities in reviewing the school curriculum and program. The purpose of this review would be to consider what should be kept in the curriculum of the public schools, with a view toward evaluating those services which the school should offer and those services which the church or the home or the community or any combination of the three, should offer.

The minister and educator should move in the direction of creating sympathetic understanding and approachment in carrying out their respective tasks, roles, and responsibilities. The minister should utilize every opportunity for conference, exploration, and negotiation of problems involving religion and public education.

One area of concern which needs to be dealt with by the church is the area of vocational guidance. This is an aspect of the welfare of children which can be dealt with cooperatively by church and school. There should be an attempt to assist the vocational guidance officers of the public schools by making available to them materials, cooperatively produced by the churches. This material will interpret not only church vocations, but also general Protestant doctrine of Christian vocation. This point of view can also be brought to the attention of the vocational guidance officers through articles in their own professional journals and through personal conferences between ministers and counselors.

We recommend that steps be taken by the proper unit of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. to prepare vocational guidance material which can be made available to counselors as resource material in helping young people choose careers. We recommend further that a conference be called by the National Council of Churches for the purpose of sharing with vocational guidance personnel in the public schools the church's concern in this area.

Churches can make a major contribution to the strengthening of public schools by helping recruit teachers for those schools. Among the many ways in which this can be accomplished are: more adequate observance of American Education Week by the churches and more effective recognition of the public-school teacher as to give status to his role in the community.

The churches also have a responsibility for helping teachers in service grow in their own understanding of their Christian vocation. This can be done in various ways—through the local church, through the denominations, and through interdenominational agencies.

The need in this whole area is urgent. As the church reaffirms its belief in public education and responds to the imperative need for cooperation between the church and the public school, a cooperative relationship can develop which will strengthen the school, the church, and American democracy.

**Moral and Spiritual Values**

The Educational Policies Commission, sponsored jointly by the National Education Association and the American Association of School Administrators, "believes that moral and spiritual values can be actively promoted in the public schools by:

1. Defining as goals the accepted moral and spiritual values in our society;
2. Encouraging and helping the individual teacher;
3. Giving attention to moral and spiritual values in teacher education;
4. Teaching these moral and spiritual values at every opportunity;
5. Utilizing all of the schools' resources;
6. Devoting sufficient time and staff to wholesome personal relationships;
7. Assuming an attitude of friendly sympathy toward the religious beliefs and practices of students;
8. Promoting religious tolerance actively;
9. Teaching about religion as an important fact in our culture.

"This program is not offered as the complete and perfect answer to the problem of moral and spiritual values, nor as the only one. But it does, we trust, offer a practicable way of dealing in the public schools with a controversial and highly important matter."—Moral and Spiritual Values in the Public Schools." Educational Policies Commission, 1201 16th St., N. W., Washington, D. C., 1951. Page 80.

**Members of Group II**

Franklin I. Sheed, Chairman
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III. The Bible in Public Schools

Questions Referred to Group III

1. What effects do we observe from Bible reading and studies now practiced in some public schools? How do attitudes of the teacher affect the learning of pupils? Should we sponsor further studies of such programs?

2. Is there a difference in use of the Bible in the public schools in (a) worship, (b) instruction, (c) as history, (d) as literature, which should control practices? If we support use of the Bible in the public schools, how and under what condition should it be used?

3. Should schools sponsor extra-curricular activities involving use of the Bible, such as "Bible-reading Clubs," denominational groups, interdenominational groups using the Bible?

4. Where the Bible is now lawfully used in the public schools, do we have a responsibility to assist public schools to avoid sectarian instruction through cooperative production of suggestions for study, cooperative production of Bible translations?

5. Where local laws or interpretation of laws now do not permit use of the Bible in the public schools, do our church agencies have any responsibility for asking compliance with and enforcement of the laws as interpreted locally?

6. What information of the Bible and its history do we regard as a necessary part of the general education of the individual in our culture? What is the responsibility, if any, of the public school for transmitting the biblical portion of our cultural heritage to succeeding generations?

7. In public schools using the Bible, do public schools have a responsibility for acquainting pupils with the fact that there are many versions of the Bible? With some of the facts of the history of the Bible?

8. Should (a) the Ten Commandments, (b) the Twenty-third Psalm, (c) the Beatitudes be taught in the public schools?

9. If public schools limited their use of the Bible to the Old Testament, would this assure non-sectarian use of the Bible? Would such a practice fulfill the responsibility of the public school for acquainting youth with this portion of their cultural heritage?

10. Should public school teachers assist in distributing Bibles?

11. Is there danger of religious rote learning in public schools which may be the enemy of true religion?

12. Should we recommend more study in public schools of the sacred writings of the major world faiths? If so, under what conditions?

13. Do we think legislation governing use of the Bible in the public schools is needed? If so, should it be sought at local, state, or national levels?

14. What training for teachers would we desire for persons giving instruction in the Bible in the public schools?

Report of Group III

(1) The committee considered as the first item on its agenda the question, "Is there a difference in use of the Bible in the public schools in (a) worship, (b) instruction, (c) as history, (d) as literature, which should control practices? If we support the use of the Bible in the public schools, how and under what conditions should it be used?"

The committee spent some time defining what would be meant by the word "worship," coming to the consensus that if the use of the Bible was motivated by a desire to lead children to recognize and adore God as they used it, worship would be involved. Questions were raised about the value or lack of value in providing Bible reading in public schools without adequate guidance for interpretation. A number of members of the committee felt that the Bible should definitely be used in the public schools as literature, as some states do.

Other members of the committee expressed the feeling that one needs to separate a formal use of the Bible from an informal use of it in public school systems. In other words, they felt that the Bible should be allowed to be set on a plane similar to that occupied by other reference books used in school systems.

Recommendation No. 1: After considering the question at considerable length, the committee agreed on the following statement which might be recommended as policy: "When the Bible is used in public schools, its most effective use is when it has bearing on a course of study."

(2) The group next considered the question, "What information of the Bible and its history do we regard as a necessary part of the general education of the individual in our culture?"

Individual members of the committee felt that persons should know the makeup of the Bible and its general literary content, and be able to recognize biblical poetry, biblical history, biblical legislation, and so on. Other persons felt that individuals should know the ideas of the Bible such as brotherhood, love, mercy, and so on. Still other members of the committee expressed a feeling that educated persons should know how the Bible was translated and came down to persons in the present day. Some members of the committee expressed a feeling that the Ten Commandments, the Sermon on the Mount, and the Beatitudes constituted a core of biblical content that all educated persons should have in their frame of reference. The feeling was expressed by...
some members of the committee that educated persons in America should know the place the Bible had in the founding of the American republic, and in the American Revolution.

Recommendation No. 2: After considering the question at some length, the committee decided to draw a picture of an educated person, and to identify the things about the Bible this educated person should know, without reference to how that knowledge is obtained. They felt that (1) the adult educated person should know the role of the Bible in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. This felt (2) that the educated person should know the content of the Bible including its concept of God, its major personalities, its history and chronology, its ideals and teachings, and its literary composition. They felt (3) that the educated person should know something of the influence of the Bible in American history, on culture, on the American concept of liberty, freedom and justice, and on current moral standards.

(5.) The committee next considered the Question, "What is the responsibility, if any, of the public schools for transmitting the biblical portion of our cultural heritage to succeeding generations?"

Recommendation No. 3: The committee has thus far formulated the following statements with reference to this question:

1. In the treatment of history, the public school should help young people to appreciate the relation of the Bible to the development of the Judaic and Christian cultures.

2. In tracing the distinctive qualities of the American citizen, the public school should point out that the founding fathers and succeeding generations recognized the Supreme Being and looked to him as the author of liberty and justice.

3. That in teaching social living, the public school should make reference to the Judaic and Christian principles of conduct that have been a vital factor in shaping American law and standards of behavior.

4. That in teaching the arts, the public school should recognize the influence of the Bible in art, music, sculpture, etc.

5. That in teaching literature the literary aspects of the Bible should be treated on a similar basis with other great literary masterworks.

6. That in teaching the great universally-accepted ethical ideas and principles of societies, the public school should use the Bible as a source book on the same level as other sources.

7. That in teaching biography, the public school should make use of the biographies of biblical personalities as well as those of other individuals.

8. That in teaching English, the public school should make use of the Bible and show the influence it has had on the development of the language.

(4.) Consideration of the Question, "Should (a) the Ten Commandments, (b) the Twenty-third Psalm, (c) the Beatitudes be taught in the public schools?" by the committee brought out the feeling that teaching in this sense should not mean memorization or sectarian interpretation, that these passages should not be lifted up out of context and taught as a memory course.

Recommendation No. 4: These parts of the Bible should be handled with reference to the procedures outlined above concerning the responsibilities of the public schools in transmitting the biblical portion of our cultural heritage.

(5.) Consideration of Question, "What training for teachers would we desire for persons giving instruction in the Bible in the public schools?" brought the following recommendation:

Recommendation No. 5: Teacher training institutions should require of their graduates such competence as will enable them to use the Bible on a par with other literature and sources of reference.

(6a.) Consideration of Question, "If public schools limited their use of the Bible to the Old Testament, would this assure non-sectarian use of the Bible? Would such a practice fulfill the responsibility of the public school for acquainting youth with this portion of our cultural heritage?"

Answer: No to both questions.

(6b.) Consideration of Question, "Is there a danger of religious rote learning in public schools which may be the enemy of true religion?"

Answer: Some thought yes; others thought no.

Recommendation No. 6: Religious rote learning has no place in the public schools whether in the curriculum or as discipline or punishment.

(7.) Consideration of the question, "Do we think legislation governing use of the Bible in public schools is needed? If so, should it be sought at local, state, or national levels?", brought the following recommendation:

Recommendation No. 7: Legislation is not generally necessary, but in states where laws now prohibit any use of the Bible in the public schools, permissive legislation should be sought allowing use of the Bible when it has bearing on courses of public school study.
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IV. Practices of Worship in the Public Schools

Questions Referred to Group IV.

1. What is the educational value of formal religious exercises? Do they tend to create the impression that religion is basically a matter of certain exercises to be done or of observances to be accepted? Do such formal practices tend to create a concept of religion as being only a segment of culture rather than a basis for interpretation of all value, thus underlying all culture and knowledge?

2. Is religious exercise or witness religiously significant unless it is voluntary?

3. Should there be public prayer in public schools? If so, under what conditions?

4. Would we support silent prayer in public schools? Listening for guidance, and sharing of experience out of silent prayer?

5. Should memorized prayer be taught in public schools?

6. Should the prayer which Jesus taught his disciples be used or taught in the public schools?

7. Should public school pupils be given assignments which will take them into places in which prayer will be offered?

8. Should prayers offered before mixed faith groups in public schools by Christians be concluded with Christian forms such as "—in the name of Jesus Christ" or should the effort be to find common ground? Is it better for the representative from each faith to follow his own tradition, or to seek a common pattern which all will be expected to use?

9. Should grace be said at meals in public school lunchrooms? Should forms of prayer for grace at meals for Jews, Catholics, and Protestants, be distributed at the tables of public school lunchrooms?

10. Would we favor appointment of chaplains for public schools?

11. Are there non-sectarian hymns for use in worship?

12. In communities with the tradition of having visiting clergymen conduct worship, what principles should guide selection of such speakers, and their presentations?

13. Should opportunity for daily worship be given on time released from the public school schedule? If so, how are minority interests to be protected?

14. Should public school teachers make announcements of religious meetings, assist in distributing evangelistic leaflets, taking a church census?

15. Under what conditions can public schools appropriately plan in cooperation with churches religious emphasis periods?

16. To what extent are observances of holidays being used in public schools for sectarian purposes? Need observance of religious holidays in public schools be sectarian?

Report of Group IV.

The practices of worship, or, as synonymously used, religious exercises, in the public school present difficult but not unsurmountable problems. They are, however problems which require careful definition as to form and content. These practices have a limited but important place in the curriculum. It should be emphasized that on the home and the church and the synagogue rests the main responsibility for developing and nurturing religious life of children and youth.

The schools do have, however, two functions in relation to such religious practices. One is the educational function, in which the school may teach about the significance of religious practices in the life of people of all faiths. The other is a religious expression indigenous to the life of the school itself.

Any announcements by the group are circumscribed by two accepted assumptions, viz.:

1. All religious exercises in the public school shall be non-sectarian.

2. Participation in religious exercises in the public schools must be only with the consent of the parents of the pupils involved.

Religious practices in the public schools, if developed according to the high standards outlined above, can provide a setting which will stir the pupils’ interest in ultimate reality and orient Godward his interpretation of life, and will encourage and nurture a spirit sympathetic to religious experience and instruction.

Such directing of interests and interpretation will help to preclude undesirable secularism. The elaboration of such information, and the spelling out of the details of such orientation toward God, belong, and always have belonged, to the home, church and synagogue. The efforts of the schools to impart religious information, and to orient the pupils’ interests Godward, will be futile and without substance unless the home, church, and synagogue originate and at all times assume the primary responsibility for wooing and winning the pupils’ “commitment” to religion as a way of life.

Prayer as an overt act of acknowledging the Deity, like other religious exercises, has a limited but important place in the school. It helps orient the pupil’s interests and aspirations away from the secular and toward the religious interpretation of life and living.

Anent this practice, the schools should recognize God through the practice of meditation and prayer, and pro-
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Solutions Can Be Found

"Our conviction that the tax-supported schools, colleges, and universities cannot completely avoid religion is abundantly substantiated by actual practice and by the judgments of a proponent major-
ity of those who have cooperated in making this study. Even those who are most opposed to any delib-
erate attention to religion in public education admit that it cannot be ignored completely in his-
tory, literature, art, and music."

"We believe it is undesirable, if not impossible, to develop a policy and practice for all aspects of the relation of religion to public education with a view to their application in all communities."

"... to assume that a solution cannot be ac-
 achieved is to evidence a lack of faith in the re-
sourcefulness of the American people."

"We believe we have found the most promising approach to the further study of this problem, namely, factual study of relig' on whom and where intrinsic to general education."


Comments on the Report from the Floor

A. "I have studied printed prayers used in dining rooms, etc., and have yet to find a Jewish, Roman Catholic, or Protestant prayer which could not be used by persons of any of these beliefs. In the interest of solidarity, why not have a Christian prayer and a Jewish prayer?"

B. "Ministers on committee do find differences..."

C. "I agree in principle with the earlier speaker, but fact remains that there is increasing heterogeneity in America, and we are trying to agree on a national policy. Therefore, it seems to us that we should agree on these differences, and provide for these differences, so that each individual can participate without any violation to his conscience or his clergyman's conscience, to whom he looks for spiritual guidance."
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Report of Conference on Religion and Public Education

V. Treatment of Religious Viewpoints Within the Curriculum

Questions Referred to Group V.

1. In connection with what subjects, and at what grade levels, do questions relating to religion come up naturally? What questions do children bring their parents and pastors after studies in the public schools?

2. Can public schools handle religion as it comes up naturally in the usual school subjects (e.g., references to delay in the Declaration of Independence) without being sectarian in such teaching? Is the public school to (a) avoid such treatment? (b) deal only with such questions as may arise? (c) be responsible for pointing out the relevance of religious ideas to these facts under study?

3. To what extent has the public school responsibility for passing on the religious portion of our cultural heritage? Of relating current institutions and practices to religious viewpoints historically and presently?

4. What are the moral and spiritual values which the public school can inculcate in the presentday generation, and how can they best do that? If the public school teaches anything for commitment—e.g., honesty, or love of country—does such teaching without reference to religion minimize religion thereby?

5. Can values be taught without reference to the role of religious points of view in their formation and sanction? Is study of human reasons for morals and ethics “sectarian instruction,” if reference is not also made to sanctions held by theists?

6. To what extent will objective teaching about religion in the public school be effective in the spiritual motivation of children?

7. Is it possible that a program of moral and spiritual values in the public schools could be so adequate that it would release the churches from responsibility for religious education?

8. Shall information of church viewpoints on the United Nations and UNESCO, be noted in instruction in public schools?

9. Should an objection based on religious belief be sufficient to bar from the public school curriculum any item to which objection by any person is made?

10. Does the principle of separation of church and state inhibit evaluation of public school curricula and textbooks by church groups?

11. What information regarding religious beliefs and institutions is learned, and should be learned, in courses in the public schools?

12. Is it possible to have “secular” schools—schools free from clerical or churchly control—and yet “regularism”—a philosophy of materialism—in the public schools?

13. How shall religious viewpoints be related to public school personal and vocational counseling? Can churches and public schools make joint plans for more effective personal and vocational guidance counseling?

14. How shall religious viewpoints be related to public school instruction regarding family life and preparation for marriage, which may include discussion of matters such as divorce, sex education, marriage ceremonies?

15. Shall we further efforts to define “a common core” of moral and spiritual values available for consideration by public school authorities?

16. Is training in the religious heritage and faith of central concern of education? Can such training be given separately from instruction in other subjects?

Report of Group V.

It was the general consensus of group members that the term curriculum as it concerns the topic for this group shall be accepted in its broadest definition—all the experiences affecting the child for which the school is responsible, rather than merely as a course of study.

It was further agreed that the discussion shall place greatest emphasis on the elementary and secondary aspects of public education, although any implications in the area of higher education, and specifically teacher training, shall be considered.

Considerable time was spent in discussing what is meant by “teaching about religion.” Although very little consensus was reached, there was general agreement that the public school’s responsibility as it deals with religion is not concerned with sectarian commitment.

We note the following considerations:

1. There can be religious emphasis within the course of study, as, for example, within the treatment of the historical development of America. The schools should deal with religion intrinsic to the course of study as it is related to the course content.

2. Religion is best integrated with other subjects, not handled as a separate subject.

3. The teacher’s attitude and awareness of community sensitivity, and the teacher’s personality, may determine approach and treatment of religion within the curriculum.

4. It is necessary to recognize the pluralistic religious atmosphere in many communities and the religious pluralism of the American society.

5. Greater teacher preparation and education directed toward further competence in the area of religion is necessary. The purpose of this is to sensitize teachers to the various religious backgrounds within the school and community, that they may better handle the religious emphases within the curriculum. The program of teacher education in this area as developed at Saint Louis and Washington Universities is cited as an example of this.
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Attention is invited also to the Teacher Education and Religion Project, of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Small groups further considered three areas:

1. Can the public schools handle religion as it comes up naturally in the usual school subjects?
2. What is the relationship of moral and spiritual values to religion in the school?
3. Should the school teach the existence of God as a fact?

Following are the statements regarding these areas from the three groups; we had no opportunity to review these as a whole:

Teachers are meeting, to the best of their abilities, questions concerning religion as they arise in day-to-day teaching.

Teachers should, to the best of their abilities, handle questions and problems involving religion brought by pupils.

The abilities of teachers should be improved in these areas as in all other areas of competence which are called for in teaching.

School systems should establish policy within which teachers can and should deal with questions of religion as they arise in all of the impacts of the schools upon children.

School systems should make possible, and the teachers should maintain, a climate favorable to religion, but with fairness and respect for different religious beliefs and practices.

Schools and teachers should seek new and additional means of showing the significance of religion in human life, but always with the understanding that such teaching should not be intended to lead children to a religious commitment. Religious commitment is important, but it is the function of the home and the church to secure it.

Parents and teacher cooperation and understanding are necessary to the successful achievement of these goals.

We draw attention to the fact that moral and spiritual climate is created and sustained by the relationship, acts, and behavior of persons.

In regard to questions 4 and 5, the following comments were made: (a) Schools should afford opportunity to explore sources and sanctions of moral and spiritual values, including religions. (b) If moral and spiritual values are developed without reference to religion, religion is thereby minimized.

Section C of Group V considered Question 17: "Do the schools teach the existence of God as a fact? Should they? How can this be done without violating conscience?" There was general agreement that:

1. There may be difficulties in public schools "teaching" the existence of God as a fact.
2. The public school must not by implication or avoidance teach the non-existence of God.
3. The public school must recognize that most American people believe in the existence of God, and, if it must treat the influence of this belief in history and in contemporary society.
4. The school should help the student appreciate all the religious traditions—his own and those of others.

