

I hated to send Pashley, though; but he was all I had left."

"What 's the matter with *me*?" demanded Britton, half rising.

"Just you lie still. You ain't available," said the older man. "Pashley means well, but he 's such a bungler. He never ought to have command of anything."

"I don't know about that, major. There 's good stuff in him, for I 've talked with him, and know. Don't be too hard on him."

"The trouble is, he is n't a fighter by instinct. He was n't glad to be sent out. He took it as a duty, saluted me, and stalked off. I gave him pointers about keeping under cover, though."

"I admit he 's a little raw now, but that will wear off, and he will be a credit to the regiment."

"I hope so," said the major. "He 's got a chance to do something now that any lieutenant ought to be proud to get. You 'd have jumped at it, even as you are. But you have n't got any sense, anyway," he concluded, with rough affection.

The Sioux fire on the little knoll slackened, and became unimportant. The men stole glances out, and were heard giving vent to exclamations. Richards raised his head, and at once swore.

"My Lord! To see Pashley making a holy show of himself—prancing up the hill, sword drawn, attitude copied from the 'Death of Montgomery'! It settles Pashley—but it saves us. Come on, you men—half of you! Run now like the devil!"

Diverted from the main point by Pashley's

displayed flank attempt, the Indians were devoting themselves to that young officer. He was indulging in pyrotechnic bravery, thinking thereby to stimulate his men. They needed no stimulant. As Pashley fell, they returned a sharp fire. At the same time Richards's men ran in on the front. From down the valley a bugle sounded, and the tarrying supports came rushing in. The Indians broke, and as they fled received the fire of Britton's party on the knoll. They tumbled out of range in confusion.

Major Richards hastened to where Pashley lay, and lifted his head. The boy was already in that hazy edge country in which spirits about to withdraw from this sphere love to hide; but at the motion he rallied, and looked up at the major with faint eyes.

"One more failure, major—sorry," he murmured apologetically.

"No, indeed, Pashley. It was a success. You did nobly. It was the bravest thing I ever saw," declared the major, as though commending a child. For he thought, "What 's a lie, so long as he dies the happier for it?"

Pashley looked up, and smiled.

"You think so?" he asked.

"I do. It was positively heroic. God help me!" he added aside.

Pashley breathed gently. "I am glad. I was such a failure. I wanted to do something fine—for the regiment. Anyway, I was faithful—"

"Faithful unto death," said the major, solemnly, looking up at the little group that stood with bared heads. For Pashley was already dead.

*George I. Putnam.*

## RELIGIOUS TEACHING IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS.



HERE are some questions which can be settled only by compromise—that is, by mutual concessions. There are other questions which are incapable of being so settled. A vital principle is involved, and that principle must be discovered, recognized, and applied. I believe that the long-debated question respecting moral and religious teaching in the public schools is of this latter sort. We have tried to settle it by compromise between Protestant, Roman Catholic, and rationalist, and tried in vain. I purpose in this paper to consider, first, What right has a free State to provide public education?—and from that consideration to endeavor to deduce an answer to the question, What kind of education may it provide? I have only to premise

in addition that the question is a practical one; it is therefore the question, What kind of education may the State furnish in a country like our own, composed of citizens of a great variety of traditional beliefs, both secular and religious.

By a free State I mean a democratic State—that is, one founded, as our American States are, upon the principle of self-government. What does this principle involve? It does not imply that every man is, without preparation, able to take care of his own interests; it does imply that, if he have a very moderate amount of education, it is safer to trust him to take care of his own interests than to intrust them to the care of any one else. The individual may injure himself by his follies or his vices; but he will learn wisdom and virtue by experience. Feudalism assumes that the mass of men are

children, who must be intrusted to the keeping of their wiser lords. Democracy assumes that they are potential men, and can acquire the capacity of manhood in the school of experience. The individual is in danger from his own folly under a democracy; but he is in a greater danger from the selfishness of his keeper under feudalism.

