

The copyright of this thesis vests in the author. No quotation from it or information derived from it is to be published without full acknowledgement of the source. The thesis is to be used for private study or non-commercial research purposes only.

Published by the University of Cape Town (UCT) in terms of the non-exclusive license granted to UCT by the author.

THE PLACE OF RELIGION IN EDUCATION
FROM THE STANDPOINT OF ROMAN CATHOLICISM.

By

Alfons Paul Prinz, M.A.

A THESIS

Submitted to the Faculty of Education,
University of Cape Town,
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Degree of Master of Education.

November, 1941.

The copyright of this thesis is held by the
University of Cape Town. Reproduction
of the whole or any part may be made for
study purposes only, and not for publication.

PREFACE.

This work has been written for two main reasons:-

(a) "Religion in Education" is a real problem which all educational authorities and teachers have to face.

Before the State took it upon itself to educate the children of the nation, the Church of Rome, and later the Protestant Churches also, gave both religious and secular education, the emphasis lying on the former.

Once the State had taken over control of education, the emphasis shifted to the latter. Gradually, religious and moral instruction, leading to a practice of Christian religion, were neglected until they were virtually omitted in many public schools. This tragic result was brought about by the combined influence which naturalism and the scientific method, applied to other than the fields of science, had exercised upon education since the days of the Renaissance-Reformation period.

Men everywhere are becoming aware of the powerlessness of modern education to produce Christians. Our children are no longer educated, in the sense attached to the word education in former times, but simply prepared for living in a secular sense. While some are quite contented and ask no more than this of education, others maintain that education should also include the culture of the soul.

(b) The Church of Rome has always maintained the religious principle in education. It has therefore a special right to speak on "Religion in Education".

The approach to the problem in this thesis is made from the Roman Catholic standpoint, and the fifth chapter is entirely devoted to Catholic Education, in order to illustrate that it is possible to combine the religious and the secular elements into one, viz. Christian education.

In the first two chapters the tripartite psychology of man, stipulating a body, a mind, and a soul, and the cultures corresponding to these parts of man, physical, mental, and spiritual, are dealt with. The next two chapters attempt to outline the present-day situation and to point out how this situation

was brought about. Having thus shown what should be done and what is actually being done to-day, I have then ventured, in the last three chapters, to make some positive suggestions as to what can be done, even when the environmental influences are by no means favourable.

I wish to express my gratitude to Professors W.F. Grant and A.H. Murray for the very valuable assistance they have given me in the compilation of the thesis.

University of Cape Town

CHAPTER 1.

Education: Physical, Intellectual, and Spiritaal.

University of Cape Town

Of the many living beings in this world there is none that offers more scope for study than man himself. He has always been the great mystery; and even to-day, when so much has been written and spoken about him, there still remain problems that are unsolved. The interest man has aroused is mainly due to the great complexity presented by his being as well as to the power he possesses of seeing himself in real and imaginary situations and of watching his reactions, impulsive and emotional, in contact with every other being. Now and then thinkers have discovered a unity in this complexity, but this again did not lead to a final comprehension: the mystery remained a mystery and the man-problem still awaits its solution.

The many investigations made into the nature of man have resulted in some definite findings; one of them is that his visible appearance has the shape of a functioning organism. This part is called the body of man. How this body appeared on earth, how it reached its present harmonious development, how long man has existed, these and other queries it is not the purpose of this thesis to answer or even to consider. In this work man will be dealt with as he is known to-day: that most popular and best known living being with its head, its body, its arms, its legs, and its other parts, all having the shape and doing those things that have been associated with them since the dawn of his history on this earth.

A very legitimate question concerning the existence of man may reasonably be asked at the very beginning of an examination of man's life. Why does he exist? In other words, does he fulfil a definite function in the evolution of the universe? It would seem that without him the trees and the tiny flower, the field-mouse and the eagle, the fish in the water and the swan swimming on the lake, would be able to live as contentedly as now; that the mountains would be strewn with boulders and covered with majestic pines, and the valleys would dress themselves in the same luxuriant verdure every

season of spring; that the gold and the coal in the earth, the diamonds in the river bed and the pearls at the bottom of the sea would, in their original homes, be as indifferently happy as in the hand and service of man. When considered in relation with all the other creatures of this world, man appears to be unable to offer any reason to justify his existence. But would it be wise, logical, and even permissible, to assume that man just happened to appear, by some fluke of circumstance, on earth? It seems more reasonable to believe that he must be part of a great scheme, of that scheme which the Maker of the universe evolved from all eternity. The whole creation would resemble some huge hobby, some purposeless object, which the Creator conceived and brought forth during His spare time. This, it must be admitted is just as incredible as the assumption that man serves no special purpose, unless one's conception of the Creator is a very twisted one.

It is the interpretation of this fact, that man is on earth for a special purpose, one of a higher order than that for which all other creatures were placed in the same world with him, that the great masses of men differ. Some keep their eyes on the fortunate position in which they find themselves, as lords of all that surrounds them; others raise their eyes above this world and maintain that such a marvellous being as man cannot find the culmination of his desires in the enjoyment of earthly goods. However, they all agree that this life must be lived and, since man is endowed with great powers, that it must be made worth while the living.

Because the material body of man is the means by which life functions and perpetuates itself and because the well-being of this body furthers the discharge of the life-functions, it has always been the concern of man to adapt it to its surroundings and train it for a specific mode of living.

Physical training, as this education of the body is called, was one of the most important means by which Plato wished to ensure the correct up-bringing of the citizens of the Republic. Boys and girls were to go through a school of strenuous physical

culture that would ensure to all a harmoniously developed body fit for the soldier's, the mother's and the philosopher's lives. But this was no new attractive feature of Plato's organised communal living; it was actually being done by all free Greeks, who saw in gymnastic a pleasant pass-time and pursued it as an end in itself, while Plato stressed it for its moral effects upon the soul as well as for its physical effects upon the body. As a result of this training the Greeks developed such grace of line, such ease in gait and bearing, that other people appeared as if uneducated and unmannered when in Greek society.

In imitation of the Ancients most of the later European nations have attached much importance to the cultivation of the body. Thus developed the motto: "Mens sana in corpore sano", as it was thought impossible to possess a good mind within a poorly formed body. At some periods specific physical culture has been the privilege of the aristocratic classes; they were the warriors of the nations and required strong and supple bodies. But some games and some exercises could never be taken away from the farmers and the middle classes. Running, swimming, jumping and horse-riding, have always been possible for some and, to-day, their training value is still recognised, although they have been superseded in popularity by the more social sports, such as football and hockey.

At no time during the last twenty centuries has physical culture played such an important role in the general scheme of education as to-day. In this field it may now-a-days be said that education is a lifelong process; for it is not only the boy and the girl at school who indulge in body development, but also the man and the woman of every age that "do their daily dozen". Everybody is ready to acknowledge the great educational values of physical culture. It is very important, nay, it is essential in every well balanced scheme of education.

However, this universally recognised importance of physical culture has not blinded the man of to-day to greater issues. He is living in an age of science applied in every

walk of life. It is therefore necessary for him to have a working knowledge of that apparatus and those devices that are part and parcel of his environment. The uneducated, the mentally undeveloped are just as much out of place in modern society as were the physically deformed in the ancient Greek communities.

Now, man has a highly developed intellect. He is normally able to speak, to write, to reason and to think. While the animal must adapt itself to its surroundings, man has the power to alter his environment and adapt it to his life. Deprived of this power he would probably have long ago ceased to exist, for he is less capable of resisting the inclemencies of nature than even the smallest animal. Man's survival must therefore be attributed to these powers which he alone possesses. They place him in a class apart and make him ever so much superior to the beast roaming the wastes of the earth.