Questions for further study are:

March, 1956

1. How far can we assume consensus as to the meaning of "the existence of God?"
2. How far have we a right to assert the importance of religious faith as the basis of our values? What of the non-religious person? Does teaching that the basis of values is in religion make him seem less an "American?"
3. Is the "religion of the Founding Fathers" necessarily a sufficient guide for us today?

We ask the committee of this conference responsible for pulling together the work of various study groups to attempt to bring about in the General Board of the National Council of Churches a consideration of the plight of public education with reference to financial support, to ask the General Board to be responsible for the development and projection of a program of study and/or action designed to alert Protestants in local communities to this problem of financial support, and to enlist their leadership and that of other interested groups in securing more adequate financial support of their public schools.

Members of Group V.

Harold A. Phelps, Chairman
Mrs. Shirley McIn. Walsh, Reassembler

Arthur Gilbert
R. J. Henle
Philip Jacobson
Clarence D. Jayne
Huber F. Klemne
Philip H. Landram
Carroll H. Lemon
Harry J. Lord
Sister Marguerite Ann
Florence Martin
Clarence D. Jayne
Arthur Gilbert
Charles O. Churchill
Arthur C. Mearants
Arthur L. Miller
William F. Murra
Robert Peel
Charles H. Philpott
George H. Reavis
Gerald Read
Louis Schan
Sister Walter Marie
A. L. Schaly
Clara B. Spencer
Edward D. Staples
Robert W. Tully

Comments on the Report from the Floor

A. "... To the sentence which reads, "We draw attention to the fact that moral and spiritual climate is created and sustained by the relationship, acts, and behavior of persons," I suggest we add—"and in the present context most particularly that of teachers and school administrators, including their church membership and attendance...""

B. Commenting upon answer given to the question, "Should the school teach the existence of God as a fact? Should they? How can this be done without violating conscience?" One speaker agreed that the existence of God as a fact is not to be taught as a scientific fact. "However, I wish the group had come a little closer to the real problem. The United States government could not be expected to teach the existence of God as a fact, but the United States government does assume the existence of God as a fact. It assumes it in its courts, its coins, its educational legislation, its provision of chaplain, its governmental ritual, and in a score of other ways. The important question here, it seems to me, is whether the school can assume the objective existence of God. It seems to me it can, and can go as far as the government which it seems to serve and for which it seems to exist." Sometimes the schools seem to me to be overly cautious at this point. Of course we must respect the right of children of agnostic and atheistic parents. In government the civil rights of persons are respected, but the government acts on a belief in God, although it does not teach the existence of God. "So, it seems to me, the school can assume this underlying commitment. It is not just six of one, and a half dozen of the other that we assume, or don't assume, the existence of God. It seems to me that if a re-formation of the question and the answer will lead us a little closer to the basic problem. This just misses the mark."

(Continued on page 44)
Religion and Public Education in the States

by Don Conway

EDUCATION is one of "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, or to the people." A study of state laws is therefore a necessary part of a study of problems of religion and public education.

Most states give large responsibility to local school districts in control of school matters, often including determination of curriculum. All states must operate under rulings of the Supreme Court of the United States, some of which affect management of schools.

Limitations of the report which follows should therefore be realized; this report is limited to the state level. It includes constitutional and statutory provisions affecting ways in which public schools deal with religion. It includes opinions of state attorney-general, judicial decisions, and decisions of state boards of education so far as these have been included in the educational codes of the states, as found in the library of the Law School of the University of Chicago.

The reader should be warned also that condensation into summary form tends to obscure what may be a critical difference in a particular case. The summary form (See page 36) has the advantage of throwing into sharp relief the differences of opinion and practice. It may give focus to discussions of how public schools shall deal with matters religious.

The summary statement is compiled from the legal references cited state by state below.

State Regulations Concerning Religion and Public Education

Alabama
- Forbids aid to sectarian schools—Const., Art. 14, Sect. 263.
- Requires daily readings from Bible—Code of Ala., Title 32, Sects. 542-544.
- Permits teaching Bible as an elective high school course—Attorney General Opinion, Vol. 17, p. 68.

Arizona
- Forbids aid to sectarian schools—Const., Art. 9, Sect. 10.
- Forbids sectarian influence in public schools—Const., Art. 11, Sect. 7; Code of Ariz., Ch. 54, Sect. 54-1006.
- Forbids reading from the Bible—Code of Ariz., Ch. 54, Sect. 54-1006.
- Forbids religious exercises in public schools—Code of Ariz., Ch. 54, Sect. 54-1006.
- Forbids religious test as qualification of admission to schools—Const., Art. 11, Sect. 7.
- Requires teaching of American ideals—Code of Ariz., Ch. 54, Sect. 54-803.

Arkansas
- Forbids teaching of theory of evolution—Ark. Stats., Title 80, Sects. 80-1627.
- Requires daily readings from Bible—Ark. Stats., Title 80, Sects. 80-1605.
- Requires teaching of morals—Ark. Stats., Title 80, Sects. 80-1629.

California
- Forbids aid to sectarian schools—Const., Art. 4, Sect. 30; Const., Art. 9, Sect. 8.
- Forbids sectarian influence in public schools—Const., Art. 9, Sects. 8 and 9.

Mr. Conway is a student in the Department of Education, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.

Forbids reflection on citizens because of race, color, or creed—Ed. Code, Div. 4, Ch. 2, Art. 2, Sects. 8271 and 8272.
- Encourages moral improvement—Const., Art. 11, Sect. 1.
- Requires teaching of manners and morals—Ed. Code, Div. 4, Ch. 3, Art. 1, Sect. 8233; Ed. Code, Div. 5, Ch. 2, Art. 1, Sect. 10312; Ed. Code, Div. 7, Ch. 9, Art. 2, Sect. 13230.
- Requires teaching of American ideals—Ed. Code, Div. 7, Ch. 9, Art. 2, Sect. 13230.
- Permits released time—Ed. Code, Div. 4, Ch. 2, Art 2, Sect. 8286.
- Permits exclusion of sectarian books from public school libraries—Ed. Code, Div. 9, Ch. 7, Art. 2, Sect. 19072.
- Permits excusing pupils from hygiene for religious reasons—Ed. Code, Div. 5, Ch. 2, Art. 1, Sect. 10312.

Colorado
- Forbids aid to sectarian schools—Const., Art. 9, Sect. 7.
- Forbids sectarian influence in public schools—Const., Art. 9, Sect. 8.
- Forbids religious test as a qualification of admission to schools—Const., Art. 9, Sect. 8.
- Forbids inquiry into religion of teacher—Colo. Stats., Ch. 123, Sect. 123-17-12.
- Forbids use of school buildings for religious meetings—Attorney General Opinion, No. 1624-49.
- Permits daily reading from Bible—81 Colo 276.
- Permits excusing pupils from Bible reading—81 Colo 276.
- Permits parochial school pupils to ride regular school bus
Permits use of school buildings for religious meetings; but also permits injunction to prohibit said use—25 Conn 223 and 27 Conn 498.

Bible reading optional—no mention.

**Delaware**

Forbids aid to sectarian schools—Const., Art. 10, Sect. 3.
Forbids sectarian influence in public schools—Del. Code, Title 14, Sect. 1401.
Forbids public transportation to private and parochial schools—36 Del 181.
Requires at least 5 verses read from Bible daily—Del. Code, Title 14, Sect. 4102.
Permits repeating of Lord's Prayer—Del. Code, Title 14, Sect. 4101.
Permits use of school buildings for religious meetings—Del. Code, Title 14, Sect. 714.

**Florida**

Forbids aid to sectarian schools—Const., Art. 12, Sect. 13.
Requires daily readings from Bible—Fla. Stats., Title 15, Sect. 231.09.
Requires teaching of morals—Fla. Stats., Title 15, Sect. 231.09.
Requires teaching U. S. Constitution—Fla. Stats., Title 15, Sect. 231.09.
Permits excusing pupils from hygiene for religious reasons—Fla. Stats., Title 15, Sect. 231.09.
Permits teaching Bible as an elective high school course—Attorney General Opinion Vol. 1948, p. 318.

**Georgia**

Requires at least 1 chapter read from Bible daily—Ga. Code, Title 32, Sect. 32-703.
Permits excusing pupils from Bible reading—Ga. Code, Title 21, Sect. 32-703.

**Idaho**

Forbids aid to sectarian schools—Const., Art. 9, Sect. 5.
Forbids sectarian influence in public schools—Const., Art. 9, Sect. 6; Id. Code, Title 33, Sect. 33-2704.
Forbids religious test as a qualification of admission to schools—Const., Art. 9, Sect. 6.
Requires teaching of morals—Id. Code, Title 33, Sect. 33-1203.
Requires from 12 to 20 verses read from Bible daily—Id. Code, Title 33, Sects. 33-2705, 33-2706, and 33-2707.

**Illinois**

Forbids aid to sectarian schools—Const., Art. 8, Sect. 3; Ill. Stats., Ch. 122, Sect. 122-15-14.
Forbids reading from the Bible—245 Ill 334.
Requires teaching of morals—Ill. Stats., Ch. 122, Sect. 122-27-11.
Permits use of school buildings for religious meetings—93 Ill 61.

**Indiana**

Permits released time, if religious instruction is held apart from school property—394 Ill 228.

**Iowa**

Forbids aid to sectarian schools—Const., Art. 1, Sect. 6.
Forbids sectarian influence in textbooks—Ind. Stats., Title 20, Sect. 28-601.
Encourages moral improvement—Const., Art. 8, Sect. 1.
Requires teaching of morals—Ind. Stats., Title 28, Sect. 28-3428.
Requires teaching U. S. Constitution and American ideals—Ind. Stats., Title 20, Sect. 28-3428.
Permits daily reading from Bible—Ind. Stats., Title 28, Sect. 28-5101.
Permits use of school buildings for religious meetings—Ind. Stats., Title 28, Sect. 28-5054.
Permits released time—Ind. Stats., Title 28, Sect. 28-5054.

**Kansas**

Forbids aid to sectarian schools—Const., Art. 6, Sect. 8.
Forbids sectarian influence in public schools—Kan. Stats., Ch. 72, Sects. 72-1722 and 72-1819.
Permits daily reading from Bible—Kan. Stats., Ch. 72, Sects. 72-1722 and 72-1819.
Permits excusing pupils from Bible reading—Kan. Stats., Ch. 72, Sect. 72-619.
Permits excusing pupils from flag salute—153 Kan. 358.

**Kentucky**

Forbids aid to sectarian schools—Const., Sect. 189.
Forbids sectarian influence in public schools—Ky. Stats., Title 13, Sect. 158-159.
Requires daily reading from Bible—Ky. Stats., Title 13, Sect. 158-170.
Permits excusing pupils from Bible reading—Ky. Stats., Title 13, Sect. 158-170.
Teacher not a public officer—306 Ky 110.

**Louisiana**

Forbids aid to sectarian schools—Const., Art. 12, Sect. 13.
Forbids daily reading from Bible—136 La 1034.
Requires teaching of citizenship—Const., Art. 12, Sect. 3.

**Maine**

Requires daily reading from Bible—Me. Stats., Ch. 41, Sect. 145.
Requires daily reading from Bible—Me. Stats., Ch. 41, Sect. 146.
Permits released time—Me. Stats., Ch. 41, Sects. 147 thru 152.

**Maryland**
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77, Sect. 139.
Bible reading optional—no mention.

Massachusetts
Forbids aid to sectarian schools—Const., Articles of Amendment, Art. 46, Sect. 2.
Requires teachers to have good morals—Mass. Stats., Ch. 71, Sect. 71-1.
Requires teaching of virtue—Const., Ch. 5, Sect. 2.
Forbids having Bible reading—no mention.
Sect. 71-31.

6672. Requires teaching of Ten Commandments—Miss. Code, Title 24, Sect. 6672.
Permits daily reading from Bible—214 NW 18.
Permits daily reading from Bible—Miss. Code, Title 24, Sect. 6672.
Permits supplying textbooks to parochial schools—Miss. Code, Title 24, Sect. 6672.
Permits daily reading of Bible—Heningway's Annotated Miss. Code, 1927, Sect. 9193.

Missouri
Forbids aid to sectarian schools—Const., Art. 9, Sect. 8.

Mississippi
Forbids aid to sectarian schools—Const., Art. 8, Sect. 208.
Forbids sectarian influence in public schools—Miss. Code, Title 24, Sect. 6672.
Encourages teaching of morals—Const., Art. 8, Sect. 201.
Requires teaching of morals—Miss. Code, Title 24, Sect. 6671.
Requires teaching of Ten Commandments—Miss. Code, Title 24, Sect. 6672.
Requires teacher to have good morals—Miss. Code, Title 24, Sect. 6672.
Permits daily reading of Bible—214 NW 18.
Permits excusing pupils from religious instruction—Miss. Code, Title 24, Sect. 6672.
Permits supplying textbooks to parochial schools—Miss. Code, Title 24, Sect. 6672.
Forbids teaching of evolution—Heningway's Annotated Miss. Code, 1927, Sect. 9193.

Montana
Forbids aid to sectarian schools—Const., Art. 9, Sect. 8.
Permits daily reading from Bible—Mont. Stats., Title 75, Sect. 75-2403.
Permits use of school buildings for religious meetings—Mont. Stats., Title 75, Sect. 75-2405.
Permits excusing pupils from religious exercises—Const., Art. 9, Sect. 9.
Forbids aid to sectarian schools—Mont. Stats., Title 75, Sect. 75-2403.
Permits excusing pupils from religious exercises—Mont. Stats., Title 75, Sect. 75-2405.

North Dakota
Forbids sectarian instruction in public schools—Const., Art. 11, Sect. 9; Nev. Stats., Public Schools, Sect. 5754.
Forbids sectarian textbooks—Nev. Stats., Public Schools, Sect. 5754.
Permits daily reading from Bible—Nev. Stats., Public Schools, Sect. 5754.
Encourages moral improvement—Const., Art. 11, Sect. 1.

New Hampshire
Forbids aid to sectarian schools—Const. Part 2nd, Art. 83.
Permits use of school buildings for religious meetings—N. H. Stats., Title 13, Sect. 141-22.
Permits bus transportation to parochial school through ninth grade—N.H. Stats., Title 13, Sect. 135-9.
Bible reading optional—no mention.

New Jersey
Forbids religious test as a qualification of admission to schools—N. J. Stats., Title 18, Sect. 18:14-2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Regulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Hampshire</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires teaching of morals—N. J. Stats., Title 18, Sect. 18:5-49.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forbids inquiry into religion of teacher—N. J. Stats., Title 18, Sect. 18:5-49.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Jersey</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permits bus transportation to parochial schools—330 US 1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher not a public officer—6 N. J. 498.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Mexico</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forbids sectarian influence in public schools—Const. Art. 6, Sect. 2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires teachers to have good morals—N. Mex. Stats., Title 73, Sect. 73-12-2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires teaching of morals—N. Mex. Stats., Title 73, Sect. 73-12-2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permits use of school buildings for religious meetings—N. Mex. Stats., Title 73, Sect. 73-12-2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New York</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forbids aid to sectarian schools—Const., Art. 12, Sect. 3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forbids sectarian influence in public schools—Const., Art. 21, Sect. 4; N. Mex. Stats., Ch. 73, Sect. 73-12-2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forbids daily reading of Bible—N. Mex. Stats., Ch. 73, Sect. 73-12-2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires teaching of morals—N. Mex. Stats., Ch. 73, Sect. 73-17-1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permits use of school buildings for religious meetings—N. Mex. Stats., Ch. 73, Sect. 73-12-2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North Carolina</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires teaching of morals—N. C. Stats., Ch. 115, Sect. 115-144.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bible reading optional—no mention.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North Dakota</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forbids aid to sectarian schools—Const., Art. 8, Sect. 152.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forbids sectarian influence in public schools—Const., Art. 8, Sect. 147.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forbids sectarian books in public school libraries—N.D. Stats., Title 15, Sect. 15-2507.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires requiring of Ten Commandments in classrooms—N.D. Stats., Title 15, Sect. 15-4710.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires teaching of morals—Const. Art. 8, Sect. 149; N.D. Stats., Title 15, Sect. 15-3810.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires teachers to have good morals—N.D. Stats., Title 15, Sect. 15-3601.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permits daily reading from Bible—N.D. Stats., Title 15, Sect. 15-3812.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permits excusing pupils from Bible reading—N.D. Stats., Title 15, Sect. 15-3812.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permits use of school buildings for religious meetings—N.D. Stats., Title 15, Sect. 15-3314.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher not a public officer—60 N. Dak. 741; 59 NW 2d 605.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ohio</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forbids aid to sectarian schools—Const., Art. 6, Sect. 2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages teaching of morals—Const., Art. 1, Sect. 7.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permits use of buildings for religious meetings—O. Stats., March 1956.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oklahoma</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forbids aid to sectarian schools—Const., Art. 11, Sect. 5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forbids sectarian influence in public schools—Const., Art. 1, Sect. 5; Okla. Stats., Title 70, Sect. 11-1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forbids daily reading from Bible—Okla. Stats., Title 70, Sect. 11-1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oregon</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forbids aid to sectarian schools—Const., Art. 1, Sect. 5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forbids religious garb—Ore. Stats., Title 30, Sect. 342-650.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires teaching of morals—Ore. Stats., Title 30, Sect. 336-240.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permits use of school buildings for religious meetings—Ore. Stats., Title 30, Sect. 332-170.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permits bus transportation to parochial schools—Ore. Stats., Title 30, Sect. 338-060.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bible reading optional—no mention.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pennsylvania</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forbids aid to sectarian schools—Const. Art. 10, Sect. 2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forbids religious garb—Pa. Stats., Title 24, Sect. 11-1112.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires teachers to have good morals—Pa. Stats., Title 24, Sects. 10-1002 and 11-1109.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires at least 10 verses read from Bible daily—Pa. Stats., Title 24, Sects. 14-1400 and 14-1437.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rhode Island</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bible reading optional—no mention.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Carolina</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forbids aid to sectarian schools—Const., Art. 11, Sect. 9.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bible reading optional—no mention.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Dakota</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forbids aid to sectarian schools—Const., Art. 8, Sect. 16.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forbids sectarian influence in public schools—Const., Art. 22, Sect. 4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires teaching of morals—S.D. Stats., Title 15, Sect. 15-3516.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bible reading optional—no mention.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tennessee</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forbids teaching of evolution—Tenn. Stats., Title 7, Sect. 2343.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires daily reading from Bible—Tenn. Stats., Title 7, Sect. 2343.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires teacher to have good morals—Tenn. Stats., Title 7, Sect. 2333.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Texas</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forbids aid to sectarian schools—Const., Art. 7, Sect. 5;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wisconsin forbids exclusion from public school on account of religion—Wis. Stats., Title 6, Sect. 40.51.

Forbids sectarian textbooks—Tex. Stats., Title 49, Sect. 2899.

Forbids religious qualifications for teachers—Tex. Stats., Title 49, Sect. 2843.

Forbids daily reading from Bible—109 SW 115.

Utah forbids aid to sectarian schools—Const., Art. 10, Sect. 13.

Forbids sectarian influence in public schools—Const., Art. 10, Sect. 1; U. Stats, Title 53, Sect. 53-1-4.

Forbids religious test as a qualification of admission to schools—Const., Art. 10, Sect. 12.

Forbids daily reading from Bible—Const., Art. 10, Sect. 13.

Requires teaching of morals—U. Stats., Title 53, Sect. 59-14-10.

Requires teaching of American ideals—U. Stats., Title 53, Sect. 53-14-10.

Vermont requires teachers to have good morals—Vt. Stats., Title 18, Sect. 4392.

Requires teaching of morals—Vt. Stats., Title 18, Sects. 4301 and 4342.

Requires teaching of U.S. Constitution and good citizenship—Vt. Stats., Title 18, Sect. 4301.

Bible reading optional—no mention.

Virginia forbids aid to sectarian schools—Const., Art. 4, Sect. 67.

Requires teaching of morals—Va. Stats., Title 22, Sect. 22-238.

Requires teaching of American ideals—Va. Stats., Title 22, Sect. 22-165.