But democracy does not merely leave the individual to take care of himself: it also intrusts the interests of others to his keeping. Democracy is not anarchism, and does not tend to anarchism. Anarchism is the abrogation of all law, and a return to the individualism of nature. There is no tendency in America toward such abrogation and return. Anarchism is not indigenous in America, is seldom found in any native American, or in any American descendant from foreign ancestry of the third generation. Democracy is an organized community; it is not *demos* let loose, but *demos* united and co-working in a common life and to a common end. "The nation," says Professor Mulford, whose volume, "The Nation," is the best exponent of the American system ever issued from the press, "is not a confused collection of separate atoms, as grains of sand in a heap, and its increase is not through their accumulation. It has the unity of an organism, not the aggregation of a mass; it is indivisible; its germ lies beyond analysis, and in it is enfolded its whole future."<sup>1</sup>

This nation, which has a corporate personality, has corporate functions to perform. And these corporate functions it performs by the application of the principle of self-government. It is true that in most American communities the unit is the family, not the individual. Women and children do not generally vote. But theoretically every family is represented, and the political action of the community is the result of the total intelligence and virtue embodied in the thought and will of all the families. We do not seek a czar to exercise the corporate functions as in Russia — our Government is not paternal; nor do we by heredity seek an aristocracy to exercise these functions as in feudalism. We do not by property requirements select the men who have proved themselves possessed of practical worldly wisdom by their success in accumulation; nor do we by educational requirements select those who give indications of possessing intellectual competency to vote. American democracy is founded on manhood suffrage. It is not within the province of this article to discuss the question whether this system is wise or unwise. It is unquestionably based on an almost audacious faith in human nature. Personally, I believe that faith to be well founded; personally, I

<sup>1</sup> "The Nation," E. Mulford, p. 9.

believe in manhood suffrage for most, if not all, American communities. But the question to be considered in this article is not whether the American State is wisely organized; but what provision ought to be made for popular education in the American State as it is organized.

1. If a free State has a right to exist, it has a right to do whatever is necessary to maintain its existence. Self-preservation is a fundamental right and a fundamental duty; and popular education is essential to the preservation and perpetuity of a free State. Ignorant and immoral men are not competent to take care of themselves and their households, still less to direct the destinies of a great empire. The community has two alternatives before it: either to exclude by some natural or artificial test the ignorant and immoral from all participation in the government; or to provide systems of education such as shall enable all classes of citizens to become intelligent and virtuous. A possible third alternative, to leave permanently the property and lives of the intelligent and moral under the control of the ignorant and the immoral, is one not to be seriously entertained. In the Black Belt there are evidently only two courses open: the first, to exclude the negroes from all participation in political power, on the ground that they are incompetent to exercise it; the second, to provide such a system of education as shall make them competent. Precisely the same issue is presented in Ireland. If the Home-Ruler succeeds in vesting the Irish peasantry with the power of self-government, it is clear that he must also provide the means whereby they may be endowed with capacity for self-government. If the government is left to the incompetent, the end can be nothing else than a relapse into barbarism.

The public-school system of America is not a public charity. The reason the State provides education for the children of the poor is not because their parents are not able to provide it. The children in our public schools are not educated *in forma pauperis*. Our educational system is not an extension of poor-law methods to the educational realm. The free State assumes the responsibility for free popular education, because universal education is necessary to universal suffrage. A democratic State cannot long continue to exist without democratic education.

2. Rights are always duties. The right to life and liberty implies the duty to preserve that life and guard that liberty. The free State, because it has a right to provide popular education, is under a duty so to do. The public school is the result, and a necessary result, of the combination of the Christian spirit and the democratic organization. "Ye ought to help the weak" is the simplest and most alphabetic law of Christianity. In feudalism this