These powers of man were formerly called the human mind. According to the then prevailing conception of the mind, this aspect of man was divided into compartments called faculties. To-day we still speak of the mind, although the faculty theory has long ago been abandoned. The controversy aroused by the term 'Mind' has been largely due to the too facile acceptance granted to the traditional meaning of the word. Philosophers and psychologists have interpreted the word in different ways; some have despaired of ever reaching a satisfactory understanding of the mind, and they have denied its existence altogether. Restraining from such a rash statement, for the mind is evidently something abstract and hence more difficult of understanding than the body, but at the same time avoiding too easy and one-sided an explanation of the mind, the term will here indicate that immaterial part of man which grows and matures, and which, to put it in simple words, enables man to have thoughts and express them by way of speech, to remember past experiences and recreate past situations, to consider a problem and offer a solution, in brief, to show a rational understanding toward himself and the surrounding universe.

The body of man undergoes a continuous process of growth, and mind grows with it. The new-born child does not bring with it ready-made, those powers of speech and reasoning which are the characteristic features of the mature human being. The fact concerning the mind which is of the greatest interest to the educator is its power to grow. The educator takes hold of the child as it comes to him and leads the mind from the concrete surroundings to the understanding of abstractions. In this process the child becomes capable of speech and of forming concepts and ideas, that is, of understanding things as much as anything can be understood. The child furthermore develops into a self-conscious personality, that is, it learns to understand itself in relation to other children, to its parents, as well as to the immediate environment in which it lives.

To achieve this has been one of the chief tasks of those whom the community has chosen and appointed to supervise and guide the maturation of the human mind. These men and women have used different methods to effect the one main and never to be exchanged objective of their vocation, viz: the introduction of the child into his social - and later, national - heritage, which is his by birthright. As far back as the dawn of civilisation, this endeavour of the adult community to bring their children up to the same mental level stretches in unbroken line. It is probably the finest trait of mankind. And the motive has not always been a selfish one, though at the beginning education was given for survival purposes. For, even in the centuries before Christ, but especially since the scholastic period, there have arisen in every country great educational establishments called schools, colleges, universities, which go far beyond providing the children of the people with a few facts indispensable for a life on strictly conventional lines. In them there is accomplished the noblest function which man, as man, can engage in: the cultivation of the mind. These institutions have kept before mankind the ideal which represents the triumph over the material world. By doing so these centres of learning have demonstrated that it is a far nobler thing to have a beautiful,

that is, an enlightened mind than a body enchained in slavish servitude to the passions and inclinations of the animal. And as long as man will remain faithful to the cultivation of his mind there is hope for better to come. Wars may be fought, but these do not stand for a capitulation of the mind to the forces of nature or the laws of the jungle. They seem to be an almost necessary outcome of man's misunderstanding and disregard of higher values, which are kept in abeyance by the greed of some and the lust for power of others. The working intelligence of the cultured will always, and in the end inevitably must, bring man to a saner attitude before the difficulties that necessarily arise in a world marked by such great contrasts as ours. Plato looked for his rulers among the philosophers, for they had understanding of true relationship between man and man, between man and the world, between man and God. Perhaps some day, men will revert to the execution of this idea and place the really cultured at their head. Perhaps; but who knows?

What has been said in the previous paragraphs is proof sufficient to show the real interest man has always taken in the development of other than purely bodily endowments.

To-day, education, in both its physical and mental aspects is more widespread and better cared for than ever before. Huge sums are spent annually on the salaries of teachers and on the erection and equipment of schools. If the results secured by this vast expenditure of wealth and human effort are satisfactory, the present educational system deserves to be maintained and developed. These results will be satisfactory if the boys and girls are able to take their place in society, fill the vacancies left by their seniors and carry on the process of continuous progress without which a community would disintegrate. They will be satisfactory if the children develop their personal traits and characteristics that is, if they become individuals while at school - and not stereo-typed products as if issuing from a machine - each one with his or her appreciation of the beauty that is in poetry, art, music and the great book

of nature. Finally, the results will be satisfactory if the young man and young woman, upon leaving High School or University, are able and willing to educate themselves along the best lines, for school education is but a guiding towards the great task of self-education throughout life.

The education of the body and the mind appears, then, as necessary, as indispensable and as justified by the ends which it purposes to reach. Nobody would deny this.

When studying the history of mankind, one is struck, no doubt, by the stress which has at all times been laid upon the education of the mind and body; one notices, however, a more striking fact still, namely, that man has in all times and in all lands recognised the existence of and made provision for a third aspect of the human being. The body of man appears as an undeniable something in the material world. The mind of man, whatever its origin and composition, becomes evident in the comparison between the human being and the mere animal. But man has done more than lead a corporal existence; he has done more than cultivate his intellect by expanding and re-integrating his perceptive patterns through varied contact with the surrounding world of facts and conjectures. Man has at all times set up values and has even looked beyond them for a Cause, an Origin of all things, a Supreme Being from whom all existence proceeds.

Whether we wish to acknowledge the necessity of setting up values or to deny it, is a matter open to personal interpretation. What cannot be denied is the fact that man has set up values and lived by them, that men have made heroic sacrifices and even given up their lives in their loyalty to an adopted cause. These values have ranged through the centuries from fidelity to a monarch to the fidelity to a chosen creed. Whatever their various names be, they can in a broad generalisation be termed appreciation of the beautiful. The beauty in the man and in the woman has created immortal lovers; the beauty in nature has made the poets and the painters; the beauty in the universe has made the scientist and the philosopher; and the

~~and~~ the beauty that is believed to lie beyond this universe has inspired the ascetic and the pure in mind with thoughts, words and aspirations that could not have been derived from a material world. This tendency to set up values appears to have been a feature of universal mankind: it is found in primitive communities as well as in our modern society. It seems to be a part of man to do this individually and socially.

By reason of his great range of powers man is able, not only to set up certain values, but also to grasp them and extend them to his brother. And it is to this special power of man that the great institutions of the church, the school and the hospital must be attributed. In them man is brought into contact with ultimate and temporal values, he is, so to say, forced into acknowledging their grandeur and finally is brought to cherish and to live by them. The first of these institutions, the Church, puts before man the religious view of man's existence on earth and of his relationship with God, Who, it maintains is the originator of real values, the background of reference without which they would lose all significance.

This teaching has divided mankind into two groups, one accepting it dogmatically and the other rejecting it categorically as not being part of their experience. The latter group have been called atheists, because they do not profess a belief in God, the Supreme Being that made this universe and from which proceed all forces which keep it in existence. It will not be attempted here either to expose the folly of such an attitude or to praise the reasonableness thereof, for that is the duty of the champions of the respective sides. In all fairness to the atheist it must be said that he does not condemn the values set up by man. He may even stress the necessity of their inculcation in the hearts of the young. What he denies is for most people the fact that these values have God for their source and that there is any God at all. If the atheist, leaving aside pride and prejudice, bigotry and animal passions, can in all honesty say in his heart: "There is no God!" let him live in that conviction. But may he never take out of the heart of

his fellow-man the belief in a God. For, there are many men who say: "For me God is necessary; for me He is a living, personal Being." Just as necessary and real, in fact, for a happy life as the bread they eat and the clothes they wear.