Bible reading optional—no mention.

Washington forbids aid to sectarian schools—Const., Art. 1, Sect. 11.

Forbids sectarian influence in public schools—Const., Art. 9, Sect. 4; Wash. Stats., Title 20, Sect. 28.02.010.

Forbids religious qualifications for teachers—Wash. Stats., Title 28, Sect. 28.02.030.

Forbids daily reading from Bible—Const. Amend 4, Art. 1, Sect. 11.

Requires teaching of morals—Wash. Stats., Title 28, Sect. 26.71.110.

Requires teachers to have good morals—Wash. Stats., Title 28, Sect. 28.70.140.

West Virginia encourages moral improvement—Const., Art. 12, Sect. 12.

Requires teachers to have good morals—W. Va. Stats., Ch. 10, Sect. 1819.

Permits released time—W. Va. Stats., Ch. 18, Sect. 1847.

Bible reading optional—no mention.

Teacher not a public officer—36 WVa 782.

Wisconsin forbids sectarian influence in public schools—Const., Art. 10, Sect. 3; Wis. Stats., Title 6, Sect. 39.02.

Forbids exclusion from public school on account of religion—Wis. Stats., Title 6, Sect. 40.51.

Forbids daily reading from Bible—Const., Art. 10, Sect. 3; 76 Wis 177.

Requires teaching of morals—Wis. Stats., Title 6, Sect. 40.46.

Requires teaching of American ideals—Wis. Stats., Title 6, Sect. 40.46.

During recent weeks there has been much public discussion of various particular problems of education in America. Citizen conferences, professional associations of educators, and clerical groups have been speaking about public schools, private schools, and religion or religious values in education. But there are aspects of the general situation which these statements have not encompassed and which need to be taken into consideration. The pattern of education which prevails in America and which is appropriate to our free society, a major essential feature of which is separation of church and state, includes the public schools, private schools—many of them under church auspices—and special schools on Sundays or weekdays, some on released time, for specific religious education. The Sunday or Sabbath schools, in which more than 37 million students are enrolled, have often been omitted from recent discussions of education.

The public schools alone are not adequate for the total institutional process of education. The home and the church must provide the major portion of religious education. This combination of general public education and specific private religious education is the most generally prevailing pattern and has proved to be, on the whole, satisfactory, though both aspects need strengthening.

Those who desire, instead, to maintain private schools in which general education and religious education are brought together in one institution are appropriately free to do so in our pluralistic society. The full support for such private schools should be provided by those who choose to maintain them. Asking for the support of church schools by tax funds on the grounds that they contribute to the national welfare is not different in principle from asking for the support of churches by tax funds, for churches surely contribute to the national welfare. Such support would in both cases be contrary to the separation of church and state.

Most of us who support the combination of general public education and specific private religious education do not ask the public schools, supported by taxes and directed by the state, to assume responsibility for the formal teaching of religion. This is the responsibility primarily of the home and the church. Parents have the right to educate their children according to their conscience and best wisdom. But to take this position is not to assume that the public schools are or need be godless. It is expected that they shall teach that religion is an essential aspect of our national heritage and culture, that this nation subsists under the governance of God, and that our moral and ethical values rest upon religious grounds and sanctions. To do otherwise, would be to distort history.

The public schools are a bulwark of American democracy, being both a basis and a product of our community life. The right of a democratic state to enforce compulsory school attendance is compromised and its own existence is put in jeopardy when good non-sectarian public schools are not available for all children.

We pledge ourselves to the strengthening of the public schools and to continued effort to improve religious education in home and church so that it together with public education may develop a more God-fearing and morally responsible citizenry.
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VI. Freedom to Learn

Questions Referred to Group VI.

1. What can public schools do to secure appreciation of religious liberty and its benefits?
2. Have public schools a duty to teach positively good will between religious groups? Can this be done without equating religions?
3. How shall the public school insist on every individual his religious freedom, regardless of how many in the community agree or disagree with his religious beliefs?
4. What should the churches, because of religious beliefs, do in developing a climate of opinion favorable to the free search for truth?
5. How are the laws of learning applicable to other subjects applicable to learning religion and learning about religion? Is there a difference between "teaching religion" and "indoctrination"?
6. Will we support discussion of controversial subjects in the public schools? Are questions of religion in controversy to be handled otherwise than other controversial questions? Will we support in public schools efforts for objective determination of facts about church institutions and religious doctrines?
7. Would we support definition of teachers as "public officers" for whom a religious test is forbidden? Do we believe atheism disqualifies a person to teach in public schools? Should communists be licensed to teach in public schools?
8. Shall instruction in science and other subjects in the public schools be limited to that to which no one objects on the grounds of religious liberty? If not, how shall the religious liberty of the individual be maintained?
9. Should church agencies take note of violation of civil rights in action against teachers in schools of the state?
10. Should churches in conflict situations take any action to support the principle that freedom for the scholar to search for truth is a necessary educational practice?
11. Will we support in public schools critical examination of state, national, and international institutions?
12. How shall pupils be protected from indoctrination by a teacher who is biased?

Report of Group VI.

Within the framework and purposes of the conference, Group VI was asked to explore the situation and problems having reference to the freedom to learn.

Our group of delegates were widely representative of different segments of our Protestant constituency and our observers afforded us valuable insights of competent spokesmen of Roman Catholicism, Judaism, Christian Science, and the Universalist-Unitarian fellowships.

After much vigorous discussion the group gained consensus that the freedom to learn is vitally and significantly related to the functions of the public school. The group viewed the public school as being functionally set in the American social order, and agreed that for our purposes its functions may be thought of under three headings.

1. The public schools exist in large measure for the perpetuation of our social legacy, including our political and social institutions, our literature and the fine arts, our applied skills and practical arts, and our historical and religious traditions.
2. The public schools also exist for the development of personal adequacy in the individual. In addition to the appropriation of our cultural legacy as mentioned above, this calls for ability to think, to solve problems, to make sound judgments and to master needed skills.
3. The public school must also have an eye to the future, equipping the students with the capacities for adjustment which will be needed to keep the pace of a rapidly changing culture. In meeting this need we must seek to conserve and enlarge our ability to add new knowledge by scientific research and creative effort.

To the fulfillment of these functions of the public schools the freedom to learn must be afforded to the individual at all ages.

The group identified two areas as being in special need of constant concern. The first of these involves precautions, so that majority opinions are not imposed upon the minds of minority viewpoints. Majority groups must exercise self-restraint and keep constantly in mind the vindication which history has often afforded to minority opinions. Nothing short of a "clear and present danger" should be permitted to restrict this freedom.

The constant need for cultivating respect for the conscience and the status of the individual person was also emphasized. The group took special note of the rights of children since the days when Roman jurisprudence gave the father the right of life and death over the child. Society now protects the child from physical neglect or abuse and requires that provision be afforded for intellectual development, i.e., compulsory school attendance.

Since the public school is set in our social order in this functional manner the burden of instruction which involves absolutes or which is aimed at commitment must be carried by the family and the church. Friendly cooperation and vital participation should be shared between the several agencies which are concerned with the education of the person, looking toward properly integrated programs and the constant attention to the personal values as against the institutional interests.

In view of the current widespread concern for our public schools this study group wishes to communicate the following statement of attitude.

March, 1956
It is based on two kinds of concern which were given effective expression in our group. First: We must not lose the respect and appreciation for the wisdom, power, and love of God which undergirds the life of any people. At this time when the course of history has placed us under such heavy responsibilities in world affairs we dare not underplay our responsiveness to God, but rather continue our dedication to make our nation an instrument of righteousness and freedom. Second, we may in deep humility refuse to yield to fearful conformity and thereby surrender the experimental fringe in our educational program which makes progress possible. This, too, is particularly urgent in a time when the future seems to hold such great potential for advance.

We recognize that the basic strength and integrity of our society lies in the deep religious faith of the members of the community. We therefore enjoin both home and church to be diligent in the religious instruction of both children and adults.

It is our firm belief that the public schools of this God-fearing people will prosper so long as they continue to acknowledge and champion the fundamental God-given rights declared by the Declaration of Independence and in the Constitution of these United States.

In accordance with our concept of the necessity of public education to undergird a free society, our public schools are the agencies which we have evolved to meet the needs of all people for an adequate education to make them intelligent, responsible citizens in a democracy.

So say that where religion is not taught in our public school system, it is unfair to those who promote parochial schools and state, and not exclusive to any group. In order best to serve the needs of all our people, they should never become agencies of any special group. This means that they should have maximum freedom to search for truth and to proclaim the truth without pressure or intimidation. We believe, also, that each individual student should not be limited in his freedom to learn, and that he should at all times have free access to the truth.

Our public schools historically have operated under these principles, and, operating in this atmosphere of freedom, they have become the bulwark of our heritage of freedom and a primary factor in promoting our democratic ideals. We therefore urge all our religious bodies to continue their support of the essential freedom of our schools to fulfill their basic purposes in a free society.

In insisting upon the necessary freedom of our public schools, we also recognize that this freedom imposes upon the schools and teachers a basic responsibility to respect the integrity of the students, and the ideals and desires of the people for their schools.

We believe that religious concepts and ideals have been, and are at the core of our culture, and that they are inextricably interwoven into all our traditions and ideals. Our public schools have the responsibility to recognize these facts, and to find adequate and effective means of continuing this basic relationship between themselves and the organized religious forces of our society for the perpetuation of our religious heritage.
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The National Council of Churches' Message on Religion and Education

The following Message was adopted by the General Assembly of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America at Denver, Colorado, December 1952. It is printed in the Biennial Report, 1952 of the National Council, pages 105, 189.

---

**The Crucial Problem Concerning Religion in Education**

Concerning religion in education emerges in relation to the public schools. We believe in our public school system. It is unfair to say that where religion is not taught in a public school, that school is secular or godless. The moral and cultural atmosphere in a school and the attitude, the viewpoints, and the character of the teachers can be religious and exert a religious influence without religion being taught as a subject. On the other hand, a way must be found to make the pupils of American schools aware of the heritage of faith upon which this nation was established, and which has been the most transforming influence in western culture. This we believe can be done in complete loyalty to the basic principles involved in the separation of church and state. On no account must an educational system which is permeated by the philosophy of secularism, something quite different from religious neutrality, be allowed to gain control of our public schools. We cannot, moreover, admit the proposition that in a public system of education the state should have the unchallenged right to monopolize all the hours during which a boy or girl receives instruction five days of the week. In some constitutional way provision should be made for the inculcation of the principles of religion, whether within or outside the precincts of the school, but always within the regular schedule of a pupil's working day.

In the meantime, the state should continue to accord freedom to religious bodies to carry on their own schools. But those who promote parochial schools should accept the responsibility to provide full support for those schools, and not expect to receive subsidies or special privileges from public authorities. The subsidization of education carried on under religious auspices would both violate the principle of the separation between church and state, and be a devastating blow to the public school system, which must be maintained. The solution of the problem lies in loyal support of our public schools and in increasing their awareness of God, rather than in state support of parochial schools. The reverent reading of selections from the Bible in public school assemblies or classes would make an important contribution toward deepening this awareness.

But in all education, and in culture as a whole, the interests of truth are dependent upon freedom of thought. It is only through the toleration of ideas that we can look forward to an increased apprehension of truth and to the preparation of stalwart representatives of truth. It is, in fact, good for truth to have to struggle with error. Nothing can be more fatal to truth and to the welfare of society as a whole than to try to suppress by force so-called ideological errors. The attempt to suppress freedom of thought would be a sure way to facilitate the establishment of a totalitarian form of government. Error must be met by truth in free and open encounter. The conscientious expression of ideas must not be dealt with by a dungeon, a boycott or an index, nor by arbitrary governmental action, character assassination, nor by the application of unjust economic and social pressures.
VII. Increasing Understanding Between Church and School Leadership

Questions Referred to Group VII.

1. Would church relationships with public schools be better if the churches now used more perfectly the opportunities they have for religious education in channels such as the vacation church school, Saturdays, Sundays, early mornings, evenings, summers, and Christmas and spring holidays, released time?

2. How can church and public school achieve equitable sharing of time of the child who is part of both? Should the time of pupils not actually spent in school be reserved for home and church? Should stated hours be reserved for home and church?

3. Should public school activities be scheduled for Sunday? Should they be scheduled for so late on Saturday evening as to hinder participation by youth in church and Sunday school?

4. What process can we suggest for use in local situations to make easy communication between school and church leadership on points of misunderstanding which may develop?

5. Shall pupils in public schools be excused for attendance at Protestant church youth activities and for observance of other religious duties? If so, under what conditions?

6. What provision should be made for children not excused for Holy Day observances or released-time classes?

7. Should public schools be impartial to religious faith and its lack?

Does the public school have any responsibility to encourage religious faith?

8. Can church spokesmen avoid use of phrases which imply that only churches contribute to the religious development of children? Can public school spokesmen avoid use of phrases which seem to imply that the public school is the only educational institution?

9. If the church asks the state to take over part of the responsibility of the home and the church, will not home and church think they have less to do?

10. What can we do to awaken the entire public to the conviction that religion is essential to a complete education, and that education is necessary in the achievement of progress?

Report of Group VII.

1. In examining what we can do to awaken the entire public to the conviction that religion is essential to a complete education and that education is necessary in the achievement of progress, we believe:

   a. That if you have the backing of the people in the community, the schools will reflect the feeling of the people. Church members, parents of church school and public school pupils, should express themselves that religious education is an essential part of all education.

   b. That if you publicize, through ministerial alliances and church councils, the unity and likeness of the various religions in the community, you will give the school boards, the school administrators, and the teachers the confidence to present the need for and the values of religion to our life. A common ground for understanding can be provided by representatives of all the churches and the schools working together.

2. In the problem of the community’s time allotment for the activities of children and youth, we believe: that at the local level a committee of concerned leaders, representing schools, churches, and other groups should consider the entire distribution of time of our youth to prevent conflicts and overloading, and that national educational organizations, PTA, and councils of churches be encouraged to remind their constituencies of the value of such local committees.

3. In considering absences from the public schools, as to how, when, where, and how much, we believe that to provide opportunity for pupils to meet their various religious needs, public school and church leaders should cooperate, each recognizing the problems and responsibilities of the other, to arrange schedules to make excusals possible in accordance with Supreme Court decisions.

4. We believe that public schools have the responsibility to recognize the importance of a religious faith for the individual in view of the religious foundations of American society and government.

5. Local communities, composed of interested persons representing church and public school interests, should plan together how this program can be used in any community.

6. We believe that the spheres of influence in the educational development and the religious development of boys and girls overlap considerably. It should be recognized that the church is not the only institution that contributes to religious development, nor is the public school the only institution that contributes to educational development.

7. The churches, through their educational programs, should encourage the highest type of individuals to enter the teaching profession, and should provide encouragement and instruction to their members in the teaching profession to exemplify the values of living a religious life that can be a constant model to the pupils contacted in their schools.

Institutions which educate for the teaching profession may also provide a broad religious background for their
students so as to reveal the opportunities for and limitations in dealing with religion in public education.

Materials for use by public schools should be made available by religious groups and given wide circulation and publicity so that all local communities may be informed. Package Library Briefs, such as those prepared by Indiana University's Bureau of Public Discussion at Bloomington, Indiana (Vol. IX, No. 28, February, 1953, covers Religion in the Schools) should serve as an example of what can be made available.

7. On the local, state, regional and national levels, religious and educational organizations shall be encouraged to exchange representatives to their meetings. This may be achieved by establishing the practice of having observers, fraternal delegates, and the like.
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Comments on the Report from the Floor

A. "Discussion in this group began by talk about the responsibility of the public schools to 'encourage' religious faith. To gain agreement on a statement acceptable to all in the group, the discussion changed to talk about 'the responsibility to recognize the importance of a religious faith,' and to base it upon such things as the foundations of American society and government. The discussion cited coinage, prayers, documents assuming God. But in saying 'encourage' you get into creed, etc., and the rights guaranteed by the constitution, to believe or not to believe."

B. "There is a difference in recognizing the place of religion in our heritage, and recognizing the importance of religious faith to our individuals. I can't quite see how this can be done without some encouragement of religious faith on the part of the individuals."

V. Treatment of Religious Viewpoints Within the Curriculum

(Continued from page 39)

G. "I do not see any distinction between teaching and assuming, when the school assumes the number of concrete things you have in mind when you say, 'assuming the existence of God.' The school is then teaching the existence of God. As an educator who thinks this is not the function of the school, I think it does not simplify the problem any to make a distinction which I do not feel is a real distinction. To me, if the school has a prayer to God, if the teacher speaks of God as an objective reality to whom devotion is due, and illustrate that in any subject matter or interpretation of history or science, as some teachers do, I think that teacher is teaching God's existence. I think it is questionable for the school to teach over that function of organized religion.

D. "There may be difficulties in public schools 'teaching' the existence of God as a fact. We will all admit there would be practical difficulties here. As far as the theoretical difficulty, which is not clarified by this statement, is concerned, if there is any difficulty, we have no right to be here in this conference... The basic question is whether or not, and to what extent, a person who on principle does not believe in the existence of a personal deity has a right to enjoy constitutional protection on that particular point.

In the very essence of our government, from the Declaration of Independence to the Constitution, I see the existence of our government, our concept of democracy, the very existence of the public school system, resting on the firm basis that there is a personal God.

We say there are persons among us who are atheists and agnostics. First, I think we might exaggerate. Who has counted them? How many are there? ... Granted the number may be larger, the report of the National Council of Churches I have here estimates they might be three per cent of the people. We have more than three per cent of the American people who believe on principle—at least, that is the way they act—that the moral law does not exist. Are we, therefore, to respect their rights to say that immorality, murder, thievery, are right, and are not to teach in our public schools that thieving and taking one's life away are wrong, because there are some people who are doing these things, apparently from subjective conviction?

"I would propose that we modify the sentence above to read, 'The public schools should accept—or assume—the existence of God as a fact,' transmitting the practical difficulties to the practical level where they belong."

E. "... We have a population of 165,000,000 people. If 164,999,999 believe in the existence of God, it would still be, as long as the Constitution is what it is, the right of the one remaining person to disbelieve. The issue is not... what society thinks, or what the community thinks, but what the law and the constitution say... I would certainly say that a teacher has the constitutional right not to be a church member, not to believe in God. These are issues of law and the Constitution, and not of the preponderant will of society except as that will is converted into statutory and constitutional law."

F. "We had the same kind of discussion in our study group, and I happened to be the middle man. I do not draw quite the same implication from this that a preceding speaker drew, that the public schools should not even mention God. We did not have consensus about the statement, and stated, "There may be difficulties in public schools 'teaching' the existence of God as a fact," as something on which we could all agree.

"What we could agree on possibly was that when you say are some per cent of the American people believe in God, it is true, and certainly preferable to the reverse case. What we could not agree on was that when we talk about the existence of God, is this sufficient for the committed Christian, the committed Jew? You immediately get into the meaning of 'the existence of God,' and into 'sectarian divisiveness.'

"We felt there was a big enough area of concern that it is not merely a matter of reaching agreement, which calls for deeper thought. We admit we did not get a solution, and I believe we pointed out we encourage further study in seeking a satisfactory solution to the problem."

G. "Why not combine the statements, and say, "While there may be difficulties in the public schools 'teaching,' the existence of God as a fact, the public school must not by implication or avoidance teach the non-existence of God." ...
VIII. Relationships of Church Educational Efforts to State Agencies

Questions Referred to Group VIII

1. To what extent do decisions of public school authorities regarding the role of the public school in dealing with religion affect our decisions regarding released-time programs by the churches? And vice versa? Does religious instruction on released-time assist public schools in other problems?

2. What can the church learn from the public school and its experience?

3. Should the churches be able to operate day schools integrating the races without the necessity of securing licenses from a state whose laws require racial segregation?

4. How can what a given youth studies in the public school and in the church school be correlated to the advantage of studies both in school and in church?

5. Should children in church-operated schools participate in the tax-supported programs of free lunches, medical examinations, use of school buses, free textbooks, etc.?

6. To what extent are policies governing public schools in dealing with religion related to other aspects of church-state relationships, such as building hospitals, chaplains in the armed forces? Would we favor appointment of chaplains for public schools, after the pattern of other government agencies?