law was taken account of in the protection which the lord of the manor owed to his vassals. It was the recognized duty of the wise and strong — the lords — to care for the ignorant and weak — the villeins. If democracy involved leaving the ignorant and weak to care for themselves, it would be distinctly a reversion to the pagan type. If it were what Ruskin and Carlyle think it to be, they would be right in condemning it. And democracy without a public-school system would be what they think it to be. But modern democracy never is without a public-school system. The republic in France is no sooner established than it establishes popular education, at public expense, and under public control. Democracy no sooner gets a foothold in England than it organizes a School Board system. Slavery is no sooner overthrown in the Southern States than the public-school system is organized there, where before it was absolutely unknown. Feudal Christianity bids the wise and strong take care of the ignorant and the weak; democratic Christianity bids the wise and strong educate the ignorant and the weak to take care of themselves. One gives protection; the other gives competence and character. The public-school system marks the difference between ancient and modern democracy. The former was simply struggle for existence, and survival of the fittest. The latter is a brotherhood in which that struggle still continues, but in which all unite in an endeavor to fit each individual to survive.

3. Thus the right and duty of the free State to establish and maintain a public-school system is a primary, not a secondary, right and duty. It is not derived by express or implied consent of the parents. It is inherent in the very nature of the free State. The free State has not the power to live without exercising this right; it has not the right to live without fulfilling this duty. If this duty were left unfulfilled, the State would relapse into barbarism, and would die — and ought to die. The State does not step in to provide education for those children whose parents fail to educate them, as it provides asylums for orphans or outcast children. Every child is an inchoate citizen; and the State has a right and a duty to see that the child is educated for citizenship. The State leaves the individual to take care of himself; it is therefore under obligation to see that he is prepared to take care of himself. The State does not stand to the child in the place of the parent, and is not under obligation to fulfil the wishes or carry out the judgment of the parent. The training it gives is not vicarious or substitutional. Its authority is not conferred by the parent, directly or indirectly. France takes the young man away from home, puts him in camp for three

years, and trains him for the army. In doing this it does not stand *in loco parentis*. It does not derive its authority to do this from the consent of the parent. In determining what training it will furnish, it is not and ought not to be controlled by the wishes of the parent. France assumes that a standing army is necessary to its safety; it assumes that every young man is under obligation to fit himself for military service; and it enforces that obligation. In a similar manner America assumes that every young man is under obligation to fit himself for citizenship, and it enforces that obligation. If the parent wishes to keep the child out of school and engaged in a wage-earning occupation, America forbids, and America is right. If the parent wishes the child to remain in ignorance of the English language, and to learn only the German, America forbids, and America is right. If it is satisfied that the child is getting, outside of the public school, an education which fits it for citizenship, it may legitimately leave the education to be so obtained. But this is because it is satisfied that the parent is fulfilling a duty which primarily belongs both to the parent and to the State. To put the matter antithetically: it is not the duty of the State to satisfy the requirements of the parent; it is the duty of the parent to satisfy the requirements of the State.

4. The State cannot relegate this duty of public education to the Church, or to private enterprise. And this for two reasons.

A large experience has proved that the Church does not afford the kind of education necessary to make intelligent citizens in a free commonwealth. The Roman Catholic Church has been intrusted with education in Italy and Spain; the Protestant Church has been intrusted with education in England: and in neither country have the results been such as to justify us in repeating the experiment with either a Roman Catholic or a Protestant hierarchy. But we need not go across the sea. In our own country the free parochial school, whether Roman Catholic or Protestant, rarely furnishes an education comparable to that furnished by the free public school in the same community. This is not necessarily to condemn the hierarchy. To furnish general education is not the function of the Christian Church. Its function has been clearly defined by its Master. This is to act as a herald of the gospel, and to teach Christian doctrine and duty.<sup>1</sup> Sometimes it has to assume other functions because there is no other organization to assume them. But it always does so at a disadvantage. The most enthusiastic advocates of the parochial-school system in the Roman Catholic

<sup>1</sup> Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations: . . . teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you." Matthew xiii: 19, 20.

Church recognize frankly the tremendous obstacles in the way of that system, the great odds against which it is carried on, the drain on the energies as well as on the funds of the Church, the sacrifice of direct spiritual work entailed by this diversion of its energies to the work of secular education. This is indeed the very ground of their claim for a share of the public moneys. They propose that the State shall pay the expenses, but the Church shall direct the education.