At the beginning of this chapter it was stated that the interest taken in man is mainly due to the great complexity evidenced by the composition and the functioning of his being as well as the many powers which he alone possesses. Up to this stage of the investigation the body and the mind have been briefly dealt with and the necessity and importance of their proper development have been pointed out. However, when all is said and done about these two aspects of the human being, it becomes evident that the man-problem has by no means been solved, that one side has not been touched yet and that this third aspect is the one in which the greatest interest has been shown throughout the centuries. This is the side of man which has prompted him to set up those values of which it was spoken above, and to look beyond them for a background of reference. It is that mysterious element in man which is forever restless and yearns for something lying outside this world. In fine, it is that force which has moved man in all times to acknowledge the existence of a God, and bow in reverence before His incomprehensible Being. Theologians have called it the soul of man. Now, whatever one's conception of God, it is, nevertheless, one of another order than ours. And just as in our material and mental world nothing can be conceived that has not the nature of the agents, so also could the conception of a God never have taken place as a result of bodily or mental operations. Later on it will be seen that God has revealed Himself directly to some men and peoples, but this did not happen universally. Therefore, the belief in a Supreme Being, where no such revelation had taken place, could not have proceeded from any operation but that of this third and most unfathomable aspect of man -- his soul.

The naturalistic philosopher finds it impossible to say when and how this soul was introduced into man. As it is evidently on this side that man is farthest removed from the mere animal, he feels it necessary to do something here so that certain of his

theories do not appear utterly untrustworthy and even ridiculous. Taking human evolution for a fact, he finds it extremely difficult to establish the exact period at which man became differentiated from the type immediately lower than he. Some theorists there are who maintain that the God-idea was introduced into man by his social environment. If, at the same time, they maintain that the God-idea emerged, after a process of evolution, simultaneously with what could be called the first social environment, they would, no doubt, appear foolish to the uninitiated, for this would amount to saying that a conception developed on a stage which is at least four levels below the one on which the embodiment of that conception is. But this point has already been dealt with in the preceding paragraph and need not detain us. The fallacy of the rather sweeping statement that the God-idea was introduced into man by his environment can further be brought out by this much sounder principle, namely, that it is man who reads a meaning into his environment. It would, then, appear more reasonable to believe that the first idea of a Being beyond this visible universe originated in man, through the agency of a force which is somehow connected with that same Being. This would, no doubt, be a confession in the belief of man's soul, but this belief would be quite rational. Those who profess this belief, state that the soul was introduced into man by a direct intervention on the part of the Maker of Heaven and earth. And it must be added that their belief is based on very good authority, as well as sound common sense. However, in this work it is not intended to examine the merits and demerits of respective schools in the fields of the history of mankind. For the purpose of this thesis it will be assumed that man has something more than a body and certain powers of thinking, loving, hating, and speaking. For the same ends it is advanced here that the third aspect of man, the God-idea, is not due to environmental influences, that, as a matter of fact, it forms part and parcel of every human being at its birth. To the environmentalists, those saying that the God-idea is implanted into man solely by his environment, it will be conceded that the environment plays an

important part in the proper development of this same idea. In fact, the main object of this work will be to point out the necessity of a favourable environment in the cultivation of the soul, and that a godless atmosphere kills the very idea of a God, no matter what efforts the teacher may make in the classroom to keep it alive.

When speaking of the body and the mind it was noticed that these two constituents of man are not left to chance development; they receive sustenance whereon they can thrive, increasing in strength and adaptability. The body is fed on material nourishment, because its essence is material, and it is trained by physical exercises. The mind is fed on mental nourishment, because its essence is abstract, and it is trained on mental exercises. Similarly the soul must be fed on nourishment corresponding in essence to its own, and it must be trained on exercises that are most likely to ensure its harmonious development. Material is added to material, the abstract to the abstract, if deficiencies are to be remedied, if growth is to result. This is the law of nature. When man intends to mend a cloth he puts a patch of the same material to it; to a broken chair he adds a new leg of the same material, and so on. The soul does not form an exception to this universal law. Its preservation in life is to be ensured in exactly the same manner. It was found previously that the soul is spiritual in nature. For this reason it cannot be fed on potatoes and wine, nor can we give it sustenance only through the acquiring of knowledge; and this, because the former is food for the body and the latter is food for the mind. In the latter case it is necessary to add that the mind, being but the outcome of the soul's activity on the body, cannot represent the whole soul; it may be a functioning of the soul, but it must not be taken for that. To develop the mind only would, therefore, be an action as foolish as that of the diamond cutter, who, wishing to make a perfectly octahedral jewel, cuts one big facet and polishes it, while leaving the rest of the rough stone untouched. He would be told that he possesses a precious stone indeed, but that its

whole potential beauty has not been brought out by the one facet; what is more, every man in his senses would categorically deny that he has an octahedral diamond. This simile presents but a weak illustration of the illogical procedure of all those who leave nothing undone to cultivate their mind - to say nothing of those who lavish all their love on the body - and give little care to the development of the soul. There remains still the question: "What food is suitable for the soul?" In order to remain logical in the development of this discussion, the answer must inevitably be that the soul is to be fed on spiritual food and trained on spiritual exercise.

Before speaking about this food and these exercises, it is well to stress the fact that they are of universal application; that is, once the right food and the right exercises have been determined they must be adhered to by every man in the cultivation of his soul, for the soul is the same in essence, whether it is in a yellow Mongol or in a Black African. Every man, then, being in possession of a soul, has the duty to see to its culture. Neglect would result in sickness and even death, just as the body will die without the proper food and the mind becomes weak without mental stimulants. Moreover, every man must take those means which alone are suitable for this particular kind of culture. He must, therefore, know what nourishment will increase and strengthen a being which is spiritual in essence; he must know what is understood by spiritual food and spiritual exercises. But, first, a popular misconception of 'spiritual food' must be discarded. This has come to mean anything from the expression of sympathy to the stuff found in novels, things that make the youthful heart miss a beat and things that bring consolation to the old man seated in his armchair. It must be well understood that nothing which is stained by the introduction of some human motive, be it ever so noble in the natural order, can become nourishment for a supernatural life. Superstition, the rash and unreasoned acceptance of a belief in certain powers attributed to material objects or events; spiritism, which, if at all genuine, is served up to foolish and morbid people as

well as to despairing souls for the thrill or the temporal benefit derived from contacting a soul of the other world; philosophy, with its entire dependence on the human mind; morality, having for object to regulate the intercourse between man and man, between man and society; worship, because of the human element in it; these and many other activities of body and mind cannot give life to the soul, and hence are but of secondary value in the culture of the soul. Some of them are directly detrimental to this culture, while some others again may be means whereby the correct nourishment can be obtained, but in themselves they are incapable of ensuring the preservation and development of the soul's life. And this for the simple reason that they are not essentially spiritual themselves. After the enumeration made above, it is evident that man has nothing at his disposal whereby he can originate spiritual life and thus lay the foundations of religious culture. God, however, could not possibly have endowed man with a soul and left him in such a helpless position as never to be able to awaken that soul to actual life, just as he raises himself from a state of mental lethargy to the heights where the light of reason reigns supreme. This would have been mockery, and we simply cannot imagine the All Holy and All Powerful having a quiet joke up in His Heaven at the expense of His masterpiece the human being. If man means anything at all to Him, which evidently is the case, He must bestow upon man the gift of supernatural life and a means to preserve and increase it. Christian theologians call this gift the grace of God. Grace, as explained in theology, is the special presence of God in the soul of man. This, however, will be treated more fully in the subsequent chapter under the heading of "The Christian and God".