7. Does our experience with the "GI" program of student benefits warrant extension of that idea of elementary and secondary education, whereby funds given either by the state or the federal government could be used for education in church schools?

8. Should public schools be taught in church buildings? Use teachers in religious garb? Contract with religious orders for teachers? Display religious symbols? When does a school become "sectarian?"

9. Should school district and state administrative officials be regarded as supervising all formal educational efforts within their respective areas, or merely that portion supported by tax funds?

10. Should tax exemption status of church-operated schools be affected by fees charged?

11. Should relationships of state agencies to day schools operated by the churches be the same as day schools operated by individuals or for profit?

12. Does our interest in public schools promise to involve public schools in religious struggles and church domination after Old World patterns?

Group VIII. Report No. 1

Released time programs for religious education are for the purpose of advancing the interests represented by a particular denomination or by a cooperating group of denominations. As such the program cannot be sponsored by the public school nor can it be taught by the public school. The decision, therefore, to sponsor such a program must be made by the denomination or denominations concerned. The curriculum for such programs should be developed under the assumption that the public schools are complying with the Supreme Court decisions on this subject.

Programs of religious education conducted on a released time basis must of necessity be supported by the parents since the decision to permit a pupil to participate rests with the parent.

Public schools and religious institutions in the community ought to maintain a mutually friendly and cooperative attitude toward each other.

Although the public school may not appropriately provide instruction in any given religion this restraint does not relieve the school of the responsibility to include consideration of the influence of religion in the sociology of human affairs. Such instruction may properly take place in an integrated manner in most subjects.

Released time programs can contribute to the effectiveness of the public school's instruction in moral and ethical values, but should not become a substitute for an emphasis on these values by the public school. Released time programs may also assist in establishing contacts which frequently are valuable in personal counselling of pupils.

Group VIII. Report No. 2

The relationship of state agencies to church (parochial schools) educational efforts should be primarily of a regulatory nature.

It is the responsibility of the state to guarantee to each child a program of at least minimum standards in the basic skills of learning and to require attendance in conformity with the compulsory school attendance laws of the state.

It is expected that state agencies will enforce minimum health and safety standards, carrying on instruction in the English language, standards which guarantee promotion of American ideals and essential reporting. It is appropriate for the state agency to certify all teachers, accredit and license schools. Visitations of the schools by state personnel is essential.

Considerable discussion evolved over consultative services in addition to regulatory responsibilities which should be offered by the state department of education to church-sponsored schools.

There should be cooperative consultative services between church-related and public-school agencies insofar as state responsibility for supervision reaches. Consultative services in addition to the above which are not in
conflict with state policy and which make no undue demands on the time of the state personnel and make no claims on state funds may be appropriate.

Group VIII. Report No. 3
The group was unable to reach a consensus on matters of school lunch, transportation, medical examination, and free textbooks. Statements and positions varied.

The separation of church and state as generally conceived in the U.S.A. should be fostered and strengthened. However, it is recognized this separation is not absolute in the sense of prohibiting cooperation of the church and state in matters of common concern.

The financial support afforded former members of the armed forces who, under the G.I. Bill, attend church-related colleges, and the tax exemption of church property, illustrate this point in practice. The illustrations are used from practice, without regard to the merits of these practices.

Members of Group VIII.
John S. Greenfield, Chairman
F. Floyd Herr, Recorder
Thomas E. Bowdoin
Richard Hammill
T. Franklin Miller
William R. Peliter
A. Greig Ritchie
Erwin L. Staben
J. Manuis Tydings
Raymond A. Vogley

Comments on the Report from the Floor:
A. "I am distressed that we have no consensus on basic principles involved in this report. We must do clear thinking on this matter as Protestants. We seem to agree that because there are some minor things such as tax exemption which benefit the church, we do not now have a consistent policy of separation of church and state, that therefore it is somehow unfair to oppose the giving of money to churches or private organizations for this purpose.

"We must admit benefits such as tax exemption, but these are relatively small and indecisive benefits. They are benefits given to all kinds of non-profit agencies. Separation of church and state is a developing process. Tax exemption is a hangover from the time when the church was largely if not wholly under the direction of the slate. The question today is the direction in which we want to move. "Do we want to move toward a more sound church-state relationship, or do we want to move back to the time when the church and state were entangled? It may be that resolution of this policy requires that tax exemption for churches be abolished.

If so, in order to be consistent, I think we should argue in this direction, and not say that because this exists and has existed, we should move away from a policy which we now maintain so far as private schools are concerned. If tax exemption is to be used as a sanction for outright grants of tax money to religious institutions, it is my conviction that the churches should repudiate their tax-exempt status!

"In this and any other case, we should take into account the original purpose of the Founding Fathers in providing for the separation of church and state. At the same time, we should consider the soundness of that principle. It seems to me that the only sound conclusion that the churches shouldavow in this respect is for the strengthening of this bulwark of our religious and political freedom, and not let a specious argument erode this barrier to the point where it will have no meaning, and in time will be ultimately destroyed.

"There is much more I would like to say, but the point is that when the committee wrestles with this problem in the future, it should really come to grips with this principle of separation of church and state. Let us begin the task of developing a really sound policy in this respect."

B. "In Group VIII's Report Number 2, the recommendation is made that all instruction be given in the English language. As this is phrased, it could be construed to forbid teaching any other language. Would not the principles of our pluralistic culture, which call for appreciation of various religious backgrounds, include necessity also for appreciation of language variations in our heritage? Would we not wish in our democracy for some schools in languages other than the dominant tongue? Is reading most efficiently taught in a language other than that which the child brings to school from the home?"

C. "How about the statement also in Report 2, that "It is appropriate for the state agency to certify all teachers, accredited and license schools." You are talking here of schools operated in church buildings, using teachers and textbooks paid for by churches. Would such a practice set a precedent for the state to license preachers, to control the pulpit and its message? "Why should not the church be free to teach what it chooses in its own church day school in its educational building? In some states, it would be difficult to secure from the state agency approval of such a school. Would we not wish the church to be free, and is not this freedom a part of our democracy? "The proposal says,—license all teachers. Does this mean you would like for the state to license teachers of religion in schools operated by churches? Who would define religion, the state?"

A. C. E. Basic Principles

The Committee on Religion and Education of the American Council on Education said in its report in 1947:

1. The problem is to find a way in public education to give due conviction to the place of religion in the culture and in the convictions of our people while at the same time safeguarding the separation of church and state.

2. The separation of American public education from church control was not intended to exclude all study of religion from the school program.

3. Teaching a common core of religious beliefs is a satisfactory solution.

4. Teaching "moral and spiritual values" cannot be regarded as an adequate substitute for an appropriate consideration of religion in the school program.

5. Teaching which opposes or denies religion is as much a violation of religious liberty as teaching which advocates or supports any particular religious belief.

6. Introducing factual study of religion will not commit the public schools to any particular religious belief.

7. The role of the school in the study of religion is distinct from, though complementary to, the role of the church.

8. The public school should stimulate the young toward a vigorous, personal reaction to the challenge of religion.

9. The public school should assist youth to have an intelligent understanding of the historical and contemporary role of religion in human affairs.

IX. Towards Consistency

Questions Referred to Group IX

1. Are there grounds for maintaining different policies of the churches toward education at elementary, secondary, and higher education levels in the United States and in other countries?

2. Are there grounds for policies by which state-supported schools deal differently with religion at elementary, secondary, and higher education levels?

3. Do the reasons supporting local determination of education, as close to the parents as possible, negate efforts to define principles regarding as good for all?

4. What policies of schools operated by our churches and supported by tax funds should be considered as we attempt to define policies here? (E.g., schools operated by some of our mission boards here and abroad receive tax funds.)

5. What practices in other government units may affect practice of the public schools in dealing with religion? Is "separation of church and state" interpreted in same way? E.g., aid for building hospitals, practices of worship in armed forces?

6. Irrespective of religious affiliations, is it fair to ask that all candidates for office as public school trustees believe in public schools?

7. Does our theology support the principle that school children may gain from exchange of insights in "mixed" schools, that is, schools including children from homes of many religious viewpoints?

8. How is the democratic principle of majority rule to be reconciled with the religious liberty of the individual in deciding how public schools shall deal with religion? Are there "majority rights" as well as individual and minority rights?

9. How shall experience in one state or city be brought to other states and cities considering policies on how public schools shall deal with religion?

10. In communities where a substantial number of children observe a holy day other than Sunday, have we any word on the propriety of public school functions on that day?

11. Do conflicts come between our (a) support of public schools, and (b) support of the right of churches to operate parochial schools and like freedom for private schools?

Report of Group IX

(Editor's Note: Each person attending the Conference was invited to attend the Study Group of his or her choice. Enrollments were small for Groups VIII and IX; the two chose to combine forces. Noting that lack of time "prevented the thorough discussion some points required," the combined group reported for Group IX as follows)

In dealing with the question of the reason for differing policies maintained by the Protestant churches toward education at elementary, secondary, and higher educational levels, the group recognized that this cannot properly be understood without reference to the historical role of the churches in education. There is no doubt a need in all Protestant bodies for a review of these policies, since many of them were inherited from the past rather than developed as conscious policies within recent years.

Nevertheless we believe there is good reason for differences in the policies of the church regarding higher education and elementary and secondary education because of some distinctive contributions of the Christian college to the life of the church and the nation, such as the important influence of the churches through:

(a) Church colleges training many of our public school teachers.

(b) The desirability of providing a Christian atmosphere for students who are removed from their parental homes and their home churches.

Further, since elementary and at least some secondary education is required on the part of all children, the church has a concern for the public school in terms of the welfare of the community as a whole. If a move in the direction of Protestant parochial schools should weaken the public school system there would thus be serious consequences for the entire nation. The contribution of the public school to national unity is also an important factor.

- For these reasons it is proper to urge more adequate support of their church-related colleges on the part of the denominations constituent to the National Council of Churches even though we do not in principle advocate the development of church-sponsored elementary and secondary schools.

The interest of the churches in public education requires a sensitivity to any pressures that might involve the public schools in religious struggles. Such pressure produces reactions adverse to the best interests of both the churches and the public schools.

"Our discussions of this controversial issue are part of a normal process. Just as the Founding Fathers thought the rights and liberties of the individual would be safer in a government with powers distributed among legislative, judicial, and executive branches, so they felt the freedoms of the individual would be safer in constant tensions between the institutions of state and church." —R. L. Hunz, in The Phi Delta Kappan. Bloomington, Ill. April, 1955, Page 24.
Report of Conference on Religion and Public Education

X. Evaluation, Methods, Techniques

Questions Referred to Group X

1. How do we evaluate teachings about religion in the public schools, to know when it has been worth the time and costs?

2. How can we evaluate any differences which may exist between children taught in public and those taught in non-public schools?

3. How can we evaluate differences in results in communities having practices of use of Bible, worship, in comparison with results in communities not having such practices?

4. How can we evaluate results of public schools of the United States in comparison with results of instructions in schools of countries where an established religion provides time for formal instruction in religious doctrines, etc.?

5. Do we think the religious development of children would be furthered by more specific instruction in formal content of religion, or by further exploration of improving total experience? By specific instruction in ethics, morals, and manners?

6. Is there any better way of improving the chances for religious growth of the children than by having good schools, with enough well-trained teachers of good character working with good equipment in a pleasant environment with not too many children?

7. Is every experience of a child in the public school of concern to the religious educator?

8. How can observances of religious calendar events in the public schools contribute to mutual understanding and appreciation between children from different faith groups?

9. Do we wish the public schools to teach manners and courtesies due to members of other religious faiths?

10. To what extent and through what agencies should we plan experiments and evaluation of current practices of dealing with religion in public schools?

11. Can churches do anything to assist in securing good trustees for the public schools without danger of sectarian competition?

Group X. Report No. 1

In considering the relation of religion to public education, we must recognize that the general objectives of religious groups and of public school leaders are in accord at the point of primary concern for the development of the individual, and for establishing and maintaining conditions in the community which contribute to wholesome individual and group life. Public schools, therefore, must be concerned to provide an education which recognizes the role of religion in our cultural heritage and in human experience today. Religious groups should expect the public schools to emphasize religion only when it seems appropriate in the on-going life experiences of children and in ways which contribute constructively toward understanding and unity. The presentation of particular doctrines and practices of the various religious groups is the task of the family and the church, not that of the public school.

Assumptions

In considering the problems of evaluation, methods and techniques, our study group proceeded on the basis of the following assumptions regarding the relation of religion to public education:

1. That the public school is an agency of the entire community and not of any particular segment, and that the concern of education is with the development of individuals within the life of the total community rather than advancement of particular institutional interests;

2. That the goals of instruction with respect to religion in public schools should grow out of and be properly related to the general purposes of education;

3. That the methods, techniques and skills necessary for effective presentation of religious materials, together with the knowledge of child nature and of the learning process, are essentially the same as those required in any other type of instruction;

4. That the program for teaching about religion for any given public school should be developed locally by cooperation between school authorities, parents and representatives of the various religious groups in the community with a recognition that responsibility for conducting the program rests with the school and that the proper function of religious groups is to assist school leaders in including religious emphases in the total educational program. Freedom of teaching and the autonomy of the school must be respected by religious groups. Impartiality with respect to various religious groups must be maintained by the school.

5. That the personal qualities and abilities of the teacher and the relation of the teacher to the pupils are fully as important as the particular content of instruction and therefore our concern is as much with teacher education as with specific subject matter.

6. That the basis for evaluation of religious teaching is the same as that of any other subject matter; namely, how does it affect personal growth and the achievement of wholesome life in the community.

We agreed that there is an urgent need to develop a more critical and evaluative attitude toward the effects of religious emphases in public education. We need to know much more than we now know about the positive contributions religion is making and can make to character growth and to desirable modifications in individual and group behavior. We find that too little attention has been given to the problem of evaluation and to the development of dependable instruments of testing and measurement in this area. On the basis of available data, we find it impossible to answer definitively such questions as the following:

What significant differences exist between children who have been taught in public schools where emphasis
upon religion is reduced to a minimum and those taught in non-public schools where religious emphases are central.

What significant results are obtained by the introduction into the public schools of such practices as Bible reading, worship, and formal courses in religion? How is the religious development of children furthered by specific instruction in religious doctrines? Does “teaching about religion” in the public school tend to minimize or to aggravate sectarian divisions and prejudices? What are some tangible results from many of the various patterns of emphasizing religion in the public schools?

Until more data are available on such questions, any dependable evaluations are difficult. It would seem that here is a fruitful field for experimentation and research.

We suggest that we seek to devise means of sharing more generally reports of significant experiences with respect to including religious emphases in the public school so that the results of experimentation be more widely distributed, and that efforts be made to develop more reliable and adequate instruments of evaluation.

**Evaluation**

Sound evaluation of the educational enterprise, or any part of it, must be on the basis of the extent to which educational objectives have been achieved. If objectives are simply the acquisition of facts or information it is a relatively easy job to devise tests which will reveal the amount of subject matter the learner has acquired. However, if objectives are concerned with influencing behavior, evaluation becomes complex and difficult. The committee is interested in the latter types of objectives and evaluation.

Suggested guides in evaluation stated in the form of questions are listed below:

1. Do evaluation plans, techniques and methods stem from objectives of learning experience?
2. How was the learning experience planned? Was planning based on the learner’s needs? Were these needs determined as objectively as possible? Were appropriate persons involved in the planning? Were the abilities, interests and training of teachers wisely considered?
3. Were objectives of the learning experience clearly understood and meaningful to the learner and other persons concerned with the program?
4. Were the learning experiences planned, organized and conducted in the light of available knowledge of effective learning processes?
5. Were the learning experiences an integral part of the learner’s entire educational experience?
6. Are the results of evaluation used as a means of improving subsequent teaching experiences?

**Group X, Report No. 2**

In the process of teaching about religion in the public school all experiences are important. First of all one presupposes a teacher dedicated to the task who has an established personal faith. She must be informed in order to give her pupils a sense of security, and she must feel the support of her administration and community in order to face a sense of security of her own. With those requirements met the teacher will be expected to recognize and deal with the opportunities for religious emphasis at every age level and in all subjects. She will be expected also to plan with religious values in mind.

A number of techniques have been tried in situations where the effort is made to conserve religious values: A few are described for their suggestive values:

1. A “thought for the day.” A quotation or statement having religious content has been used in classrooms, written on the blackboard, posted on the bulletin board, or used as a theme. For the first day or so the teacher may suggest the thought. After that a committee would be responsible for choosing a thought from numbers contributed by the group.

2. Grace at noon. In one school this was care for by a gift of chimes purchased by the children. When chimes were played in the lunchroom a moment of silence followed for individual meditation.

3. Literary references. In reading *Evangelion* reference was found to the “Sinai Prophet.” No one knew who was the Sinai Prophet. A volunteer looked up the reference and made a report. The experience led to a discussion having religious value.

4. A counselor recognizes religious days of major faith. She keeps a calendar on her desk with days marked.

5. Teacher tries to illustrate a love and concern about a child’s religion that has no relation to a desire to proselyte. Her aim is to help the child keep what is precious to him in his religious heritage.

6. Biographies are chosen to reveal the influence of religion as a guide in the lives of the great.

7. Teacher attempts on every occasion to gain respect for beliefs of any child—even if the expression of the child shows that he has a conviction of what is right.

8. An example of solving a child’s problem for its value in bringing out religious emphasis: Some boys stole a considerable quantity of glass bricks from a building project across the street from the school. The teacher made an arithmetic project out of the incident. She had a committee call on the contractor to find out the cost of the bricks stolen and the amount of lost time because of the absence of the bricks, and so on. Children emerged with a consciousness of the social implications of a small theft.

9. Another teacher made a geometry project out of a study of a cathedral window. The windows might also figure in the art project.

10. Representatives of one faith had a “doll” project. A story-telling lady visits in the grades bringing a doll dressed to represent a national hero, a hero from a foreign land, or even a Bible character. She builds a story on the contributions of the group as they examine the doll.

11. Use can be made of the “show and tell” period in kindergarten and early grades. A Jewish boy brought a Menorah and was given opportunity to tell about its use in his religion.

12. A calendar is used in the school room on which are designated the special days of all faiths.

13. Recognition in assembly programs of religious festivals—one school enjoyed music of all faiths at Christmas time. Other schools take advantage of opportunities in presenting dramatics to relate positive and negative emphases; for example, in the choice of language for a character to use who seeks to represent modern youth in realistic fashion.

Hundreds of examples can be furnished by reference
Church-State Issues in Religion and Public Education

The March 11 meeting of the General Board, in response to an overture from the Division of Christian Education, authorized the appointment of a Committee composed of representatives from the Division of Christian Education and the Division of Christian Life and Work to explore "the principle of separation of Church and State as it bears upon religion and public education."

The Division of Christian Education appointed to this Committee Luther A. Weigle, John Q. Schieler, and Elmer W. Walker. The Division of Christian Life and Work appointed Eugene C. Blake, Reuben E. Nelson, and Bishop Malcolm Peabody. Dr. Weigle served as chairman. The Executive Secretaries of the two divisions were present and participated.

An overture from the December 1952 meeting of the General Department of United Church Men had been referred to the Division of Christian Education by the General Assembly. The Division gratefully welcomed "the concern of the General Department of United Church Men" and reaffirmed its commitment to the 1949 proposal, which was for a more comprehensive plan for emphasizing the place of religion in public education.

The Committee received full information relating to the plans of the Division of Christian Education for a Department of Religion and Public Education, the plans for which Department were approved by the former International Council of Religious Education in 1919 and confirmed later by the Division of Christian Education. These plans were placed before the members of the General Board in its March meeting.

Youth Commission in discussing the plans of the Division of Christian Education, recognizes that any such program must be conducted within the framework of the present and future policies of the National Council of Churches with regard to the functions of Church and State. The Committee believes that the plans of the Division of Christian Education are in accord with present policies of the Council. As an earnest of that intention, we note the reported desire of the Division to have on the Departmental Committee adequate representation from the Department of Religious Liberty of the Division of Christian Life and Work.