But even if the Churches had proved themselves adapted to the work of carrying on a system of free popular education, they are quite incompetent to deal with the problem of free popular education in our country. With all that the Churches, private enterprise, and the State are doing, it is with difficulty that we keep pace with the growth of our population. Multitudes of children, not only in the South and the less-settled regions of the West, but in the great commercial cities of the East, are growing up in ignorance and barbarism. If the State were to abandon the work of education, and leave it to the parents, to private enterprise, or to the Churches, we should be swamped in a bog of ignorance in one generation. The right and duty of the State to provide for the education of its citizens—an inherent and primary right and duty—is one which cannot be relinquished either to parents, to private enterprise, or to the Churches.

5. These considerations determine the nature of the education which the community may and must provide. It is its right and duty to provide *all the education which is necessary to good citizenship*. I do not say that it may not do more. To discuss the propriety of taxing all the people to educate *some* of the people, by providing out of State funds for university and even professional education, would be beyond the province of this article. It is enough here to say that the State does not fulfil its duty if it fails to secure for all citizens all the education necessary to equip them for good citizenship. The right of democracy to educate is the right of self-preservation; and the duty of democracy to educate is the duty of preparing citizens to direct the affairs of the State. Both right and duty, therefore, combine in demanding that the State secure for every individual whatever education is necessary for good citizenship. And for this purpose moral education is indispensable. I will not stop to discuss the necessity of moral culture for individual self-government. That necessity is self-evident; self-government depends upon the governing faculties—that is, the impulses and the will: therefore, as a prerequisite to self-government, the governing faculties must be trained. Educate a man to write without training his conscience,

and you may educate only a forger; teach him chemistry without developing in him humanity, and you may make only a dynamiter. But I desire to show a little more fully that moral training is essential to the corporate functions of citizenship in a democratic State.

It is the function of the State to protect its citizens from foreign aggression. It must know, therefore, what are the rights which other States may not infringe, and what are the duties which it owes in turn to other States. The Hawaiian and Chinese questions are primarily moral questions, and are to be settled by moral considerations. It is the function of the State to protect individuals in the State from the aggressions of other individuals. It must therefore know what are individual rights and duties; and this is a moral knowledge. It is the function of the State to administer justice between man and man, to define crime, to determine who has committed crime, and to decide what punishment shall be awarded. The administration of justice is a purely moral function, and requires in the administrator moral development. This administration of justice is more and more, under the influence of Christianity, becoming an administration of redemption. Our penal systems are gradually becoming curative systems, our prisons reformatories, our aim in punishment to make good men out of bad men. This is supremely a moral function, and requires for its proper performance moral education. It is the function of the State to perform certain corporate acts,— which are in a sense extra-governmental,— and this necessarily raises questions which are in whole or in part moral questions. What currency shall the community use—gold, silver, greenbacks, or a combination of the three? How shall it tax itself? By taxes levied on real estate, personal property, purchases, or incomes? Shall Government protect and promote certain industries, or take its hands off, and leave all industries to free competition? These are, in large measure, moral questions. And in the discussion of every one of them the public orators and public presses make constant appeal to the moral judgment of men, claiming on the one side that gold monometallism is unjust to the debtors, and on the other hand that bimetallism is unjust to the creditors; on the one hand that tariff is robbery, and on the other hand that free trade is spoliation. The men who are to determine what are the rights and duties of the State in dealing with other States, what are the rights and duties of the individual citizens in dealing with one another, what is the nature, penalty, and cure of crime, and what is the moral quality of the corporate and coöperative acts of the community, are to determine moral questions, and must be educated to perceive moral

distinctions, and to see that moral considerations always outweigh considerations of mere expediency or apparent self-interest. Otherwise the State will be an immoral State, and the representatives of the State, whether on the bench, in the executive chair, or in the legislative chambers, will be immoral men. If it is the primary right and duty of the State to give whatever education is necessary for good citizenship, it is self-evident that it is its primary right and duty to give education in moral principles, and training to the moral impulses and the will.