The thesis to be defended in this chapter is that the culture of the soul is of more importance than the culture of the mind and body. To this end the nature of man has been examined and the following basic propositions emerge:-

(a) Man has a body, a mind and a soul; the soul is immortal.

(b) the body must be developed in a normal way that it may fulfil its own function and enable the mind to function normally;

(c) the mind must be cultured by mental exercises, because it is in this way that man becomes civilised, that is, differentiated from the beast;

(d) the soul is cultured by spiritual exercises. From considerations on the soul of man and what its presence means to him, namely, the independent working of the mind, it can be reasonably deduced that this third aspect of human nature can not only be neglected without grave danger, but is to receive the greatest share of the attention given to the development of the whole of man. The body and mind are after all of an ephemeral existence. They last the span of life and then cease to exist. This follows from the two facts that the body is made of perishable matter and that the mind simply does not exist where there is no body, since this material composition is the agent through which it manifests itself. After death there is nothing but pure consciousness, no thinking, no remembering, just one fixed present moment bringing eternally into the vision of the soul the one unchangeable state in which it is. Of the three aspects in human nature the soul alone exists by itself, once it has been called into being by its Maker; and, because of its spiritual nature, it can never come to an end, not being subjected to any of the laws of nature which govern the growth and end of everything that has matter for its basis of function in its constitution. For this reason the culture of the soul is an end in itself, while the cultures of the mind and the body are but means to achieve this end more easily and more perfectly. The culture of the soul alone is justifiable when placed in the universe of true values; the culture of the body and the mind pursued for no other end than the cultured body and the cultured mind, can receive no such justification. And this, because they work for non-essentials and often tend to disregard essentials, if they make man ignore the one everlasting element in his nature, namely, the soul.

Under one name or another, religious culture, as the culture of the soul may be called, has always been a main objective

in the deliberate attempt made by man to educate the rising generation. Among primitive tribes all male children pass through a period of initiation and during this time they are introduced into the treasured inheritance of the group. This unchanging patrimony handed down from generation to generation includes, among other things, formulae of incantation used at the great ceremonial gatherings for worshipping the local deities. The boys also learn how to placate offended spirits and how to show respect to everything sacred so that the protection of the unseen world may rest upon them in all their enterprises. The whole process of initiation is intended to make the boy a good member of the tribe and by 'good' is implied, not only a crafty huntsman or hardy warrior, but especially one who will in all ways observe the conventional relations between the spirits and the tribe. And this is the religious culture of the primitive: an unquestioning acceptance of the creed of his fathers, participation in ceremonial dances and public worship, and, in most cases, fear of the Unknown. Not very much, it must be admitted, but as much as can be expected from an uncivilised man. He is a creature just above the beast in craft and artifice, of a small intellect that will not pry into the mysteries of life and death, soul and God, but accept without reservation everything the wise men of the clan confide to him. It will be noticed, also, that the initiation is held not so much for the individual as for the tribal community; it is the welfare and preservation of the latter that count; the individual being nothing, he is readily sacrificed to the interests of the group. Surrounded by strict conservatism and an overwhelmingly strong public opinion, the savage has little chance of ever living as an individual, that is, of using his reasoning powers to arrive at an understanding of the higher values, better morals and a more correct relationship with God.

It is when man is allowed free development. when he may live an individual instead of a herd life, that civilisation advances. In company with others, the individual seems to be bereft of his own free will, following in all what may be termed a group mind. Left to himself, he begins to think and be dissatisfied,

to speculate and calculate, to query and solve. Then, also, does he theorise on the nature of man and wonder what will happen to that something within him after death. In the course of time a whole religious system develops thus from the cogitations and findings of a few thinkers. Due to the various interpretations given of certain natural phenomena, due to the climate and productiveness of the land, and especially due to the singular differences in opinion which the human mind can form on the same point, great diversity is to be found in the various religious systems of the ancient peoples. There are certain fundamental similarities, such as the basic element of a belief on a god or gods, but, on the whole, they are characterised by great differences, that tend to indicate an independent origin in many parts of the world, and not a religious evolution from a primal system. It is a question here of the religion of more civilised nations, for with the savage, as has been seen there can be no question of anything very elaborate in the way of a religious system. However, it is not the purpose of the present work to prove the existence of religion among the peoples in the pre-Christian era, but, taking this for a universally accepted fact, to show in what way and by what means the culture of the soul was supposedly carried on. Among the civilised pagan nations of antiquity, particularly with those of Greece, there prevailed a religious system called pantheism. The pantheists do not distinguish between the gods and the material world. Everything that exists is part and parcel of the all pervading divinity, which continually informs all material beings. For this reason there were sacred birds, sacred geese, sacred cows, sacred trees, sacred this and sacred that, which received special veneration from the members of the particular religious belief. In many instances, by worship or by direct contact with one sacred object, either by burning, eating or merely touching it, the individual was able to acquire merits and obtain forgiveness of some crime which he had perpetrated. The latter fact, which is attested by the washing in a sacred river and the burdening of a scape-goat with the people's sins, clearly shows the underlying belief in the life of the soul and that it must be regained, when it has been lost through

disobedience to the laws, otherwise it might not be received in the heavenly abode of the forefathers. During the time of his education at the mother's knees or by the preceptor's side, the child heard about the deeds of the gods and the heroes, learnt how to pray to them and how to offer up sacrifice. Soon he would take part in the public acts of worship and later still have his own shrine at which, as the head of the family, he must placate the gods and intercede for those dear to him.

The Christian may be inclined to condemn these religions of antiquity in an off-hand manner for their cruelty - in some, human sacrifices were offered - or for their superstitious beliefs; he must admit, however, that there was much piety and earnestness in many pagan worshippers. Fanaticism, in any case, misdirected proselytism, useless disputes and dissensions, the glorious ap- an- age of some Christian sects, were almost completely absent. These religions formed the best solutions which humanity could present to the individual, that he might rest assured that the yearning he felt inside him would one day be stilled.

Some great minds, there were who abandoned the cruder religious practices and the unreasoned beliefs in many evidently contradictory teachings. These were the philosophers who, having thought much and raised themselves above public opinion, saw everything in a new light. Endowed with almost superhuman mental power, they reasoned their way out of the morass of fallacious doctrines, through the thorny ground of petty controversy, over the barren fields of unbelief and arrived finally, by the efforts of reason alone, on those heights where the human eye can scarcely see them, so dazzling is the light that surrounds them. Some of them, like Plato, believed in one God and came very near to that conception which Christian philosophy has formed of the relationship between this world and the Creator. These men, then, had the most perfect religion before the advent of Christianity - with the exception of the Jews, to whom a direct revelation had been made.- It's name is Natural Religion. This also will be treated more fully in the following chapter.

From a secularist standpoint it would seem, then, that religion's culture was far advanced among some nations long before

Christ appeared on earth. The Christian theologian, however, does not speak of a life in the soul of a pagan - and here again there may be some exceptions - and, because of this, he maintains that religious culture, when this means the development of the spiritual life within man, has become universally possible only since the advent of Christianity. The pagan, no doubt, has a soul and, by its presence, it enables him to reason about the laws of nature and theorise on the possibility of a future life, but that soul never is alive as it is in the Christian. For the human soul, as it has been said already, cannot be brought to life by the efforts of man alone, because it eludes both the mind and the body. It was also stated that the soul can be called into life by God alone, who made it and has therefore controlling power over it. Notwithstanding the splendid efforts and the marvellous progress made by the pagan in the religious field, it is yet impossible to speak of religious culture in his case. At the best, religion had become a philosophy and hence subject to the limitations of the human mind. The fact that these venerable philosophers spent their lives in the vain endeavour to arrive at the vision of the Supreme God and that even after death they may not have been admitted to it, due to the state of their soul, casts a gloomy veil over all the splendid achievements of those grand ages, when the great minds were noble and honest in their wrestling with the unseen world.