It is our understanding that the proposed Department will make consultative services available to state departments of education, to county and local school boards, to administrators and faculty members of teachers' colleges and liberal arts colleges, and to all those interested and involved in American public education. We have noted with appreciation the declaration of faith in the American public school system. We commend the Division of Christian Education for its intention to make such resources available to responsible school authorities in order that our schools may better fulfill their own purposes in serving the needs of the nation.

In the services to be provided by this proposed department, every attempt will be made to strengthen the distinctive and appropriate educational roles of the home, the Church and the state school respectively. The home and the Church must assume their primary roles as teachers of religion. That is, to them is committed the responsibility of nurturing and instructing children in religious commitment, faith, and discipleship. No agency of the state, including the school, can safely or wisely be entrusted with this task.

At the same time, we believe that the public school has a responsibility with respect to the religious foundations of our national culture. It can declare, as the state itself declares, that the nation subsists under the governance of God and that it is not morally autonomous. It can acknowledge, furthermore, that human ethical and moral values have their ground and sanction in God.

The school can do much in teaching about religion, in adequately affirming that religion has been and is an essential factor in our cultural heritage.

The school can bear witness to its appreciation of the place of religion by the personal characters of those who teach in its classrooms.

No impairment of the separation of Church and State is involved in the assumption of such responsibilities. Nor is the basic responsibility of the home and Church in any way lessened. It is as committed persons gather in Churches and as they build homes that the most effective agencies of religious education are made possible. Moreover, as committed persons teach in or administer the public schools, they can exert religious influence by their character and behavior.

The Committee believes that as the people of our American communities seek to enrich the life of their schools and as they seek to explore the rightful and proper place of religion therein, they will be wise to avoid reliance upon legislative compulsion. Religious testimony and religious exercise especially are significant to the extent that they are free and voluntary.

We assume that these preliminary observations with regard to religion and public education will be supplemented in time by more comprehensive statements with regard to church-state relationships which will provide a general Council policy within which the Department of Religion and Public Education and all other units of the Council will operate.


International Journal of Religious Education
Materials Received by Delegates

Sunday, November 6—American Education Week Observance


2. "It's Time to Prepare!" American Education Week file. American Education Week, National Education Association, 1201-16th Street, N.W., Washington 6, D.C.


12. "State's Concern About Public Education," The Council of Church Relations, 341-B Ponce de Leon Avenue, N.E., Atlanta 8, Georgia.


OFICIAL STATEMENTS of policy for the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America, are made only by its General Assembly, and by its General Board between the biennial sessions of the General Assembly.

The Conference on Religion and Public Education was a study conference sponsored by the Committee on Religion and Public Education, one of 72 activity programs in the National Council of Churches. The working papers and reports of the National Conference on Religion and Public Education did not require, nor do they carry, the approval of the General Assembly of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America, nor approval by any denomination or council of churches constituent to it.

Monday, November 7—Morning Study Groups
1. Extracts from "Foundation Values of American Life... for Major Emphasis in the Cincinnati Public Schools," Department of Instruction, Cincinnati Public Schools, Cincinnati, Ohio.
3. "Exploring State American Documents for Their Moral and Spiritual Values," issued by the Nebraska Department of Public Instruction in cooperation with The American Legion, Nebraska Department, 1954. The Nebraska Dept. of Public Instruction, Lincoln, Nebraska.
8. "An Educational Platform for the Public Schools—Some Phases of Instructional Policy," 1952. Inland Press, Inc., 600 West Van Buren, Chicago 7, Illinois. 10c in lots under 100 copies; 5c each in lots of 100 or over.

Monday, November 7—Afternoon Study Groups
2. November-December, 1953 issue of Religious Education. Religious Education Association, 515 West 111th Street, New York 25, New York. Single copies, $1.00 each. Membership in Association, $5.00 or more per year.
3. April, 1953 issue of Phi Delta Kappan on "Religion in Education." Phi Delta Kappa, 203 Fourth Road, Homewood, Illinois. Single copies, 50c each. Subscriptions, $4.00 per year.
8. Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights Questionnaire on The Religion Clause of the First Amendment. Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, Chairman Thomas C. Hennings, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

(Editors' Note: This list of materials should not be regarded as a bibliography on problems of religion and public education. An extensive annotated bibliography, recently prepared, is available at a service charge from the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 11 Elm Street, Oneonta, New York.—R.L.H.)
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PREFACE

The churches comprising the National Council of Churches hold in common with many other American organizations certain convictions and concerns about the role of public education in a free society. These member churches also hold in common with each other certain distinctive religious convictions that bind them together as members of the universal Church of Jesus Christ.

While the former concerns about the role of public education in a free society have informed the writing of this study paper, it is the latter shared convictions about the Lordship of Christ that have motivated it and provided the framework within which it is cast.

We believe that God is Supreme over all His creation. We believe that God is Redeemer as He has revealed Himself in the life, death, and resurrection of His Son Jesus Christ, by whose grace we are saved from sin and death. We receive and rejoice in this good news, which comes to us through faith by the Holy Spirit.

As Christians and churches, our primary task is to proclaim this good news by word and deed that all men and nations may see, hear and believe. An integral aspect of this task is the bringing up of the children of believers "in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." We believe that no other community or institution can do this, nor should be permitted to attempt it. While reserving to ourselves the freedom to practice and proclaim our faith without interference from government or other agencies of society, we would be less than fair if we did not grant to other religious communities the same freedom. We are glad that our Constitution guarantees to all Americans this basic right in the constitutional principle of separation of church and state.

The Christian faith has played no small part in creating a society in which all claims to truth have the freedom to compete with each other in the open market place of ideas for the uncoerced commitment of the human conscience. Most religious communities, Christian and non-Christian, claim some kind of special knowledge about ultimate truth, the nature of God, life, death and human destiny. We believe that it would be disastrous to the kind of society in which we are free to proclaim that distinctive revelation of God in Jesus Christ which we confess if the right to indoctrinate or coerce the consciences of persons were to reside in any institution of government. Therefore, as churches and Christians we are committed to strengthening and maintaining the free institutions of a free society,

Persons outside the United States who send "Relation of Religion to Public Education" will please note it is written within the framework of the laws and tradition of the United States. Its principles are limited in application. We shall profit by examining each other's experience, but readers in other countries are advised to consult their respective councils of churches. Canadians, for example, may address the Department of Christian Education, Canadian Council of Churches, 2 Spadina Road, Toronto 4, Ontario.
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Part I. Some Convictions Which Influence Our Thinking

1. Differences and Agreements. Theological differences divide the churches, limit cooperation between churches and public schools, and are often blamed for the gradual exclusion of religious content once accepted in public education. Religious bodies define their faiths in creeds or imply them in deeds; each church and home expresses its religion in its own way. The task of the public school is made more difficult by the variety of faith and practice.

Churches and synagogues believe that God exists, that God is the ultimate reality in the universe, and that God is the source of truth and values. Each church and synagogue says more, however, and each says what it believes in a different way. Other groups and individuals have affirmations for them just as basic, but not based on belief in God; this fact too must be taken into account.

Study among differing religious traditions uncovers common ground for churchmen from which to discuss their concerns with schoolmen. Such conversations give hope for replacing tension and conflict with creative relationships.

There are differences among public educators as well as among theologians. The techniques of teaching, the content of courses, the goals of education are warmly debated. To the layman, differences on these points may be as confusing as theological differences. Basic attitudes with theological assumptions underlie many educational decisions. Teachers are increasingly aware of religious or philosophic presuppositions behind "secular" subjects at such points as "humanism" in literature, "economic determinism" in history, "mechanistic determinism" in biology and chemistry. The religious" is to be found in the "secular" perhaps as often as elsewhere. Teachers come upon religion daily, and many administrators know the problem of avoiding or including it in the school program.

2. The Child. The Judeo-Christian tradition views the child as an individual personality having worth in his own right, bearing the image of God. Nurture by parents or those who act for parents is indispensable if the child is to grow in "wisdom and stature and in favor with God and man." As society becomes more complex, the child increasingly needs education in the knowledge, skills and attitudes necessary for full development. As a co-worker with the parent, the teacher in church school or in public school to whom a child is entrusted carries a tremendous responsibility.

The individual lives in a social environment. His talents are best nurtured and his personality gains are greatest when he is interacting with other individuals in human society. Each person must be accorded the right to worship God in his own way, or not to worship, and must have freedom to think, to speak, to act,
to develop in fullest measure within the limitations of the common welfare.

3. Education, A Shared Responsibility. Education in a pluralistic society, involving all agencies which can provide a contribution to the education of the school child, is essential in helping individuals see many facets of truth, weigh values, make choices, and develop individual and social maturity.

The family, the church, the community, and the school must share in the educative process, each in its own way. This sharing of responsibility brings together the insights and judgments of the several institutions of the community, complementing and correcting one another, so that no one institution—family, church, government, or public school—holds exclusive control over the acquisition of knowledge.

4. Tax-Supported Schools. The public school is the major agency which our society provides for the formal education of children. Every educable child is morally entitled to a maximum educational opportunity consonant with his abilities. Minimum requirements of attendance have been legally established according to which a child is required to attend a public school, or another of his parent’s choice, until he has reached a specified age or level of scholastic achievement. Partly because of this double emphasis upon maximum opportunities and minimum requirements American citizens and students of their free and universal public school system; it has served well this nation constituted of many peoples, tongues, and faiths.

The assumption underlying support of the schools, by taxes from all citizens for all children, was upheld legally by court decisions relatively early in the history of the nation. The Christian’s basis for this kind of concern for others is in his faith—deeper, broader, and more compelling than any legal enactment. Religious convictions as well as the needs of our democratic society have called forth the general support of public education. To say that we support the public school system is not to say that it is beyond improvement. Suggestions for improvement are involved explicitly and implicitly in this document. They are made by committed leaders of that system.

State laws establish minimum standards and curricular requirements for their schools and criteria for certification of teachers. At the same time, the typically American principle of local control of schools is maintained. Local people in most states select their local boards of education, which build schools, appoint teachers, adopt budgets and determine school programs of studies.

Without impairment of principles of local control it may be increasingly necessary to broaden from local school districts the base of taxes for support of our public schools in order to equalize educational opportunity for all children.

The ideal has been expressed in The Declaration of Human Rights adopted by the United Nations, in these terms:

1. Everyone has the right to education. Education shall be free, at least in the elementary and fundamental stages. Elementary education shall be compulsory. Technical and professional education shall be made generally available and higher education shall be equally accessible to all on the basis of merit.

2. Education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It shall promote tolerance, understanding, and friendship among all races and religious groups, and shall further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace.

3. Parents have a prior right to choose the kind of education that shall be given to their children.

5. Other Schools. We maintain the right of churches and private corporations, at their own expense and under conditions assuring health, safety and equipment, to operate schools for the teaching of religion, for general education, or for specialized education. Parents have the primary right and responsibility to determine the kind of education that shall be given to their children, under laws establishing minimum standards to safeguard rights of the child and of society.

Those who support church-directed schools often do so because of their conviction that religion of their peculiar faith must be at the heart of all education of their children. Whatever other function such schools have, as institutions they are instruments for teaching a sectarian faith, and as such have no valid claim on public funds. Nor do schools organized or maintained to avoid racial segregation have any valid claim upon public funds, whether such schools are operated under church or private auspices.

It is the obligation of the churches to see that children are provided with opportunities for religious learning and commitment. Each church should provide an effective educational program consistent with its own theology and its best knowledge of how persons grow and learn, and share responsibility for the Christian education of its own and all children. The church and home must help the child acquire the religious and ethical principles and insights that will permeate and illumine his education in the public school and the community.

6. Separation of Church and State. Issues of church and state relationships inhere in questions of church and public school relationships. The people of the United States chose to keep the churches as institutions free from the control of the state, and the state free from the control of the churches.

Perhaps the most radical and deliberately conceived departure from the common political and ecclesiastical practices of European nations from which the earliest settlers came was the provision of the United States Constitution for church-state separation. This practice is sound, and the state should be nothing but away.

The First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States says: “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.” Throughout our national history this provision of the Constitution has had significant interpretations, stated here in the form of four propositions:

a. Religious freedom is a God-given right of each citizen. The conscience and the religious convictions of the individual are to be regarded as inviolable. Constitutional enactments recognize these rights. The acceptance, practice, promotion and support of religion is to be left to initiative of the individual and to such institutions as he may establish in free association with like-minded persons. This freedom should be exercised to the full, short of infringement upon the freedom of others and the well-being of the community as a whole.

b. There is to be no established Church, nor preferred status or financial support by the state for any church. The term “establishment of religion” means the recognition by law of a church or churches as a state church, or the support of a church in whole or in part by public funds. Such “establishment” by Congress is forbidden in the First Amendment to the Constitution. The Fourteenth Amendment as interpreted
by the United States Supreme Court prohibits the several states from doing what the Federal Government is forbidden to do.

c. There is to be no interlocking of the respective jurisdictions of state and churches. The state jurisdiction of civil law, or the jurisdiction of public institutions created by the state, must not supersede or overlap the rights of jurisdiction of a church or churches whose autonomy is guaranteed by the First Amendment and whose domination by the state or any of its subdivisions, institutional or officers is forbidden.

Neither is the church to invade the domain of the state.

Such overlapping or interlocking of legal and ecclesiastical machinery spells union of church and state at that particular point. This is the exact opposite of "separation." In other words, the legal structure of the churches and of the state must remain separate. Each must finance its own program.

d. There should be cooperation between the churches as free institutions and the state and its institutions.

Commitment to the principle of religious freedom, to the principles of non-interlocking and non-establishment of jurisdictions, does not mean that there must be isolation or antagonism, or that friendly cooperation is impossible. Cooperation between church and state is to be encouraged, as should cooperation between government and the voluntary community, state, or national agencies which have concern for children and youth—assuming that each pays for the functions it controls.

These principles, understood and implemented, preserve the independence of the church and the independence of the state, help to protect each from economic or political dominance by the other. The voice of the eternal and universal, to which the church is committed, must be heard in a moment of time in a particular place, a word spoken through private persons or the church rather than government. It is a matter of high national import that the churches be free to express religious beliefs which may transcend or even oppose the national policy and culture, to speak to the issues and problems of everyday life. In the practice of this freedom the churches should have opportunity to create programs and institutions needful to their message and mission.

7. Principles of Relationship

a. Aspects of Religion. Discussion of the relation of religions and public education may be clarified by distinguishing on the one hand certain aspects of religion which ought to be reserved to the home and church, and on the other hand those aspects which may be dealt with appropriately in the public school.

Characteristic elements of religion include (1) worship and commitment to God as He is understood in one's particular religious heritage, (2) beliefs and the idea structure of the particular faith, and (3) an ethical code.

Religion expressed in terms of commitment and incultation of beliefs and idea structure is essentially sectarian, doctrinal, denominational or ecclesiastical. Religion as conceived is primarily the province of homes and churches separately and together, where it may be affirmed in terms rich with historic meaning and in terms of faith that quicken and challenge. The teaching for commitment to sectarian and ecclesiastical concepts, proselyting, recruitment for church membership, specific instruction in dogma, doctrine, ritual—these are not the function of public schools, but of the church, the home, and voluntary agencies.

The public schools observing the limits of their assigned task appropriately cooperate in a reasonable arranging of school schedules and programs, to permit parents and churches to meet their respective responsibilities for specifically religious instruction.

Expressing one's religion through ethical conduct is a functional outworking of one's belief and commitment. In these terms religion is functional and not sectarian. Developing acceptable ethical judgments and conduct is the joint concern of home, church, public school and community. Each should reinforce the other in helping the pupil develop the kind of behavior which most Americans consider necessary to the development of a free society.

Wide-spread usage and the significant content of such terms as "ethical character" and "moral and spiritual values" suggest that there is some common ground, not only among religious people who are convinced that the highest quality of personality emerges only when vital religious faith is at the center, but also between religious people and those who deny the presuppositions of religion. Churches in the main support the common stress upon the importance of "moral and spiritual values." Agreement on importance is helpful. George Washington saw reason to say long ago, "Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports... And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion."

b. Desired Behavior. There is substantial agreement upon what kind of individual and group behavior is wanted. The same behavioral goals for pupils may be sought by school and church, and interpreted differently by each. For example, both school and church seek to develop pupils who are committed to the practice of brotherhood. The school teaches the practice of brotherhood as a part of the democratic ideal. The church teaches brotherly love as a response to the command of God to love one's neighbor. Church and school may and should interpret their behavioral goals in ways which reveal common elements, and thus strengthen the appeal to the pupil.

But church and school must each be free to interpret its own role with integrity. Whereas the church's ultimate concern goes beyond strengthening democracy, the school's primary concern is limited to the tasks assigned by modern society. The public school is out of character when it becomes involved in defining or rejecting the theological claims of religious groups.

Again, persons of different commitments may agree on what is desirable conduct while disagreeing on the sanctions for that conduct. The secular humanist may practice brotherhood as an expression of a purely human value, while the committed Christian practices brotherly love because the prior love of Christ calls it forth.

c. Factual Information. In a pluralistic society the school has a significant and interpretive function to perform regarding the nature of such a society. Where germane to subject matter, it should provide factual information about religious movements that have influenced the development of our free institutions. It should foster good intergroup relations by seeking to help pupils appreciate the kind of diversity that exists within our culture. The school should encourage in
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the child a spirit of free inquiry. It is not the public
school's task directly to try to secure a specific religious
commitment.

d. Sanctions Are Important. In teaching and ad-
vocating values which religious persons see as outcomes of
religious faith, the school should (1) be aware of the multiple
sanctions for these values accepted in our society; (2) recognize that religious per-
sons see these values in ways which allow for the addi-
tion of sanctions of religious faith. The school should
not teach that the values alone are important, and that
the addition of sanctions is unimportant. Rather
pupils should be encouraged to adopt for themselves
those values and sanctions which provide maximum
meaning.

In many public schools there is an attempt to main-
tain a strict silence not only in regard to the different
claims of particular faiths, but also concerning question
of whether or not God exists. This silence is often
misinterpreted for neutrality, or even for objectivity. The
practical effect may be to give support to the charge by
some that religious persons have no influence, and
that religion itself does not count. On those occasions
when silence should be maintained, the silence should be
interpreted as a recognition that questions about the nature
of God are beyond the province of public
schools, and pupils should be referred to their homes
and churches. A mistaken interpretation of separation
of church and state may result in attacks upon religious
freedom, since intellectual coming to God by public
schools means certain encroachments upon the govern-
ment's freedom to act from the point of view of a
sectarian view of life. Attempts to dominate public schools by
a sectarian view of life are also to be avoided. Each
child must be protected from embarrassment because of
his faith or lack of it. Preferential, overt or implied, of one religious group over another should be tolerated.

e. Public Schools Are For All. The schools exist for all
the people, Protestants, Orthodox, Roman Catholics,
Jews, unbelievers and all others. Churches must avoid
pressure upon the school to do what it cannot do. Parents and churches must go on from there, nurturing
and teaching separately and together as their own
understanding of God requires. If the public schools
shall declare their identity of purpose with the govern-
ments which created them and with the people who
support them, they have done enough. More should
depend not to be expected.

f. Obligations of Teachers. Christian teachers may
have temptations to make of the school a church and
of the classroom an evangelical hall. The more com-
plete the commitment of the teacher, the more power-
ful his temptation, because of the evangelistic and
missionary nature of the Christian faith. But the
teacher must remember that the public school is not
the proper place for attempts to win converts to his
faith, or any faith, however commonly held. That
must be done within the church, home, and community.
In the public school classroom, the teacher has obliga-
tions to all the parents and taxpayers for the defined
and limited purposes of public education.

Part II. Some Specific Problems

The application of general principles to specific prob-
lems is not always easy. A course of action which
commends itself to any group in the community usually
has in it some values against which other values must
be weighed. The choice of one course of action may
mean loss of values to be gained by another course.