6. Nor is it possible to give such moral instruction and training without involving something of the religious spirit, if not of religious education. We not only cannot prepare youth for citizenship, we cannot even carry on a public school, without both teaching the pupils certain moral principles and training the pupils in certain moral actions, without teaching some rules of righteousness, and requiring observance of them. And in doing this the teacher must be prepared to answer the question: "Why is this right? Why must I do this and abstain from that?" She may reply, "Because you will be punished in the one case and rewarded in the other"; or she may reply, "Because we are all under obligation to secure the greatest good of the greatest number"; or she may reply, "Because we are all living under the law of our heavenly Father, a law of love which proceeds from him because he is love." In the first case she will base her teaching and training on an irreligion of fear and self-interest, and will develop by it the lowest impulses; in the second case, upon social obligations, and will develop a conscience equal but not superior to the conscience of the community; in the third case, her teaching and training will be vitalized with the essential spirit of Christianity. But in any case her teaching will have a religious or quasi-religious foundation: in the first, godless and selfish; in the second, godless and social; in the third, godly and altruistic.

7. I have purposely dealt in this article with very general principles. I have wished to indicate by fundamental and essential considerations some popular errors, and to point out the way in which the long dispute concerning our public-school system may reach an abiding settlement. That settlement will not be reached by disintegrating the present system, and relegating public education to the Churches. Popular education does not belong to the Churches,

1 The Church has received from her divine Founder the mission to teach the supernatural truths. . . . But the Church has not received the mission to make known the human sciences, she has not been established for the progress of nations in the arts and sciences, no more than to render them powerful and wealthy. . . . Her duty of teaching human sciences is only indirect

and it does belong to the State. The public-school system, by which I mean a system of education maintained exclusively by the community, and *controlled exclusively* by the community, is essential to the maintenance of the free State. Settlement will not be reached by drawing an imaginary line between the religious and the secular, and relegating moral and religious education to the Churches, and leaving secular education to the State. No such line exists in fact. Religion is the spirit in which all secular life is to be carried on. The reason why a State has a right and a duty to maintain a public-school system is that it is the right and duty of the State to prepare its citizens for citizenship; and they cannot be prepared for citizenship without moral training, inspired by the spirit of reverence and love—that is, by a religious spirit. Settlement will not be reached by diminishing so-called religious exercises to a minimum,—as to a reading of the Bible, the recital of the Lord's Prayer, and the singing of a hymn,—the chief effect of which is to throw contempt on religion by teaching the children to think that they can do with very little of it. These so-called religious exercises are not teaching—they are worship; and it is not the function of the State to conduct worship, not even a very little worship, if objection is made by those who support or those who attend the school. Settlement will not be reached by contriving some simple theology which can be taught in the public school, on the theory that a theology can be found so broad and simple that agnostics, Jews, Protestants, and Roman Catholics will agree upon it. Theology is the philosophy of religion, and the philosophy of religion is not necessary to good citizenship. Few men of any sort will be found so narrow as to aver that there are not good citizens, and many of them, in other denominations than their own. Few agnostics of any sort can be found who will aver that good citizenship can be developed by educating the intellect, and leaving the selfish and animal propensities unregulated by the conscience and the will.

There is a strong movement to-day in the Roman Catholic Church in the United States in favor of the public-school system. The principle laid down in this article—that public education is a primary duty of the State—is laid down with great force by Father Bouquillon of the Roman Catholic Church in his famous but unfortunately inaccessible pamphlet, entitled "Education: To Whom does it Belong?"<sup>1</sup>

—a work of charity or of necessity: of charity, when they are not sufficiently taught by others who have that duty; of necessity, when they are badly taught—that is, taught in a sense opposed to supernatural truth and morality.—Father Bouquillon, "Education: To Whom does it Belong?"