Christianity, then, brought into this world the correct attitude to be adopted before the Almighty. Christians all believe in Him. They question neither His existence nor His powers. But they do differ in many essentials as well as non-essentials of that vast programme called Christian Religion. One of the differences arises over the question of spiritual food, spiritual exercises, that is, over the question of how the life of the soul is to be maintained and strengthened. There have been many splits in the Christian body; there have been many heresies: when people thought it necessary to re-arrange a divine institution, to improve on the divine plan. Usually these separating bodies adhered to some fundamental beliefs, which would have been sufficient to save their souls' lives. To-day, however, there is one heresy which is

CHAPTER 2.

THE FOUNDATIONS OF RELIGIOUS CULTURE.

University of Cape Town

followed out in all their extent, it provides a secure foundation to Christian Society, giving a sense of security to the property holder, hope and contentment to the working man, and authority to the Government. But Christianity is not primarily meant to do this or to support an economic system; it is not an agent helping some men to enrich themselves and others to bear patiently with the lot of bare sufficiency that has befallen them. What, is more, the religion of Christ has not for its essential role the support of one particular culture, or the advocacy of one particular school of morals except in a secondary sense. This used to be quite evident to pre-Reformation men, but since those days the true nature of Christianity has been lost sight of by many, who are inclined to judge it according to the temporal advantage it has bestowed upon humanity in general, rather than by the true test of its internal function. In this particular case, religion and morality are inextricably interwoven, but this is more of a coincidence and need not necessarily be so. Christianity, let it be repeated, is before all else a religion.

And what is religion? From a consideration of its true nature it becomes evident that religion is a means whereby man establishes union with God. For this reason man is sometimes called a religious animal: of all living creatures he alone feels the need for companionship with a higher being. Many men possess a ready-made solution for the problem of finding some way of getting into touch with this being called God; they inherit it from the society into which they are born, along with a particular religious creed. Whether they are right or wrong never worries them, relying implicitly as they do on the wisdom of their ancestors. But there are other men who show real, active interest in the problem: these are either ^{the} anxious souls that fear they are treading a wrong path, or the strong and fervent ones that wish to get constantly nearer their ideal, instead of just passively accepting its existence. The fact, then, is that a real problem exists for that mass of men who believe in a supernatural order of things and who associate with that belief a number of ideas on the existence of God and other

followed out in all their extent, it provides a secure foundation to Christian Society, giving a sense of security to the property holder, hope and contentment to the working man, and authority to the Government. But Christianity is not primarily meant to do this or to support an economic system; it is not an agent helping some men to enrich themselves and others to bear patiently with the lot of bare sufficiency that has befallen them. What, is more, the religion of Christ has not for its essential role the support of one particular culture, or the advocacy of one particular school of morals except in a secondary sense. This used to be quite evident to pre-Reformation men, but since those days the true nature of Christianity has been lost sight of by many, who are inclined to judge it according to the temporal advantage it has bestowed upon humanity in general, rather than by the true test of its internal function. In this particular case, religion and morality are inextricably interwoven, but this is more of a coincidence and need not necessarily be so. Christianity, let it be repeated, is before all else a religion.

And what is religion? From a consideration of its true nature it becomes evident that religion is a means whereby man establishes union with God. For this reason man is sometimes called a religious animal; of all living creatures he alone feels the need for companionship with a higher being. Many men possess a ready-made solution for the problem of finding some way of getting into touch with this being called God; they inherit it from the society into which they are born, along with a particular religious creed. Whether they are right or wrong never worries them, relying implicitly as they do on the wisdom of their ancestors. But there are other men who show real, active interest in the problem: these are either ^{the} anxious souls that fear they are treading a wrong path, or the strong and fervent ones that wish to get constantly nearer their ideal, instead of just passively accepting its existence. The fact, then, is that a real problem exists for that mass of men who believe in a supernatural order of things and who associate with that belief a number of ideas on the existence of God and other

superior beings on the origin and destiny of men, and on the best way of living the life here on earth that they may be accounted worthy of an eternal reward in the hereafter. The Egyptians, the ancient Greeks, the old Romans and almost all the peoples of antiquity, cherished the fond hope that one day they would be reunited with those that had preceded them to the abode of the Gods. In the world there have always been men who do not concern themselves with these questions of God and Eternity. They are of two types: Those who, by debasing their human nature in following slavishly the call of the lower instincts, have lost contact with the things of the spirit and in some respects are similar to the beasts that live in the forests; and those who, depending entirely on the civilisation into which they came by birth, never give a thought to the origin and the causes of the culture which has become the common patrimony of every human being.

The two essential elements of religion, then, are a system of doctrine which solves all the problems connected with the spiritual world, and grounded upon this doctrine, a practical discipline establishing and regulating the relations between man and God, between man and the temporal powers by which his life is ruled. Religion then is to be distinguished, on the one hand, from superstition, which lends a facile ear to any fantastic doctrine concerning matters spiritual, and, on the other, from philosophy which tends to solve these problems by relying on human reason alone, while it is upon the solid basis of tradition and revelation that religion presses its claims upon us. What we must understand about religion is that its essential function does not consist in teaching men how to behave in their relations with each other, or even in pointing out the way to human happiness, but rather in establishing true relations between themselves and God. These relations are expressed in a concrete and visible manner in worship, by which act man is brought into touch with the unseen. And, because all religion is based on the belief that in the unseen world there are superior beings, it follows that worship will naturally and primarily express itself in acts of homage.

Just as man renders homage to the great of this world, so also does he honour the superior beings whom he knows to exist in another world. In fact, the two tendencies arise from the same fundamental source in the human mind, namely, the conviction that there must of necessity be relationships between man and man, between man and God, and that these relationships must be governed by definite rules, so that every sentiment of respect, veneration, love and gratitude may be properly expressed. Thus it has come about that most forms of worship include a ritual of prescribed ceremonial actions and fixed formulae of expression. Whether this be the cutting of the mistletoe with a silver sickle the evening of the new moon, the bowing towards Mecca, the slaying of a young maiden at sunset, the burning of a lamb, or the saying of Holy Mass, it does not matter here; the undeniable fact is that man has insisted and still insists, on definite forms of worship. But it is not the particular form of ritual or the beauty of the priest's incantations that must bring man to one type of religion; How many men attend spiritualist seances but for the 'thrill' which they derive from the proceedings? It is rather the fact whether that religion is true to the very nature of religion; to establish a relationship between God and Man.

The one conclusion to which these considerations lead, is that the real test as to whether a religion is true, is not its usefulness to Society or the soundness of its morals. These are but of secondary importance. It goes without saying that the true religion must of necessity be of service to mankind, must advocate a high system of morality and a lofty code of ethics; but material utility and social value are not the true end of religion. The only question to be asked with regard to the claims of any particular religion to be true is; does it bring man into a right relationship with God? This is all, really. Other aspects of that religion may be of interest to the onlooker, may provoke discussion or may even attract outsiders, but to those within all these things are of little importance. They cherish the conviction that they are in correct relationship with God and thus they have obtained from their religion

all that they have any right to ask.