Yet general principles must be applied to specific
problems if they are to count for anything. The fol-
lowing statements are therefore offered for considera-
tion by churchmen in local communities where prob-
lems arise. Local conditions may cause variation from
recommendations made from the national viewpoint.
Every local decision also affects the national situation.

and institutional expressions—cardinal articles of faith
for the believer—left to the teaching and nurturing
ministries of home and church where properly they
belong, and where they can be transmitted and inter-
preted most effectively. Differences between the af-
fIRMations of members of particular faiths emphasize a
point upon which they all agree, that religious beliefs
are important. This children in public schools may
learn.

In all of this, freedom of belief must be preserved.
The rights of minorities, however small, must always be
a matter for solicitous concern. A wise public
school is under obligation to reflect faithfully the life and
culture of a total community overwhelmingly com-
mitté to the preservation of American democracy,
based on theistic faith. It must respect the personal and
civil rights of the child or family of unpopular religious
or political views, so long as they do not clash with
public morality. The school sustains the basic views
that our democratic institutions should be upheld,
respected, served, defended and improved. The school
shall remain void of any direct or indirect religious
view of life. Attempts to dominate public schools by
a sectarian view of life are also to be avoided. Each
child must be protected from embarrassment because of
his faith or lack of it. Preferential, overt or implied, of one religious group over another should be tolerated.

1. Auxiliary Services. The state through its power
to tax, provides public school facilities to insure the avail-
ability of an education to each child and youth in the
community. These services are open to all without
regard to race, class, religion, or nationality. Those
who do not care to take advantage of the provisions
for public schooling and its services are constitutionally
protected in their right to avail themselves of facilities
privately controlled and supported. Just as the gov-
ernment is not expected to construct and service pri-
ivate roads which may be built alongside public high-
ways, it should not be expected to subsidize non-public
schools nor provide them with services of an educa-
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fessional standards and building standards should be comparable to standards of the public school. Attendance must be on a voluntary basis, a child being excused from school only on a written request of his parents.

In establishing and maintaining a program of weekday religious education, the principle of separation of church and state enunciated by the United States Supreme Court in the Zorach case is to be observed in letter and spirit. The National Council of Churches continues to advise against the use of public school buildings during school hours, and use of the public school machinery in conducting such classes. Local boards of education and councils of churches have of course the right and responsibility to develop their own sound patterns of procedure.

d. "Moral and Spiritual Values." The public school has long taught ethical and moral values. Plans for teaching these should be encouraged and strengthened. The questions of support or "sanctions" for the values taught are matters on which there are differences of convictions. Christians and Jews find the essential support for them in theistic faith. The Declaration of Independence describes men as endowed by their Creator with unalienable rights, as under a Divine Providence and a Supreme Judge; some of the individual rights of men are spelled out in the Constitution's first ten amendments. Public schools properly include in their instruction understanding of these terms and facts of history. The public schools therefore rightly teach that religion is an important aspect of our national heritage, that it is commonly accepted that this nation subsists "under God," and that moral and ethical values are widely held to rest upon religious grounds and sanctions. No person is required to accept any article of belief, but all should be acquainted with these important facts. In a pluralistic society there are many bases for support of values which may properly be explored in the public school classroom.

The growth of children is greatly influenced by the persons they love and admire. The teacher is a central figure in the effort to lead children to recognize and accept moral and spiritual values, such as the sacredness of human personality, brotherhood, justice, love. The more fully such qualities are exemplified in the teacher's life, the more certain we are that the child in his care will be inspired to adopt them as his own. The public schools should continue to emphasize the importance of these values.

e. Some Contemporary Approaches. In a democracy erected on the principle of separation of church and state it is manifestly improper for public schools to indoctrinate students in the tenets of sectarian religion, whether theistic or humanistic. Various other ways of treating religion in public schools need appraisal. (1.) A Common Core of Religious Faith. It has often been proposed that the common convictions of Protestants, Orthodox, Roman Catholics, Jews and other theists be taught as elements of religious faiths supposedly held by all members of the community. It
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See Resource Materials for relevant quotation.

"Standards for Weekday Church Schools" and "Introducing the Weekday Church School" are available at 25 cents each from the Department of Publications, National Council of Churches, 43 Riverside Drive, New York 27, New York. For request information on the "Cooperative Series of Weekday Church School Texts," on request to Cooperative Publications Association, Box 1329, Beaumont Station, St. Louis 3, Missouri. See also "Statement of Purpose of Weekday Religious Education" in Resource Materials, following.
has been urged that the Old Testament, sacred to Jews and Christians, be taught in the school as divinely inspired revelation.

Though attractive, the common core proposal does not offer substantial promise of immediate use. When one considers the wide range of subject matter and practice to be found among us, the amount of "common core" is small. Even in those communities in which all religious people are in agreement, it must be remembered that Old Testament materials, while acceptable to Jews in so far as their contents are concerned, are often unacceptable as a "common core" because of convictions and context when taught by Christians. Nor is there yet a canon and an English text of the Old Testament accepted fully by the several faiths. Christians and Jews differ enormously among themselves, and with each other, on warrants and sanctions for their convictions and for their sacred Scriptures. To deal in any depth with these "cores" of conviction and sacred literature involves the explanation and invocation of these sanctions. At this point "commonness" ends, and conscientious division begins. This proposal is worth further study, but seems to offer little present hope for advance. Workable plans must be sought elsewhere.

(2) The Regular School Subjects Teach Facts. The role of religion in contemporary culture is an essential one. The history of education tells us that religion can be understood only by considering religion as well as other ideas and facts. Similarly, objective study about religion is done in history, literature, art, music, when the integrity of the regular subject is maintained.
become acquainted with essential health information.

The school should not try to compel belief of this information, nor individual action based upon it, by any means. Any mere moral compulsion or any other subject which may infringe upon religious rights. Where the subject matter objected to is not judged to be indispensable to the child's survival or the community's health, children may be excused. The right of the minority does not include determination of policy for public institutions, so long as exemption serves to protect individual conscience.

Few denominations related to the National Council of Churches have made official pronouncements on these and similar issues, although the Department of Religious Liberty has examined comparable areas. These problems of conscience often come from sects and groups which do not relate themselves to other religious bodies, so that grounds for their scruples are not generally understood. Tensions are seen between general welfare and rights of conscience in some cases.

Just as it is possible to claim "conscience" for a whim, so it is possible to dispose lightly of disruptive questions in the name of "welfare." Only a real threat to the general welfare should override the rights of conscience.

There are a number of contested points which arise in connection with the daily program of the school at which genuine issues of religious dissent emerge. A child of Jehovah's Witnesses refuses to salute the flag or to repeat the pledge of allegiance. A pacifist high school student enrolls in physical training in military training. Standards of modesty and/or convictions about amusements and recreation grounded in religious belief cause parents and their children to abstain from some kinds of physical education, from social dancing, from classroom sex instruction. Teachers or students may hold to certain behavior patterns believed by them to matter to conscience. In all these matters the private religious conscience should be respected, no overt or covert attempt at coercion should be made and the school enact every effort to respect social non-conformity based upon religious conviction, even at the cost of administrative inconvenience or annoyance.

5. Religious Observances, Worship, Clubs

a. Religious Observances in the School. The First Amendment to the Constitution says that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. . . ." The public school is not designed to be a church. The power of the state should not be used to compel any person to attend a service of worship, nor to prohibit such attendance.

Situations in schools vary greatly. Some religious observances such as moments of silent prayer, a common prayer, the reading of Scripture, and similar basic religious statements or recitations, are practiced in many communities. Seasonal religious music and recognition are also common in many communities. There should be no laws requiring such practices. Within legal limits and community custom, participation in such practices is appropriate when they are natural rather than strained expression: no person should be compelled to participate, nor should special sectarian advantage be intended for any institution or group.

Christians should be especially sensitive to the fact that children are not noted for their non-conformity, and that so-called voluntary exemption does not overcome the compulsion exerted by majority behavior.

Religious customs which call for grace at meals should be honored. When the school is responsible (in loco parentis) for the time, safety, and activities of the student, occasions such as school camps, band and athletic trips, and the like, the school should encourage and give opportunity to the student to observe his own religious practices.

Public graduation exercises should be held in public buildings. It is appropriate that a prayer be made invoking the blessings of Almighty God upon the people and their institutions. The prayer is best expressed in terms most meaningful for the religious affiliations represented in the particular audience, but each person taking his turn in leading public prayer should be free to speak from his own tradition. The public school may follow the pattern of the Congress and the inauguration of the President of the United States.

If a baccalaureate exercise with definitely religious content is desired by a community, attendance should be voluntary, bearing in mind against the pressures upon the student toward conformity. Each church in the community may wish to conduct religious exercises honoring its own graduates, or join with other churches in similar exercises.

b. Excused Absences for Religious Observances and Holidays. Parents on occasion seek to have their children excused for special religious rites, holy days, conferences, and retreats. Such requests are made as a right of the parent who is responsible for the religious instruction of the child. Where the right is in question, or abuses appear to handicap the work of the public school, rules or regulations should arrange hours for such events which do not conflict unduly with public school schedules and policy. Schools have a right to expect coordination among churches for such requests, and the school should generally be protected against unilateral congregational demands for anything more than a single special occasion during a school year. School authorities should also be considerate as to scheduling tests and compulsory work at these times. Advance conferences between public school and church authorities should lead to better understanding and unity of action.

c. Religious Holidays During Public School Terms. Proposals for Saturday classes as a means of making up time lost because of storm or other emergency should include consideration for children of faith holding Saturday a religious holiday, and such as often use Saturday for religious instruction preparatory to confirmation. Like consideration should be given to religious holidays of the patrons of the school in arranging dates for important events of the school year, such as the opening of school terms, and scheduling major tests.

d. Extracurricular Clubs. Clubs with character-education purposes should be expected to fulfill the same requirements as other clubs with academic or leisure-time purpose. They may be organized by school students, meet on schoolgrounds, and be assisted by faculty leadership voluntarily offered. The public school is not the arena for evangelistic or proselytizing endeavor and such activities must not be engaged in on school premises with school support.

6. Financial Support of Church-Related Education

a. Scholarships. Proposals come from some quarters for tuition scholarships from state funds for elementary and secondary school pupils in church-related schools. Elementary and secondary education is gen-
8. The Standing of Leaders in Church and School

a. Clergy in the Schools. The participation of clergy in the life and work of the school deserves special mention. They are called in most frequently for one of several purposes:

1. They may participate with others as community leaders concerned for the general social well-being of the community. Their function, in such instances, is not a narrowly clerical role, but one of responsible citizenship. Thus the clergyman appears in a "teacher day" program on the same basis with representatives of other professions and trades.

2. They may participate in religious observances for school assemblies or public gatherings held under school auspices. The invocation of the blessing of God upon the life of the school seems entirely appropriate. Prudence will indicate that the school will be sensitive to the variety of religious convictions represented in the school level. They should not aid or permit the distribution of religious literature upon public school property or the request to the public school organization to do so, nor should they seek use of confidential data in public school files on such matters.

b. Religious Census. The public school personnel should not aid nor permit the distribution of religious literature upon public school property for the advantage of any sect or denomination. No child should be required to receive or to use religious literature against his conscience.

Sectarian literature is out of place in the public school, except for purposes of general education. At the high school level, there may be a valid use of literature containing sectarian points of view for purposes of general education, comparable to factual study of platforms of political parties, when such study is integral to a regular school subject. It appears desirable that school policy make possible such use of sectarian literature for purposes of understanding, and not for propaganda or indoctrination. Such material should be relevant to the subject under study, and all relevant viewpoints should be available. The high school student has a right to free search for truth within limits of his maturity level and the purposes of general education.

c. Distribution of Bibles. The Supreme Court of the United States has ruled that the distribution of a single translation of the Bible to children in the public schools is an "establishment of religion" prohibited by law. Full compliance with ruling court decisions is advised. Effective ways of distributing the Bible are to be found through church, home, and other agencies.

8. The Standing of Leaders in Church and School

9. Loan Funds for Educational Buildings. At the higher education level, church-related institutions, borrow substantial funds from the federal government to build dormitories and other self-liquidating facilities. Since provision is made through taxation for public school buildings for all children, government loans should not be extended to non-public elementary and secondary schools.

7. Outreach Efforts of the Churches

Religious Census. It is desirable, if state laws do not prohibit, that the public schools make note of the religious affiliation of its pupils in the process of enrollment. In order that pupils may be dealt with helpfully in connection with leaves of absence for religious holidays, or similar matters of religious understanding, or in discipline, counselling, or first aid. When questions are asked for such record of religious affiliation by the school administration, response should be optional. No person should be required to answer against his conscience, and report of non-affiliation is to be received on a par with report of active affiliation. It seems inappropriate, however, for churches to take a religious census on public school property, or to request the public school organization to do so, nor should they seek use of confidential data in public school files on such matters.

b. Religious Literature. Public school personnel should not aid nor permit the distribution of religious literature upon public school property for the advantage of any sect or denomination. No child should be required to receive or to use religious literature against his conscience.

Sectarian literature is out of place in the public school, except for purposes of general education. At the high school level, there may be a valid use of literature containing sectarian points of view for purposes of general education, comparable to factual study of platforms of political parties, when such study is integral to a regular school subject. It appears desirable that school policy make possible such use of sectarian literature for purposes of understanding, and not for propaganda or indoctrination. Such material should be relevant to the subject under study, and all relevant viewpoints should be available. The high school student has a right to free search for truth within limits of his maturity level and the purposes of general education.

c. Distribution of Bibles. The Supreme Court of the United States has ruled that the distribution of a single translation of the Bible to children in the public schools is an "establishment of religion" prohibited by law. Full compliance with ruling court decisions is advised. Effective ways of distributing the Bible are to be found through church, home, and other agencies.

8. The Standing of Leaders in Church and School

9. Loan Funds for Educational Buildings. At the higher education level, church-related institutions, borrow substantial funds from the federal government to build dormitories and other self-liquidating facilities. Since provision is made through taxation for public school buildings for all children, government loans should not be extended to non-public elementary and secondary schools.

7. Outreach Efforts of the Churches

Religious Census. It is desirable, if state laws do not prohibit, that the public schools make note of the religious affiliation of its pupils in the process of enrollment. In order that pupils may be dealt with helpfully in connection with leaves of absence for religious holidays, or similar matters of religious understanding, or in discipline, counselling, or first aid. When questions are asked for such record of religious affiliation by the school administration, response should be optional. No person should be required to answer against his conscience, and report of non-affiliation is to be received on a par with report of active affiliation. It seems inappropriate, however, for churches to take a religious census on public school property, or to request the public school organization to do so, nor should they seek use of confidential data in public school files on such matters.

b. Religious Literature. Public school personnel should not aid nor permit the distribution of religious literature upon public school property for the advantage of any sect or denomination. No child should be required to receive or to use religious literature against his conscience.

Sectarian literature is out of place in the public school, except for purposes of general education. At the high school level, there may be a valid use of literature containing sectarian points of view for purposes of general education, comparable to factual study of platforms of political parties, when such study is integral to a regular school subject. It appears desirable that school policy make possible such use of sectarian literature for purposes of understanding, and not for propaganda or indoctrination. Such material should be relevant to the subject under study, and all relevant viewpoints should be available. The high school student has a right to free search for truth within limits of his maturity level and the purposes of general education.

c. Distribution of Bibles. The Supreme Court of the United States has ruled that the distribution of a single translation of the Bible to children in the public schools is an "establishment of religion" prohibited by law. Full compliance with ruling court decisions is advised. Effective ways of distributing the Bible are to be found through church, home, and other agencies.
Part III. Conclusion

A. Define the Roles. Ordinarily Christian parents in the United States prefer to meet their responsibility for the general education of their own children and all children through support of a common school. This is thus assigned to the public school major responsibility for general education, including the skills of literacy, and for certain basic preparation for competent citizenship. The public schools are assigned a shared responsibility for many other things, such as vocational training and education in manners and morals. The home and the church instruct in religious faith and practice.

The public school should make clear these distinctions, so that children in attendance and their parents will understand that the public school does not educate persons in all matters of life, and that the community must look elsewhere for those aspects of education not assigned to the public school. It is the task of the church and the home—not the public school—to provide adequate programs of religious education.

The home and church should send to the public school grounded in a faith, who know why they wish to learn and for what ends they are being educated. The public school, in turn, gives these children skills and insights providing foundations for further religious education.

B. Support of Free Public Education. Where the role of the public school is thus defined and understood, where it teaches well in its proper field, it provides equal and adequate opportunity for all children of the community, where it promotes moral and spiritual values, and where it is friendly to religion, the public school is to be commended. Such happy results are the product of the joint concern and work not only of schoolmen but of citizens in general, among whom should be numbered every active churchman.

Where the public schools do not meet such standards, church members as citizens have a responsibility to help them to do so, to be worthy instruments for the education of their own and other children. We call upon the people of our churches to defend rights of public school students to freedom of inquiry and thought. At the same time, we call for frank and friendly evaluation and criticism, looking toward every possible improvement of the public schools.

In this sense, as an expression of Christian responsibility for the child and for the social order, we give our ardent support to the cause of free tax-supported education in the United States of America.

C. The Need for Further State and Local Studies.

The many questions considered in the foregoing illustrate the need for discussion in school districts throughout the nation. Conferences are recommended between public school and church leadership regarding common concerns, and the preparation of both school and church may perform their proper functions most effectively and in fullest cooperation.

Similar study and discussion are needed in local church and community groups to develop support for the public schools to clarify their function, and constantly to evaluate their objectives and improve their programs.

The End of the Study Document

National Council of Churches’ Statements

The National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., has spoken officially in a number of important matters. This statement, which is taken from the Study Document, "Religion to Public Education."

From the Message of the General Assembly of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., in session at Denver, Colorado, December 1952, comes the following:

The crucial problem concerning religion in education emerges in relation to the public schools. We believe in our public school system. It is unfair to say that religion is not taught in a public school, that school is secular or godless. The moral and cultural atmosphere in a school and the attitude, the viewpoint, and the character of the teachers can be religious and exert a religious influence, without religion necessarily being taught as a subject. On the other hand, we must find introduced to the pupils of American schools aware of the heritage of faith upon which this nation was established, and which has been the most transforming influence in Western culture. This we believe can be done with loyalty to the basic principles involved in the separation of church and state. On no account must an educational system which is permitted by the philosophy of secularism, something quite different from religious neutrality to give control of our public schools. We cannot, moreover, admit the position that in a public system of education the state should have the unchallenged right to monopolize the hours during which a boy or girl receives instruction five days of the week. In some constitutional way provision should be made for the inculcation of the principles of religion, whether within or outside the precincts of the school, but always within the regular schedule of a pupil’s working day.

In the meantime, the state should continue to accord freedom to religious bodies to carry on their own schools. But those who promote parochial schools should accept the responsibility to provide full support for those schools, and not expect to receive subsidies or special privileges from public authorities. The subsidization of education carried on under religious auspices would both violate the principle of the separation between church and state, and be a devastating blow to the public school system, which must be maintained. The solution of the problem lies in loyal support of our public schools and in increasing their awareness of God by the support of parochial schools. The reverent reading of selections from the Bible in public school assemblies or classes would make an important contribution toward deepening this awareness.

But in all education, and in culture as a whole, the interests of truth are dependent upon freedom of thought. It is only through the toleration of ideas that we can look forward to an increased appreciation of truth and to the preparation of stalwart representatives of truth. It is, in fact, good for truth to have to struggle with error. Nothing can be more fatal to truth and to the welfare of society as a whole than to try to suppress by force so-called ideological errors. The attempt to suppress freedom of thought would be a sure way to facilitate the establishment of a totalitarian form of government. Error must be met by truth in free and open encounter. The conscientious expression of ideas must not be dealt with by a dungeon, a boy-coal of an Index, nor by arbitrary governmental action, character assassination, nor by the application of unjust economic and social pressures.

The General Board of the National Council of Churches in session in Chicago, Illinois, May 20, 1923, received the report of a Committee asked to review among other things a proposal to establish a Department of Religion and Pub-
In the services to be provided by this proposed department, every attempt will be made upon the distinctive and appropriate educational roles of the home, the Church and the state school respectively. The home to the Church must assume their primary roles as teachers of religion. That is, they are committed the responsibility of nurturing and instructing children in religious commitment, faith and discipline. No agency of the state, including the school, can safely or wisely be entrusted with this responsibility.