and is implied in the propositions of Monsignor Satolli,<sup>1</sup> who speaks on this subject with the authority of the Vatican. The other principle, that moral if not religious training is necessary to any system of education worthy of the name, is enforced with characteristic vigor by Professor Huxley in his educational essays.<sup>2</sup>

These two utterances are typical of two movements in antagonistic schools — the hierarchical and the rationalistic — toward a common ground. That ground is that the State may and must furnish all the educational training necessary to constitute good citizenship, and that education in moral principles, and training in moral activities, inspired by a spirit of reverence and love under the sanction of a divine law and Lawgiver, are essential to good citizenship. The practical working out of this principle may be left to the future, for "where there 's a will there 's a way." But it must clearly include a public recognition of the fact

that the public school is a moral institution; that no one but persons of a profoundly moral nature have any right to appointment on the school boards or as school-teachers; that moral power is a first requisite of the school-teacher; and that her liberty to use her moral power in inculcating a spirit of reverence for law, and a spirit of service and self-sacrifice, must be not restrained, but encouraged.<sup>3</sup>

If these principles, or rather this fundamental principle, be recognized throughout the country, it will not be difficult by local experiments to find a method by which out of school hours, either in the school-rooms or in other adjoining rooms, distinctly catechetical, theoretical, and denominational instruction may be given, not by or under the public-school authorities, but by such adjustment with them that it shall not interfere with their work, nor lay a double burden on the pupils, too hard for them to bear.

*Lyman Abbott.*

<sup>1</sup> The Catholic Church in general, and especially the Holy See, far from condemning or treating with indifference the public schools, desires rather that, by the joint action of civil and ecclesiastical authorities, there should be public schools in every State, according as the circumstances of the people require, for the cultivation of the useful arts and natural sciences; but the Catholic Church shrinks from those features of public schools which are opposed to the truth of Christianity and to morality; and since, in the interests of society itself, these objectionable features are removable, therefore, not only the Bishops, but the citizens at large, should labor to remove them, in virtue of their own right, and in the cause of morality.—Father Satolli's "Propositions," p. 6.

<sup>2</sup> But the boys and girls for whose education the School Boards have to provide have not merely to discharge domestic duties, but each of them is a member of a social and political organization of great complexity, and has, in future life, to fit himself into that organization, or be crushed by it. To this end it is surely needful, not only that they should be made acquainted with the elementary laws of conduct, but that their affections should be trained, so as to love with all their hearts that conduct which tends to the attainment of the highest good for themselves and their fellow-men,

and to hate with all their hearts that opposite course of action which is fraught with evil.—"Science and Education," ch. 15, The School Boards, p. 393.

<sup>3</sup> A school is not made a Christian school by taking up a good deal of time in doctrinal instruction, or in devotional exercises, which would otherwise be spent in acquiring secular knowledge. Some time, indeed, must be given to these, and it ought to be, and can be, made the most instructive and beneficial part of the school hours; but that time need not be, and should not be, so long as to be wearisome to the pupils, or damaging to other studies. What above all make it a Christian school are the moral atmosphere, the general tone, the surrounding objects, the character of the teachers, the constant endeavor, the loving tact, the gentle skill, by which the light and the spirit of Christianity—its lessons for the head, for the heart, for the whole character—are made to pervade and animate the whole school life of the child, just as the good parent desires that they should animate his whole future life in all his manifold duties and relations as man and as citizen. This is the kind of school which a parent, anxious, as in duty bound, to give his child as thorough Christian training as possible, will naturally choose.—The Right Rev. John J. Keane, "Denominational Schools," p. 9.

## LOVE CONQUERS DEATH.

LOVE conquers Death by night and day,  
 L Beguiles him long of his destined prey;  
 And when, at last, that seems to perish  
 Which he hath striven still to cherish,  
 Love plucks the soul from the fallen clay.

Death is not master, but Love's slave.  
 He smites the timid and the brave;  
 Yet as he fares, with sweet low laughter,  
 Love, the sower, follows after,  
 Scattering seed in each new-made grave!

*Florence Earle Coates.*