Does Christianity answer the questions which every man may reasonably ask the religion that claims to be the true one? An impartial examination of its doctrine and of its functioning aspect, having stood the scrutiny of twenty centuries of human intelligence, both call out an emphatically positive reply. The true Christian shows that his religion is achieving the desired results, when he asks himself in every day life; "How will this effect eternity?" and then acts accordingly. Thus he shows that the purpose of his being on earth, namely, to prepare for an eternal union with God and His angels, is constantly before his eyes. The Divine Founder of Christianity recommended His disciples and the world at large; "Seek ye first the Kingdom of Heaven", Things necessary for the sustenance of life would be added unto them. And to the cowardly Pilate, he said: "My Kingdom is not of this world". Christ's Kingdom is not of this world, and His religion in function unites men with that other world where He reigns. This is the message He brought to a disillusioned world; occasional references to respect for law and temporal authorities He made but in reply to those who tempted Him. He was not concerned with the material aspects of this life; asking His Apostles to abandon everything they possessed, and to the man who asked Him^{to} settle a difference between himself and his brother He said; "Man, who hath appointed Me judge or divider over you?" His mission was to proclaim the new religion of love and childlike trust in God's mercy and bounty in place of the "tooth for a tooth" religion of the Israelites. Jesus offered no political freedom to the Jews, nor did He put His signature to an economic system; He did not pose as the drastic reformer of the morals of a sunken world; He did not put forward a startling new educational theory. And to-day, He is considered as perfect model of the wise reformer and true educationist, simply because He is high above all great men of history. This, because He set up a new relationship between man and God, giving man a correct outlook on on this life, giving him a true religion; all else was subordinate to this primary purpose. All His teachings of perfection through self-denial, sacrifice and boundless love, are the conditions

whereby man would come in closer contact with God. The Jews used to worship God from a distance; they did not venture themselves into the presence of the Holy One, but sent Moses or the High Priest to intercede for them. Jesus Christ abolished this religion of fear and in its stead He placed His own divine religion, which allows and even invites man to speak to God directly. "Come to me all ye that are burdened", "Follow me". Thus He made the love of God become effective in man's soul. And the good Christian can abandon himself completely to his religion; he need not worry whether his relationship with God is right, for he knows this for a certainty. By imitating the life of Jesus, who is God and man, perfect yet imitable, he will achieve a union with the Divine, which nothing outside religion can parallel, for who can stand closer to God than God Himself in the Person of Jesus Christ?

If Christian religion is to be properly understood it must before all be approached on a supernatural level. Discard every temporal benefit it has brought in its wake, forget the ethics of the pagan jungle which it has replaced by its own ethical code, remember no more the relationship it has created between man and man, between man and society, but examine it in its *raison d'être* and realize how wonderfully true it is to its nature! Then it will be understood that Christianity is the true religion, offering every man an infallible means to make contact with God, and a set of rules that organise and control the act of worship whereby this contact is established. Certainly, for apologetic purposes to defend their point of view against outsiders, Christians may call attention to the beneficent influence of religion and the Church. Faithful to the example of their Divine Master, they will interest themselves in the fate of their fellow men and do them all the good they can. But it remains true that the one essential thing is to secure that relationship with Almighty God, which is in accordance with the Divine Will. The Christian religion is, above all, an interchange of divine love between the Creator — "For God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son" — and the creature called man, the handiwork of God's love. "If you have not

love, all things are vain".

In conclusion we may turn to a consideration of two extremes. Christianity is essentially a religion of the middle way. "In medio stat virtus" is an old saying, one that can, with truth, be applied to the teaching of the Church concerning man's union with God. There have been, and there always will be, those who care for nothing but the material side of this life; the unbeliever who does not wish to know of the existence of God, and the egotist who treasures nothing but the actual enjoyment gained from the satisfaction of his primitive nature. These are condemned by the Church and by Jesus Christ, Who had no place where to rest His head, and Who recommended the rich youth to give all his possessions to the poor that he might be perfect. In direct contrast with the materialist is the man who wishes to seclude himself entirely from all intercourse with the world, to bring his body under the control of his higher nature by fast, prayer, vigil and rigorous discipline in order to live and die in union with God. Because of the element of selfishness in this state and the dangers inherent in a life of seclusion, the Church has brought these men back to a more normal life by making them live in monasteries, in which there is at least a certain amount of contact with other men and subjection to the authority of the Superior. In order to live a life of union with God, it is not necessary to sever all the ties that bind man to the world. Christianity is for the masses as well as for the individual; it concerns itself with the present life, with social welfare, with government, and with almost everything that appertains to men's relationships with each other, although it is but for the sake of God.

THE CHRISTIAN AND LIFE.

Life is a mystery. It can be observed in its effects upon the body, produced either by its presence or by its absence. Life enables both the animal and the human being to move and the latter to think. Much has been said about it. Many are the theories which men have advanced on the nature of life, the best kind of life, the purpose of life, and so on. Being evidently of tremendous significance, life is of

special interest to the Christian, much more so than to the pagan. The Christian, moreover, gives the whole question a much more complex appearance by his firm belief in the continuation of life after death. He distinguishes between that life which is common to man and animal, and the life of the human soul. This is a novel feature and lends more interest to the whole subject of Life. The life of the body is but a means of fostering and developing the other life, that of the soul; the one is of little importance to him when confronted with the supreme value of the other.

The Christian life, taken in its entirety, is the life of the love of Jesus Christ, passed on to men and transforming their natural lives. It is called supernatural life, or the life of God's grace in the soul of man. From this very fact it must be concluded that the Christian Life essentially belongs to the unseen world and that it has its origin, its growth and its final function in God. The Student of religion is made aware of the existence of this spiritual life, when he reads of Nicodemus, a man who came to Jesus by night for fear of the Jews. To him it was said; "Unless a man be born^d again, he cannot ~~enter~~ the Kingdom of God". Now, to be born means to come to life, and, to be born again must necessarily mean to come to a second life. A second life, not only after death, but even in this world, while the body is still animated by natural life.

Human life is engendered by the act of conception; we are all aware of the fact that the fecundation of the ovum is ^{the} necessary factor in process of perpetuating human life. Divine life, the life of the soul, is caused through the infusion of God's grace into man. It is a gift of God which, in his mercy, He presents to fallen mankind in order to save the souls He has created. Furthermore, the exact moment of this life's inception can be given with certainty; it is the moment when the cleansing waters of Baptism flow over the head of the person that is being received into the Church of God,

the mystical body of which Jesus Christ is the head. Since Christian life is called into existence by the coming of God's grace into the soul of man, it is necessary to explain what is meant by this invisible agent. Grace can be defined as the presence of God in the soul of man, a presence not to be ascribed to God's attribute of being everywhere, but to a deliberate intention on His part of wishing to be there. He is not thus present in the soul of every man, but only with him who, having been baptised, lives according to His law.

By this divine action man is brought into identity with God's nature, * without, however, ceasing to be his natural self. This transformation worked in every man who possesses grace is a reality of the supernatural order, and, therefore, it does not change his exterior appearance.

* Without interfering with man's natural existence, grace transforms, nevertheless, his very life and gives a super-natural value to all his actions. This, then, is the effect of the Christian life on man; it raises him and all his actions to a supernatural level. Eating, drinking, working, amusing himself just as the unbeliever does, the Christian who has the grace of God in his soul is, nevertheless, separated from him by a gulf so wide that no amount of natural goodness can span it. St. Paul expresses this idea when he says; "I live now, not I, but Christ liveth in me". Christ is God; therefore every one of His thoughts, words and actions must be divine; so also every thought, word and action of the Christian has a supernatural value due to the presence of Christ in his soul. This is no mere fictitious statement, nor is it the dogmatic teaching of an arbitrary authority, it is nothing but the teaching of Christ, and this, it must be admitted, is good authority, for He says; "If any one keeps my word, my Father and I will come into him."