At the same time, we believe that the public school has a responsibility with respect to the religious foundations of our national culture. It can declare, as the state itself declares, that the nation subsists under the governance of God and that it is not morally autonomous. It must further declare that human ethical and moral values have their ground and sanction in God.

The school can do much in teaching about religion, in adequately affirming that religion has been and is an essential human heritage. The school can bear witness to its appropriate place of religion by the personal characters of those who teach in its classrooms.

The Committee believes that as the people of our American communities seek to enrich the life of their schools and as they seek to fulfill the rightful and proper place of religion therein, they will be wise to avoid reliance upon legislative proscription. The religious exercise especially are significant to the extent that they are free and voluntary.

We assume that these preliminary observations, relative to religion in the public school, will be supplemented in time by more comprehensive statements when the relation of Church and State in any way is involved. It is our belief that the educational associations of educators, and clerical groups have been speaking about public schools, private schools, and religion or religious values in education. But there are aspects of the general situation which these statements have not encompassed and which need to be taken into consideration.

The pattern of education which prevails in America and which is appropriate to our free society, a major essential feature of which is separation of church and state, includes the public schools, private schools—many of them under church auspices—and special schools that are not public schools and are provided for religious education. The Sunday School is one in which more than 35 million students are enrolled, have often been omitted from recent discussions of education, and, for reasons determined by society as a whole, our public schools have been in a position to deal adequately with that portion of human experience commonly called religious.

We, therefore, affirm that the churches have an urgent responsibility to bear witness to the revelation of God within the totality of man's experience. There is special need to help children and young people to interpret their public education in this perspective. Bearing this witness in relation to public school education is the specific concern of the Division of Christian Education of the National Council of Churches' program of weekday religious education on released, reserved, or dismissed time.

The Committee believes that as the people of our American communities seek to enrich the life of their schools and as they seek to fulfill the rightful and proper place of religion therein, they will be wise to avoid reliance upon legislative proscription. The religious exercise especially are significant to the extent that they are free and voluntary.

We assume that these preliminary observations, relative to religion in the public school, will be supplemented in time by more comprehensive statements when the relation of Church and State in any way is involved. It is our belief that the educational associations of educators, and clerical groups have been speaking about public schools, private schools, and religion or religious values in education. But there are aspects of the general situation which these statements have not encompassed and which need to be taken into consideration.

The pattern of education which prevails in America and which is appropriate to our free society, a major essential feature of which is separation of church and state, includes the public schools, private schools—many of them under church auspices—and special schools that are not public schools and are provided for religious education. The Sunday School is one in which more than 35 million students are enrolled, have often been omitted from recent discussions of education, and, for reasons determined by society as a whole, our public schools have been in a position to deal adequately with that portion of human experience commonly called religious.

We, therefore, affirm that the churches have an urgent responsibility to bear witness to the revelation of God within the totality of man's experience. There is special need to help children and young people to interpret their public education in this perspective. Bearing this witness in relation to public school education is the specific concern of the Division of Christian Education of the National Council of Churches' program of weekday religious education on released, reserved, or dismissed time.
research, and study in the area of religion should be threefold. First, a department of religion should be provided so that a critical, systematic, and disciplined study of the subject may be undertaken under the guidance of well-trained teachers in scholarly, unapolitical, comprehensive ways, allowing for full academic freedom in this area. The theological discipline should be central to the department and adequate offerings in the content of the Hebrew-Christian tradition should be included. The department should be established on a par with other departments and it should function under regular academic procedures and policies. Second, certain courses using religious subject matter but the disciplines of fields other than theology (e.g., psychology, philosophy, literature, history, area studies, sociology) should be related within the inclusive curriculum in relation to encourage diversity in instruction and wider availability to students, and the Institute should be related to the department of religion in an institution-wide "field" of study in religious education. Thirdly, integral to academic freedom is the freedom for all instructors in all schools to expose the subjects they teach that the issues, facts, implications of religion may be included without fear of the damage that they may teach from the point of view they actually hold (since to hold none is impossible), and that they may interpret their subject matter in its deeper and ultimate dimensions.

Other Materials from Church Sources

Many church groups have given consideration to some of the problems in religion and public education. The General Conference of the Methodist Church, for example, has placed in its Discipline paragraphs regarding public schools. Among recent publications from church sources are:

"Our Public Schools," an elective unit by Thomas J. Van Loon, with leader's guide by John Blysterly Smith and Fred Cloud. 1953, 43 pp. (publishing company: Nashville, Tenn., or nearest branch. 35 cents.)

"The Church and the Public Schools," a statement approved by the 127th General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, 30 pp. 15c paper copy from Presbyterian Distribution Service, 415 Riverside Drive, New York 27, N. Y. (Discussion guide available with quantity orders.)


"The Relation of the Churches to the Public Schools and the Place of Religion in Education," prepared by the Commission on Religion and Education of the General Assembly of the Christian Church, 77 West Washington St., Chicago 2, Ill., 50c. 10c a copy.

"Christian Responsibility for Freedom" is the title of a social action emphasis for 1952-53 in many denominations. A "case book" will be ready for use in May 1952; two of its eight cases deal with religion and public schools. For information and price quotation, inquire of your denomination's board of the Department of Religious Liberty, Division of Christian Life and Work, National Council of Churches, 415 Riverside Drive, New York 27.

Many decisions of the United States Supreme Court affect how public schools in any part of the U.S. may deal with religion. The complexity of the issues raised by cases bearing upon religion and public education are such that the justices often differ among themselves, to result in report of majority and dissenting opinions. The question which most concerns us is: What can schools do? In the case of Tessim Zoroch and Esta Gluck vs. Andrew G. Clausen, et al., Board of Education of the City of New York, et al., held on June 19, 1943, in the United States Supreme Court on the subject. The question at issue was the constitutionality of a program of released time conducted by churches in their own buildings.

"We are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being. We parenthetically add that our students worship as one chooses, we make room for as wide a variety of beliefs and creeds as the spiritual needs of man deem necessary. We sponsor an attitude on the part of government that shows no partiality to any one group and that lets each flourish according to the seal of its adherents and the strength of its convictions. When the state encourages religious instruction or cooperates with religious authorities by adjusting the schedule of public events to sectarian needs, it follows the best of our traditions. For it then respects the religious nature of our people and accommodates the public service to their spiritual ends. To hold that it may not would be to fail in the Constitution a requirement that the government show a casual indifference to religious groups. That would be preferring those who believe in no religion over those who do believe. Government may not funnel religious groups nor undertake religious instruction nor blend secular and sectarian education nor use secular institutions to force one or any religion on any person. But we find no constitutional requirement which makes it necessary for government to be hostile to religion and to throw its weight against efforts to widen the effective scope of religious influence. The government must be neutral when it comes to competition between sects. It may not thrust any sect on any person. It may not make a religious observance compulsory. It may not coerce anyone to attend church, to observe a religious holiday, or to take religious instruction. But it can close its doors or suspend its operations so to those who want to repair to their religious sanctuary for worship or instruction. . . . In the McCollum case of 1948, the McCollum classrooms were used for religious instruction and the force of the public school was used to promote that instruction. Here, as we have said, the public schools do no more than accommodate their schedules to a program of outside religious instruction. We follow the McCollum Case. But we cannot expand it to cover the present released time program unless separation of Church and State means that public institutions can make no adjustments of the building and necessary to meet the religious needs of the people. We cannot read into the Bill of Rights such a philosophy of hostility to religion."

The majority opinion in the Zoroch case speaks of following the McCollum case of 1948, in turn based on the Everson case of 1947, in which the U.S. Supreme Court said:

The foundational theory of liberty upon which all governments in this Union rest is the freedom of the individual to worship God in any manner he chooses. We make room for as wide a variety of beliefs and creeds as the spiritual needs of man deem necessary. We sponsor an attitude on the part of government that shows no partiality to any one group and that lets each flourish according to the seal of its adherents and the strength of its convictions. When the state encourages religious instruction or cooperates with religious authorities by adjusting the schedule of public events to sectarian needs, it follows the best of our traditions. For it then respects the religious nature of our people and accommodates the public service to their spiritual ends. To hold that it may not would be to fail in the Constitution a requirement that the government show a casual indifference to religious groups. That would be preferring those who believe in no religion over those who do believe. Government may not funnel religious groups nor undertake religious instruction nor blend secular and sectarian education nor use secular institutions to force one or any religion on any person. But we find no constitutional requirement which makes it necessary for government to be hostile to religion and to throw its weight against efforts to widen the effective scope of religious influence. The government must be neutral when it comes to competition between sects. It may not thrust any sect on any person. It may not make a religious observance compulsory. It may not coerce anyone to attend church, to observe a religious holiday, or to take religious instruction. But it can close its doors or suspend its operations so to those who want to repair to their religious sanctuary for worship or instruction. . . . In the McCollum case of 1948, the McCollum classrooms were used for religious instruction and the force of the public school was used to promote that instruction. Here, as we have said, the public schools do no more than accommodate their schedules to a program of outside religious instruction. We follow the McCollum Case. But we cannot expand it to cover the present released time program unless separation of Church and State means that public institutions can make no adjustments of the building and necessary to meet the religious needs of the people. We cannot read into the Bill of Rights such a philosophy of hostility to religion."

The Supreme Court of the United States said in 1952, in rendering judgments for two Oregon corporations operating schools—the Hill Military Academy and the Society of Jesus—that the first amendment to the Constitution means at least this: Neither a state nor the Federal Government can set up a church. Neither can pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religions, or prefer one religion over another. Neither can force nor influence a person to go to or to remain away from church against his will or force him to profess a belief or disbelief in any religion. No person can be punished for entertaining or professing religious beliefs or disbeliefs, for church attendance or non-attendance. Nor in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions. Whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may assume, any attempt by a public authority toorth with the power of the State to standardize its children by forcing them to accept instruction in public schools only. The child is not the mere creature of the State; those who nurture him and direct his destiny have a right, coupled with the high duty, to recognize and prepare him for additional obligations. No question is raised concerning the power of the State reasonably to regulate all schools, to inspect, supervise and examine them, their teachers and pupils; to require that all children of proper age attend school under certain conditions, that teachers shall be of good moral character and patriotic disposition, that certain studies mainly essential to good citizenship must be taught, and that nothing be taught which is manifestly inimical to the public welfare. The U.S. Supreme Court, in 1934, when ruling that the constitutional rights of the American citizen are violated by racially segregated schools, said:

Today, education is perhaps the most important function of state and local governments. Compulsory school attendance
laws and the great expenditures for education both demonstrate our recognition of the importance of education to our democratic society. It is required in the performance of most useful occupations and responsibilities, even service in the armed forces. It is the very foundation of good citizenship. It is a moral instru-
ment in awakening the child to cultural values. In preparing him for later professional training and in helping him to adjust normally to his environment. In these days, it is doubtful that any child may reasonably be expected to succeed in life if he is denied the opportunity of an education. Such an opportunity, where the state has undertaken to provide it, is a right which must be made available to all on equal terms.

Bibliography

Persons wishing to make a serious study of how public schools may deal with religious questions should consult the sources mentioned in footnotes of the Study Document, and some of the titles which follow. A good general bibliography on the subject of religion and public education is:


Protestants and Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State. 1633 Massachusetts Ave., N.W. Washington 6, D.C.

For Roman Catholic Viewpoints. Consult priests of the local parish, the diocesan office, or the National Catholic Educational Association, 178 Massachusetts Ave., N.W. Washington 6, D.C. See also—Keller, James. All God's Children. From the Christophers Inc., 18 E. 46th St., New York, 1953, 251 pp. $3.00.


For Jewish Viewpoints. Consult a local rabbi, or local branch of one of the follow-
ing organizations:

American Jewish Committee, 155 E. 56th St., N.Y. 22.

American Jewish Congress, 55 E. 8th St., N.Y. 3.


National Association of Education of Religious Bodies, National Council of Churches, 425 Riverside Drive, New York, N.Y.

Synagogue Council of America, 110 W. 46 St., N.Y. 19.

Union of American Hebrew Congregations, 838 5th Avenue, New York, N.Y.

For a Humanist Viewpoint, non-theistically oriented, write the American Humanist Association, Yellow Springs, Ohio. En-
close 10 cents.

For Problems of Public Schools in Desegregation. The Southern Regional Council, 62 Auburn Avenue N.E., Atlanta 3, Georgia.

Department of Racial and Cultural Relations, National Council of Churches, 415 Riverside Drive, New York, N.Y.


For Separation of Church and State. Department of Publications, N.E.C.C.U.S.A., 475 Riverside Drive, New York 27, N.Y.


"Public Education and Religion." A report of the National Conference on Religion and Public Education sponsored by the Committee on Religion and Public Edu-

Why should teachers and other officials be taxed for support of education in the community? Do the obligations of the Christian extend beyond those of the citizen for education of their children? Why?

In the United States, is it possible to dis-
tinguish between a school run for the pur-
pose of the state and a school run for the purposes of the people by people who control the machinery of the state? Is the public school in the United States better described by the second than the first concept? Why?

To what extent do the permanent prob-
lems of federal-state-local district relationships affect problems of how public schools deal with religion? Should the policies be set by trustees in local school districts? By state legislature or department of edu-
cation? By United States Congress or Court? Why?

Is it possible to have freedom of conscience without freedom not to be-
lieve?

Should the public school help a child to understand religious practices of his fellows?

What objective data exist to show dif-
f erences between products of public and non-public schools? Are any differences surely attributable to the kind of school attended?

Figure the time a child spends in school as a percentage of his time from birth to graduation. Compare teaching opportuni-
ties of home, school, church, community.

Are church day schools operated for purposes of religion, or for general edu-
cation? What portions of the program are religious? What portion of the time is spent in religious instruction? What portion is spent in religious education?

What other facts would you like to have before making decisions on how public schools should deal with religion? How can the facts be secured?

Relation of Religion to Public Education
Thought Starters—For the Individual or the Group

1. Miss M—adjusted the microscope. Her fifth-grade pupils were peering through it, to catch their first glimpse of protozoa. On the board she wrote "protozoa—protozoans—first form," and "protozoans—first life.

An interested boy read, and questioned. "Teacher! My Dad says the world is flat!"

What do you wish that teacher in the public school to do?

2. Mr. L—was in the sixth-grade geography class, reviewing reasons why people think the world is round. Said Joe S— from the second row, "Teacher! My Dad says the world is flat!"

The class hushed, and the teacher waited. "The Bible says the world has four corners," added Joe. What do you wish that teacher in the public school to do?

3. What does the Bible say about responsibility of (a) the state (b) the church for the education of children, both their own and others?

4. The Bible says (Mark 12:17) to render to Caesar God and to Caesar what is Caesar's respectively. To what extent is Caesar's government comparable to our own? Compare "whether it is right . . . to listen to you rather than to God . . ." (Acts 6:13) with "Let every person be subject to the governing authorities." (Romans 13:1)

5. Do churches and states have the same goals, the same methods? The goals of the state include peace, order, justice—what are the church's goals and methods of compulsion? Does the church?

6. "Everybody's business is nobody's business." Whose business is it in the church to concern himself with the welfare of children in the public school? The pastor? The minister of education? The Sunday school superintendent? Which, if any, committees? What are advantages, disadvantages of placing responsibility on each?

7. Compare the variety of definitions of religion with the variety of definitions of education. Can people be talking about religion and education, using different meanings of each? How can people use words in different meanings get acquainted with the thought of the other parties in the discussion? How long do you think this process requires, understanding?

8. When you have a difficult subject, is it better to "push it under the table," or to bring it on top of the table, where the light of reason and experience may be brought to bear upon it? What does your answer say for your discussion of the question of Religion to Public Education?

9. "A man's religion is his own business."

—A Study Document
What Is a Study Document?
The paper you hold in your hands is a study document. It is designed to aid in the formation of a policy. A study document is not a policy statement, but one step toward the formulation of a policy statement if desired.

This paper does not report the official position of any of the cooperating denominations or state councils of churches. It is offered for consideration to them, if they choose, they may use it to develop policy statements.

A study document is not an official policy statement of the National Council of Churches. Only two bodies are authorized to speak for the National Council of Churches—the General Assembly which meets once in three years, and between these the General Board. Neither has seen this document before its publication. This study document comes from one of more than 70 units working in the National Council of Churches.

One of four Divisions in the National Council of Churches, the Division of Christian Education, has given permission for publication of this paper, with the request to member churches and councils to encourage local churches, individually and collectively, to study the document in the next three years, and to inform the Committee of their reactions. In 1956, the Committee which developed the paper will consider whether to make new policy statements.

This paper comes to you from the Committee on Religion and Public Education, appointed by one of three Commissions of the National Council of Churches. Successor to committees first convened by the Division of Religion and Public Education, this Committee on Religion and Public Education now has—
47 members named by 27 denominational boards of education
21 members named by 18 state councils of churches
23 members named by related units in the National Council of Churches, such as the Department of Religious Liberty, the Committee on Weekday Religion's Education
14 additional members named because of some special interest or competencies
4 staff members, ex officio

Copies of the Study Document, "Relation of Religion to Public Education," with accompanying resource materials, Pages 2T-3G of the International Journal of Religious Education, April, 1900, are available at 10 cents per copy, $9.00 per 100.

Order from
Office of Publication and Distribution
N.C.C.U.S.A.
475 Riverside Drive
New York 27, New York

Thought-Starters

(Continued from previous page)

22. If tax money is made available by scholarships or other plans to support schools operated by churches, will you advocate starting such a school? What would be gains and losses?

23. Could resistance by some persons to any mention of religion in public schools combine with the desire of other persons to effect new sectarian school systems, in effect backing all into religious "ghettos"? Would goals of each be thus attained?

24. Can a public school teacher achieve greatness? What are the opportunities in this compared with other careers, by the Christian standard of greatness?

25. Compare your state constitution with Section 10 from a model constitution published in 1935 by a committee of the National Municipal League.

Sec. 10. No public money or property shall ever be appropriated, applied, donated, or used directly or indirectly for the use, benefit, or support of any sect, church, denomination, sectarian institution or association, or system of religion, or for charitable, industrial, educational, or other purposes not under the control of the State.

26. Is it right for a church to seek to place its members on a school board? What are qualifications of a good school board member? How can candidates so qualified be assured and elected?

27. If churches accept tax funds for schools they operate, what state controls should they anticipate?


Help Make Policy

How should public schools deal with religion? Every citizen should share in the making of decisions of policy. In your local community, share in the making of the decisions about how public institutions—school boards, city councils, the police, the courts—shall ever be appropriated, applied, donated, or used directly or indirectly for the use, benefit, or support of any sect, church, denomination, sectarian institution or association, or system of religion, or for charitable, industrial, educational, or other purposes not under the control of the State.

What may, does, should a child learn about religion in the public schools?

You are invited to share your reaction to the positions taken in this document with the Committee. You may wish to send a copy to your denominational board of education, your council of churches. Do you agree, or disagree, with the thinking expressed in the document? Do you wish to suggest an improvement by addition or omission or amendment? Does your suggestion represent your own thinking, or that of a group? Does it come from a first reading, or after discussion and study with a group? Your comments should be addressed to:

The Secretary
Committee on Religion and Public Education
National Council of Churches
475 Riverside Drive
New York 27, New York

Relation of Religion to Public Education
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A PRONOUNCEMENT

A Policy Statement of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America

THE CHURCHES AND THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Adopted by the General Board
June 7, 1983

As Christians we acknowledge God as the ground and source and confirm of truth, whose Spirit is ever ready to respond to men's and children's search for understanding by correcting their fumbling misapprehensions and leading them into larger and fuller truth. Teaching and learning at their highest are pursued within this recognition. As Americans we are firmly committed to the right of freedom of conscience and freedom of religion, that is, the freedom of each citizen in the determination of his religious allegiance, and the freedom of religious groups and institutions in the exercise and declaration of their beliefs.

The American tradition with respect to the relations of government and religion, often described as "separation of church and state" does not mean that the state is hostile toward, or indifferent to, religion. On the contrary, governments—national, state and local—have prevalently acknowledged the importance as well as the autonomy of religion and have given expression to this principle in many ways.