From an examination of their modes of living no apparent difference can be traced in the lives of the Christian and the pagan, who by the efforts of reason alone has reached what was called natural religion and obeys its dictates. As a matter of fact, there is nothing from a secular point of view, to distinguish between them in the universe of natural goodness. The two may be pursuing honourable callings in life and that with equal degrees of success; they may take part in

the same lawful enjoyments; they may both be examples of kind, dutiful, respectful citizens, as it behoves good men to be. It is further true that both may find it difficult to be honest and true to their convictions on all occasions; they are tempted by the same world to abandon the pursuit of their ideal and both pass through many difficulties and afflictions before reaching it. The fundamental difference lies in the two motives urging them to the acceptance of the necessity of such a life. The pagan, the unbeliever, the naturally good man toils and suffers for the attainment of a natural ideal; the perfect man as he sees him. Belonging to the sphere of natural objectives this ideal must of necessity be imperfect, for perfection is not of this world. It is further rendered very vague and thus deprived of a universal character by the very fact that the perfect human being assumes different proportions in the estimation of every individual. What one calls good, another will qualify indifferent or evil. From a purely philosophical point of view it is very difficult, if not impossible, to say what thing is intrinsically good, what is the absolute good; speech fails, even when the philosopher seems to secure a glimpse of it when the clouds that surround man's intellect appear to disperse momentarily. The various theories, too, postulated by men, tend to support the statement that the form of the good is elusive and cannot be arrested by the efforts of reason alone. In this matter no man can by himself be authority for anybody else, for the simple reason that no two men are related to the surrounding world in exactly the same manner. It seems, therefore, obvious that man must ultimately rely on an authority, if such authority there be, that lies outside this world, and to accept that ideal of life established by this authority as superior to the one he has moulded himself.

While the unbeliever is striving after a very unstable ideal, endeavouring to achieve something he is unable to define beforehand, the Christian bases his life on reasonable faith. The former is like the builder who has to erect a construction and does not know of any plan concerning the size, shape and internal arrangements of the edifice to be. The latter is the Architect-builder who has plans and

material ready before undertaking the enterprise. With divine grace in his soul he works for God and pursues the ideal which was put before him in the person of Jesus Christ. This is the higher ideal: it is divine in essence, implying nothing less than divine perfection;

there is no trace of egoism in its pursuit, because this is done entirely for the sake of procuring God's glory. Like every human being the Christian is continually harassed by the appeal of the senses; he is subjected to the evils of the flesh which tend to drag him down and exhaust him; even with the assistance of God's grace, his life is still wearisome and difficult. But he knows that God had not placed him into this world to be gently framed by the passing breeze, but to work hard at a perfection which, humanly speaking, lies beyond his power to attain. His endeavour is perpetually being renewed in enthusiasm by the word of Christ, "Be ye perfect."

In the eyes of the Christian this life, then, is, above all, a means of striving after heavenly perfection. Whatever he does has a twofold purpose and a twofold value: one natural and the other supernatural. Leading in all appearance a perfectly natural life, the Christian yet lives on that level which most philosophers have consumed themselves in vain efforts to reach by the efforts of reason alone. Relying for guidance on the Gospel and not on the cogitations of materialist philosophers, he finds in those writings an irresistible call to a divine life, to the quest after the glory of a life transformed by divine grace. Whenever Jesus spoke of the sojourn of man on earth, he made such definite statements as to leave no doubt in the minds of His hearers as to the kind of life He wanted them to lead. And from what He said it can be deduced that the Christian life is no easy matter, but that it is a wandering along a narrow path strewn with thorns and beset with many difficulties. "If any man will follow me, let him deny himself and take up his cross." Not once in a while is the Christian expected to astound the world by some heroic deed, but his must be the unflagging heroism that is as great in little things as in bigger ones. Yet, this yoke imposed upon him by his religion is sweet and the burden of Christ is light, when he feeds his soul constantly at that table where spiritual food is given to the just. Man must deny himself

many things if he is to walk in the footsteps of his Divine Master. Yea, even his life must be accounted for little in the pursuit of the Christian ideal. "For whosoever will save his life shall lose it; and whosoever shall lose his life for My sake and the gospel shall save it." Nor can this offering up of one's life be a timorous surrender to which the Christian finds himself willy-nilly compelled by the consequences of not conforming. He neither speculates on the bare minimum performance required for salvation nor on the maximum indulgence he can allow himself without jeopardising it; he simply does not gamble on this very uncertain proposition that needs very much elucidation. If the Christian is really in earnest, if he will throw himself whole-heartedly into the work of achieving in his soul the likeness of God as he finds it outlined in the gospel, his endeavour must be all enthusiasm, beauty, self-surrender, idealism and love. He must not be the calculating and selfish type who wants to eat his cake and have it; nothing is too big for him, for Christ requires of every man that he give himself to that life without reserve.

Jesus presented the world with God's love and thus He gave men the one great means of achieving the closest relationship with God possible. Without His aid it would be folly to contemplate the possibility of this union between the natural and the divine. Christ was the first and only person to possess two natures. He was the Son of God and the son of man, and in Him the two apparently incongruous elements were harmonised perfectly. His was a union no other man will achieve. This, however, seems to be the very nature of every ideal, that it be unattainable in its fullest conception; but no man has ever allowed this fact to deter him from the pursuit of his ideal. For the same reason does the Christian give his all, once he has heeded the call of Christ inviting him to perfection. By this perfection is meant a continual striving to increase the grace of God in the soul. Thus, there can be no question of a divided allegiance in his life. He cannot try to serve two masters; God and the world. There is a strange god whom many worship enthusiastically, but the Christian

puts aside his facile code of ethics and his false morality; he does not subscribe to the heresy that places the body with its capacity for carnal enjoyment above the living God. All that he is, does and thinks, he gives to Jesus Christ in a spirit of total surrender, for such is the spirit of the gospel.

The morality of the Christian does not consist in the avoidance of evil alone. He does not say; "I harm no man; what else can you expect of me?" Those who speak in this strain seem to indicate that there is something more which God has the right to expect of them. ~~What they mean to say is that they don't murder to expect of them.~~ What they mean to say is that they don't murder and steal and that what they do in their private lives is of no concern to anybody and of no importance to God. The commandments were given to the Jews in the Old Testament, a religion of fear and strict justice. But the Christian cannot be satisfied with their bare observance, he who belongs to a religion of love and mercy. Christian morality as outlined in the inspired writings stands on a much higher level than the morality of the Jews. It is a fact, noticed by all students of comparative religion, that the prevailing religion always gives its tone and colour to the morals of its adherents. Now, the distinguishing characteristics of Christianity are to be found in the new commandments, those which Jesus gave us, if we are to be perfect. "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heartand thy neighbour as thyself." These are noble words indeed, and far in advance of the "Thou shalt not steal" type of commandment promulgated on Mt. Sinai. And this is precisely the reason why the religion of Christ leads to perfection more certainly and more quickly than the Law and the Prophets. In the spirit of Christ's commandments the Christian considers himself and God first, for his salvation is the important thing; then he turns to his neighbour with the same love and helps him also to achieve union with the God in Whom he believes. Where he sees good he gives praise, and where he meets with evil, he does not condemn; he does not stone the woman taken in adultery, nor the man that gathers wood on the Sabbath day. After the example of Christ he

feels sorry for the weak person, but far be it from him to judge. Charity, then, is the mark whereby we recognise Christian morality; love of God and love of every human being. Under this cloak the Christian covers the multitude of weaknesses which he notices in his brethren, and he tries to see in them potential images of God, other Christs. Jesus had hard words for one type of person; the one of deliberate blindness who exalts himself and condemns his brother. The publican, the poor sinner, is the object of God's mercy and forgiveness; the pharisee in his self righteousness receives nothing but scorn and condemnation. Every man, no doubt is the keeper of his brother, but no one is his judge. To be christianly moral, then, is to love God with all one's heart and for His sake, and man equally for God's sake. This is the moral-religious ideal which the Christian must pursue all his life, for, as has been said previously, in this case morality and religion are inseparably entwined.