In present-day American society, with its diversity of religious conviction and affiliations, the place of religion in public education must be worked out within this recognition of the prevalently positive attitude of the American people as a whole toward religion and safeguarding of religious liberty.

As Christians we believe that every individual has a right to an education aimed at the full development of his capacities as a human being created by God, his character as well as his intellect. We are impelled by the love of neighbor to seek maximum educational opportunities for each individual in order that he may prepare himself for responsible participation in the common life.

CONCERN FOR THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

We reaffirm our support of the system of public education* in the United States of America. It provides a context in which all individuals may share in an education which contributes to the full development of their capacities. It serves as a major cohesive force in our pluralistic society. We also recognize that significant value derives from the fact that this system is financed by public funds, is responsive to the community as a whole, and is open to all without distinctions as to race, creed, national origin, or economic status.

DEFINITION OF ROLES

Religious ideas, beliefs, values, and the contributions of churches are an integral part of our cultural heritage as a people. The public schools have an obligation to help individuals develop an intelligent understanding and appreciation of the role of religion in the life of the people of this nation. Teaching for religious commitment is the responsibility of the home and the community of faith (such as the church or synagogue) rather than the public schools.

We support the right of religious groups to establish and maintain schools at their own expense provided they meet prescribed educational standards.

We support also the right of parents to decide whether their children shall attend public or non-public schools. The parent who chooses to send his children to a non-public school is not excused from the responsibility of the citizen to support and seek to improve the public schools.

Neither the church nor the state should use the public school to compel acceptance of any creed or conformity to any specific religious practice.

It is an essential task of the churches to provide adequate religious instruction through every means at their disposal. These include both those activities which individual churches provide within their own walls and also various joint ventures of churches involving cooperation with the public schools. Christian nurture and the development and practice of Christian worship are inescapable obligations of the congregation and the family. We warn the churches against the all-too-human tendency to look to the state and its agencies for sup-
port in fulfilling the churches' mission. Such a tendency endangers both true religion and civil liberties. At the same time, we call the churches to renewed worship, study, work and sacrifice to fulfill their mission as God's people in the world.

PLACE OF RELIGION IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

No person is truly educated for life in the modern world who is not aware of the vital part played by religion in the shaping of our history and culture, and of its contemporary expressions. Information about religion is an essential part of many school subjects such as social studies, literature and the arts. The contributions of religious leaders, movements, and ideas should be treated objectively and broadly in any presentation of these subjects. Public school administrators and textbook producers are to be commended for the progress made to date in including objective information about religion in various subject matter fields. Teachers should be trained to deal with the history, practices, and characteristics of the various religious groups with competence and respect for diverse religious convictions. Their greatest influence will be through the life and attitudes they reflect in the classroom. They should be free as persons to express their own convictions in answer to direct questions from pupils when appropriate to the subject matter under study.

The full treatment of some regular school subjects requires the use of the Bible as a source book. In such studies—including those related to character development—the use of the Bible has a valid educational purpose. But neither true religion nor good education is dependent upon the devotional use of the Bible in the public school program.

The Supreme Court of the United States in the Regents' Prayer case has ruled that "in this country it is no part of the business of government to compose official prayers for any group of the American people to recite as part of a religious program carried on by the government." We recognize the wisdom as well as the authority of this ruling. But whether prayers may be offered at special occasions in the public schools may well be left to the judgment of the board responsible for the program of the public schools in the local community.

While both our tradition and the present temper of our nation reflect a preponderant belief in God as our Source and our Destiny, nevertheless attempts to establish a "common core" of religious beliefs to be taught in public schools have usually proven unrealistic and unwise. Major faith groups have not agreed on a formulation of religious beliefs common to all. Even if they had done so, such a body of religious doctrine would tend to become a substitute for the more demanding commitments of historic faiths.

Some religious holidays have become so much a part of American culture that the public school can scarcely ignore them. Any recognition of such holidays in the public schools should contribute to better community understanding and should in no way divert the attention of pupils and the community from the celebration of these holidays in synagogues and churches.

We express the conviction that the First Amendment to our Constitution in its present wording has provided the framework within which responsible citizens and our courts have been able to afford maximum protection for the religious liberty of all our citizens.

CHURCH SUPPORT OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS

American public education should have the full and conscientious support of Christians and Christian churches. Therefore, we urge our constituency to continue efforts to strengthen and improve the American system of public education through positive steps such as the following:

1. Providing intelligent appraisal and responsible criticism of programs of public education;
2. Keeping informed about the needs of the public schools and studying issues related to public education as a basis for intelligent action as citizens;
3. Supporting able candidates for boards of education and being willing to serve as members of such boards;
4. Working at local, state, and national levels for improved legislative and financial support of public schools;
5. Emphasizing to prospective and present teachers the profession of public school teaching as a vocation that is worthy of the best service a Christian can give;
6. Exploring cooperative arrangements of the churches and schools whereby the church's teaching of religion may be improved.

In American education, there is a substantial inter-relation between primary, secondary and higher education. It needs to be stressed that, in a substantial majority of publicly-maintained institutions of Higher Education; provision is offered for the voluntary election of courses in religion on a parity with all other subjects of the curriculum, and not infrequently for publicly-supported chaplains and other services of religion.

The question should be explored whether these arrangements through which religious instruction and services are provided within state institutions of Higher Education without infringement of law or offense to individual conscience may not offer suggestion for more adequate provision within the public schools of opportunities for the study of religion where desired, fully within the constitutional guarantees of freedom of conscience and of religious expression.
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A PROTESTANT AND ORTHODOX STATEMENT REGARDING DUAL SCHOOL ENROLLMENT

A Policy Statement of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., adopted by the General Board on June 4, 1964

PUBLIC EDUCATION in the United States is for all children regardless of race, creed, color, or economic status.

In the main, in this country, Protestants and Orthodox on the one hand and Roman Catholics on the other, have chosen to take different paths to discharge their educational responsibilities for the nurture of their children.

While approximately one half of the Roman Catholic children are in public school the officially approved system is one composed of parochial schools organized under the total direction of Church authorities. While some Protestant and Orthodox children are in parochial schools or church day schools—perhaps a half million—most Protestant and Orthodox children are enrolled in public schools.

The rapidly increasing number of children and the rapidly increasing costs of education, along with other factors, have caused Roman Catholic educators and parents in recent years to ask for public funds in discharging part or all of their educational responsibility. Assistance is often asked for that portion of the task most clearly identified with "general education." Protestant and Orthodox educators and others have generally favored the use of tax funds for public education, and resisted the use of public funds for church-related schools.

So far this unresolved difference has prevented direct grants to religious elementary and secondary schools; it has also hindered the passage of general legislation for federal aid to public education.

Resistance and opposition, however, are not a satisfactory permanent stance for Christians.

Protestants and Orthodox are conscious of the financial difficulties under which their Roman Catholic brethren and others labor in supporting two systems. While this predicament is not accurately described as "double taxation" it does involve additional costs. We are concerned, as Christians, to explore dual school enrollment as one possible solution to this problem.

Dual school enrollment is here defined as an administrative arrangement in which the school time of children is shared between public school and church day school. Students who are enrolled in a church day school are also enrolled in a nearby public school for part of their general education.

In dual school enrollment each school system remains in control of its own facilities, curriculum, schedules, and other administrative functions. Decisions to provide for dual school enrollment must be made and detailed arrangements worked out community by community by the responsible boards or administrators involved.

We know of no legal opinion holding that dual school enrollment violates the federal constitution. Most states' constitutions or educational legislation appear either to permit or not to forbid dual school enrollment.

We therefore approve further experimentation with and continuing evaluation of, dual school enrollment for classroom instruction as a viable provision for those who, for conscience sake, maintain separate schools.

We believe that boys and girls now limited by the resources of some religious day schools will be benefited by the equipment and program offerings for the portion of the time they attend the public school. We believe that this association and intermingling of the children in the school will result in a broadened support for public education and will serve to unify our now partially divided communities. At the same time, "We reafirm our support of the system of public education in the United States of America. It provides a context in which all individuals may share in an education which contributes to the full development of their capacities. It serves as a major cohesive force in our pluralistic society."2 It is our hope that dual school enrollment may prove to be a means of helping our nation to maintain the values of a general system of public education, yet at the same time meeting the needs of those who desire a system of church-related education, while upholding the historic American principle of the separation and interaction of church and state.
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Christian responsibilities for education through the week

A message to the churches

EXPLANATORY NOTE: The "Message to the Churches" below was considered by the General Board of the National Council of Churches at its meeting on June 3-4, 1965 and was adopted unanimously.

This paper was initiated in observance of the fiftieth anniversary of released time programs in 1964. It was reviewed by various groups at the annual meeting of the Division of Christian Education in February 1965 and was approved unanimously by the Division. It thus represents the responsible view of representative Protestant churchmen regarding support for public education, public school teaching about religion, and particularly about the need for expanded weekday programs of Christian education.

Churches are called to witness to their Lord at all times and under all conditions. Times of transition and change give focus and particular urgency to that witness. As the people of God we would serve Him daily in private and public tasks as well as through programs internal to the churches.

Recent court decisions have clarified the relation of religion to public education and the relation of churches to the public schools. While there rulings limit religious practices within public schools and clearly recognize religious commitment as the responsibility of home and church, they encourage teaching about religion as an essential part of general education.

In witness to their Lord the churches should now respond with fresh concern for an effective total Christian education ministry including through-the-week teaching-learning opportunities. In supporting church-sponsored through-the-week programs we affirm our heritage of separation of church and state as institutions. However, our heritage also recognizes the propriety of communication and cooperation between church and state in the discharge of their joint responsibility for the complete education of children and youth.

I. Support for public education

In the pronouncement, "The Churches and the Public Schools," (June 7, 1963) the General Board of the National Council of Churches declared, "We reaffirm our support of public education in the United States of America." We emphasize that this support should be adequate in financing and personnel to make education of high quality available to all the children and youth of America. To this end we urge increased local and state appropriations for public education. In line with the policy statement of the General Board on February 22, 1961, "Public Funds for Public Schools," we call for federal aid for public schools.

We emphasize that public education should be integrated wherever and whenever there are varied racial and ethnic populations. Where there is discrimination, quality education becomes difficult, if not impossible, for all students, especially for those who are discriminated against. High quality integrated education serves as a major collective factor in our pluralistic society. It has potential for enriching and strengthening the character of persons and groups in our society. Significant values develop when public education policy is determined by a responsible body representative of the entire community, including minority groups, and when all public schools are open to all without discrimination as to race, creed, national origin or economic status.

II. Public school teaching about religion

A positive approach to the way public schools teach about religion has been taken by the denominations and councils constituent to the National Council of Churches in a policy statement, "The Churches and the Public Schools," June 7, 1963: "The public schools have an obligation to help individuals develop an intelligent understanding and appreciation of the role of religion in the life of the people of this nation. . . . No person is truly educated for life in the modern world who is not aware of the vital part played by religion in the shaping of our history and culture, and its contemporary expressions. Information about religion is an essential part of many school subjects such as social studies, literature and the arts."

In the Supreme Court decision of June 17, 1963, the Court said, "It might well be said that one's education is not complete without a study of comparative religion or the history of religion and its relationships to the advancement of civilization. It certainly may be said that the Bible is worthy of study for its literary and historic qualities." (Abington School District v. Schempp, June 17, 1963, P. 22) Thus the Court has afforded an opportunity for the enrichment of public education about which the churches have not yet shown great concern.

Mr. Justice Brennan, in his concurring opinion in the
... that the contemporary situation makes more necessary than ever before reinvigorated, extended and expanded programs of Christian education through the week. Churches and communities should be aware that such programs may take many forms including dual school enrollment released or diminutive time, after school and free time approaches, as well as experimental patterns not now employed. Those churches and communities now maintaining programs should improve, extend and expand them, in accordance with high standards, and those that do not have such programs are urged to proceed with the establishment of them.

IV. The churchman in public education

The children of most Protestant Christians in the United States attend public schools. Many teachers, administrators and others serving in the public schools are Christian. Christian teachers, administrators, board members, and others officially serving the schools should remember that their task is God-given and should be carried out as holy responsibility. Such responsibility is carried out in the public school best by doing the work at hand joyously, effectively and humanely with respect for the integrity of the public school and without attempt to impart or compel any sectarian point of view. In carrying out the public task, the responsible school person is not asked to give up or even hide his religious convictions. For example, so long as the freedom of the students' convictions is respected, the teacher has freedom, to be exercised responsibly, to state his own convictions when such statement is germane to instruction.

We call upon Christian students to seek to love God with their minds, and to see their role as students as a response to His calling. We call upon high school and college students to consider the school professions as worthy callings of our Lord to serve persons in need, young and old, and the common needs of all humanity. We call upon parents and other adults to see their school responsibilities as Christian duty and opportunity.

The church needs to assist the churchman, be he child or adult, in understanding and interpreting his task in public education. Such assistance should be provided from the perspective of Christian faith and within awareness of the totality of the school person's experience.

---
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A LIST OF RELEVANT ORGANIZATIONS AND INDIVIDUALS
A LIST OF RELEVANT ORGANIZATIONS AND INDIVIDUALS

The following list of contemporary organizations and individuals is offered as a basic minimum starting point for further information regarding current developments in studies of religion in public schools. It is necessarily selective and thus limited.

Organizations

American Academy of Religion, Department of Religion, The Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida 32306

American Association for Jewish Education, 114 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York 10003

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036

American Association of School Administrators, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036

American Association of Theological Schools, 534 Third National Building, Dayton, Ohio 45402

American Bible Society, 1865 Broadway, New York, New York 10023

American Civil Liberties Union, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York 10003

American Council on Education, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036

American Jewish Committee, 165 East 56th Street, New York, New York 10022

American Jewish Congress, 15 East 84th Street, New York, New York 10028

American United for Separation of Church and State, 8120 Fenton Street, Silver Springs, Maryland 20910

Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 1640 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036
Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036

Association of Professors and Researchers in Religious 
Education, Chicago Cluster of Theological Schools, 
1100 East 55th Street, Chicago, Illinois 60615

Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs, 200 Maryland 
Avenue, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20002

Council on the Study of Religion, c/o Waterloo Lutheran 
University, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada

Church Women United in the U.S.A., Room 812, 475 Riverside 
Drive, New York, New York 10027

Ecumenical Task Force on the Religious Observance of the 
National Bicentennial, Room 576, 475 Riverside Drive, 
New York, New York 10027

Educational Communication Association, 960 National Press 
Building, Washington, D.C. 20004

Educational Research Council of America, Rockefeller 
Building, 614 Superior Avenue, West, Cleveland, Ohio 
44113

Laymen's National Bible Committee, 815 Second Avenue, 
New York, New York 10017

Ministries in Public Education, c/o Educational Ministries, 
The American Baptist Churches in the U.S.A., Valley 
Forge, Pennsylvania 19481

National Catholic Educational Association, One Dupont Circle, 
Washington, D.C. 20036

National Conference of Christians and Jews, 43 West 57th 
Street, New York, New York 10019

National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 Rush Street, 
Chicago, Illinois 60611

National Council for the Social Studies, 1201 Sixteenth 
Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036

National Council of Churches, Office of Public Education, 
Department of Educational Development, 475 Riverside 
Drive, New York, New York 10027
National Council of Catholic Laity, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005

National Council of the Teachers of English, 1111 Kenyon Road, Urbana, Illinois 61801

National Council on Religion and Public Education, Administrative Offices, Ball State University, Muncie, Indiana 47306

National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036

National Humanistic Education Center, Springfield Road, Upper Jay, New York 12987

National Jewish Community Relations Advisory Council, 55 West 42nd Street, New York, New York 10036

Pennsylvania Religious Literature Courses, Department of Religious Studies, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania 16802

Project FORWARD (Freedom of Religion Will Advance Real Democracy) '76, Room 1676, 475 Riverside Drive, New York, New York 10027

Public Education Religion Studies Center, Wright State University, Dayton, Ohio 45431

Religion in American Life, 475 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York 10017.

Religion in Social Studies Project, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida 32306

Religious Education Association, 409 Prospect Street, New Haven, Connecticut 06510

Religious Heritage of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036

Synagogue Council of America, 432 Park Avenue, South, New York, New York 10016

U.S. Catholic Conference, National Center of Religious Education-CCD, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005

World Religious Curriculum Development Center,  
6425 West 33rd Street, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55426

**Individuals**

Dr. James S. Ackerman, Professor of Religious Studies,  
Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana 47401

Dr. Daryl B. Adrian, Professor of English, Ball State University, Muncie, Indiana 47306

Dr. Rodney F. Allen, Professor of Social Studies Education,  
Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida 32306

Dr. Guntram G. Bischoff, Professor of Religion, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Michigan 49001

Dr. Donald E. Boles, Professor of Political Science,  
Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa 50010

Dr. Peter Bracher, Professor of English, Wright State University, Dayton, Ohio 45431

Dr. William Cenkner, Professor of Religion and Religious Education, The Catholic University of America,  
Washington, D.C. 20017

Miss Claire Cox, Towners Road, Route 6, Brewster, New York 10509

Dr. R. B. Dierenfield, Professor of Education, Macalester College, Saint Paul, Minnesota 55101

Dr. David E. Engel, Professor of Education and Religion, School of Education, University of Pittsburgh,  
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213

Dr. J. Blaine Fister, Director, Public Education Concerns, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.,  
Room 710, 475 Riverside Drive, New York, New York 10027

Dr. Edwin Scott Gaustad, Professor of American History,  
University of California, Riverside, California 92507

Dr. Merrill Harmin, Professor of Education, Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville, Illinois 62025
Dr. George E. Koehler, Assistant General Secretary, Division of Education, Board of Discipleship, The United Methodist Church, Nashville, Tennessee 37202

Dr. Vincent Lannie, Professor of Education, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana 46556

Dr. Robert W. Lynn, Professor of Religious Education, Union Theological Seminary, New York, New York 10027

Dr. William May, Professor of Religious Studies, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana 47401

Dr. Neil G. McCluskey, Dean of Teacher Education, Herbert H. Lehman College, Bronx, New York 10468

Dr. John R. Meyer, Director, Moral-Value Education Project, Burlington, Ontario L7R 3S1, Canada

Dr. Robert Michaelsen, Professor of Religious Studies, University of California, Santa Barbara, California 93106

Dr. Paul A. Olsen, Director, Curriculum Development Center, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska 68508

Mr. James V. Panoch, Field Coordinator, Public Education Religion Studies Center, Wright State University, Dayton, Ohio 45431

Dr. Philip H. Phenix, Arthur I. Gates Professor of Philosophy and Education, and Chairman of the Department of Philosophy and the Social Sciences, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York 10027

Dr. Nicholas Piediscalzi, Chairman, Department of Religion, Wright State University, Dayton, Ohio 45431

Dr. R. Terry Russell, Assistant Professor of Christian Education, Scarritt College, Nashville, Tennessee 37203

Dr. Samuel Sandmel, Professor of Bible and Hellenistic Literature, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio 45220

Dr. Archibald B. Shaw, Professor of Education, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48823
Dr. Sidney B. Simon, Professor of Humanistic Education,  
School of Education, University of Massachusetts,  
Amherst, Massachusetts 01002

Dr. Theodore R. Sizer, Dean, Graduate School of Education,  
Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

The Rev. Richard Upsher Smith, Pastor of Episcopal Parish,  
104 City Island Avenue, Bronx, New York 10464

Dr. Robert A. Spivey, Department of Religion, Florida  
State University, Tallahassee, Florida 32306

Dr. Frank L. Steeves, Dean, School of Education, Marquette  
University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53233

Dr. James K. Uphoff, Dean, Western Ohio Branch Campus,  
Wright State University, Celina, Ohio 45822

Mr. Thayer Warshaw, English Department, Newton North High  
School, Newtonville, Massachusetts 02160

Dr. Charles Whelan, Professor of Law, Fordham University,  
New York, New York 10023

Dr. John R. Whitney, Professor of Religious Education,  
Virginia Theological Seminary, Alexandria, Virginia

Dr. Donald H. Wimmer, Professor of Religious Studies,  
Seton Hall University, South Orange, New Jersey 07079
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