Having considered the origin and development of the supernatural life, in the soul of the Christian and ^{the} effects which its presence has upon the material life of the body, there remains nothing but to examine the position of the Christian in the world of to-day, to see whether the whole atmosphere of thought and practice is favourable to the attainment of his ideal or not, and to gauge the effect of a Christian life upon the society in which it is lived.

The Christian of to-day finds himself in that peculiar position of almost being a stranger in his own homeland. He has been at home all the time, no doubt, but the others have wandered and strayed in foreign lands, and now he is either wilfully ignored or playfully ridiculed by them. For Christianity is to-day somewhat different from what it used to be, at least what has now come to be accepted as Christianity by many. The religion of Christ has been re-edited many times and the final impression bears little resemblance to the original. Having speculated on the origin, the content and veracity of Christianity, modern society has at last reached the stage where it takes that interest in Christ's religion

which the antiquarian shows towards a rare object, on account mainly of its power of survival. Large masses of people are interested in Christianity, but this does not mean that they show a personal concern. It is a problem offering endless possibilities of personal interpretation and hence it is regarded as just a good exercise for the mind as the cross-word puzzle and the "Test your knowledge" corner in the week-end newspaper. Men of every degree of standing and of every shade of belief are asked to express their opinions on Christian doctrine and teaching. They will write on "The reality of Hell", "Christ in our Days", "Does God exist?" and such like topics with the facility of a reporter describing a football match, without any regard being paid to Christian tradition, Christian feelings and beliefs. It is in this way that Christianity has become obscure, contradictory and even meaningless to the average man of the street whose library consists mostly of the daily paper.

No wonder, then, that the upright Christian is bewildered and feels a stranger in his own house. For Europe is the home of Christianity, European civilisation is Christian civilisation, and European religion is Christian religion...on paper, at least. In the midst of this devastating flood of free thinking in matters religious, of ridicule poured upon true religion, of twisting and re-arranging the original to suit one's personal feelings and inclination, he must find it very difficult to avoid being dragged down. The thoughts of other people concerning matters in which one is interested too can, however, be disregarded; one need not bother about them, one need attach no significance to them, if they do not agree with one's own. This is what the informed Christian does as a rule. The real danger to his religion is to be found in the actions of those who do not live up to Christian standards. Actions are either moral or immoral. Christian religion implies a morality based on the actions and teachings of Christ Himself. For centuries this was clear to every Christian. But to-day, morality has been severed from religion and, just as religion, it has been made into a convenience. The Christian in modern society sees everywhere a facile code of ethics and a morality which is immoral

in its hypocrisy and self-deceit. The very foundations of all Christian institutions are being shaken by such practices as birth-control, prostitution and divorce, which are either legalised or tacitly agreed to by the State.

Among intellectuals it is often said that the Sermon on the Mount is a very fine ethical code. They pay lip-service to the Christian life as set forth in the Beatitudes, but in their own lives they do not exhibit the reality of these beliefs. So long as morality was based on the teachings of the New Testament, it was stable. For the Christian, it may be said, that a stable morality is based on Christ's teachings. This is a diametrically opposed view to that taken by the pragmatist for whom morality is relative to social needs. As social needs change, the pragmatist stated the moral code will be modified. To the Christian with his unchanging standards of christian morality the changes which are advocated by the pragmatists can only be regarded as expressions of human instability, unassisted by the teachings of the Christian code.

This modern atmosphere of thought and practice cannot be called a favourable one, in which the ideal of a Christian life is to be pursued. The Christian hears, reads and sees much that is exactly the opposite of his idea of a good life. The appeal of modern ethics, morality and religion must be tremendous. It is not astonishing, then, that many souls follow the world instead of their conscience. The fault lies probably not so much with them as with a faulty educational system which fails to provide for a correct religious training during those years when the human heart is easily turned one way or another. Defections may be explained by many reasons. The astonishing thing is that many Christians should remain true to their convictions and loyal to their practices of religion, for all his life long the honest Christian has to perform the feat of seeing light in a world of spiritual darkness. Many people no longer believe that there are men who are true to their religion in its entirety; what is more, they are quite honest in this belief. It is strange, indeed, that people can be so near-sighted and so badly informed in matters lying out-

side their small circle of acquaintance. For, if darkness has descended upon part of mankind, if men are irreligious in sheer despair, if men reject practical Christianity, there is also the other side of the picture which shows the Church of God as strong and as fresh to-day, as it was in the centuries before the Reformation. Monasteries are still filled with contemplatives, who spend their lives in union with God to intercede for their less fortunate fellow men. In many schools teachers still speak to the young of the beauties of Christ's religion. There still are many churches in which the prayers and confessions of faith of packed congregations rise day after day to the heaven above.

The Christian, then, is not entirely a stranger, for there are many followers of his religion. In his narrow social circle he may be surrounded by unbelief and irreligion, but in the wider sphere of his religion he finds many kindred souls. He need, therefore, not fear the forces arrayed against him. His faith and supernatural life belong to the order of things spiritual, and there is no force great enough to deprive him of these precious possessions. Heeding the warning voice of the Church and disregarding all false rumours and pagan tendencies of the world, he can in all peace walk on to his ideal and cherish the fond hope that his goal will be reached. His life of charity, of self-denial, and all that which is implied by the ideal of the Christian life, will be a powerful incentive to many. In any case, it will be a light in the darkness showing the whereabouts of the path which leads to heaven.

THE CHRISTIAN AND HIS NEIGHBOUR.

As long as this life lasts, man is dependent on the services and co-operation of his fellow men. It is unnatural on the part of the individual to seclude himself from all the rest of mankind, even if this seclusion is to ensure an unbroken contemplation of the beauties of the spiritual life, that is, to bring about as close a union with God as is humanly possible. There have been notable

exceptions, but that was in a century when secularism was rampant in the Church and these must be considered as an effort to save Christianity from disintegration. It has been seen that the Church discouraged the Christian from going into the solitude of the desert. To-day, both in the Catholic and the Anglican Church, men desirous of a more perfect life live in communities under the same monastery roof. This investigation, however, is concerned with the masses of Christians who strive for religious culture in the world. Those who live in monasteries are the fortunate souls who have solved all human problems by their act of total self-surrender and can thenceforth give themselves completely to their chosen task. These and those in the world are, nevertheless subject to the same general rule which is: religious culture cannot be achieved by the efforts of the individual alone, although everything in this matter depends ultimately on the will of the individual. Religious culture is necessarily conditioned by close co-operation with other men.

In the preceding part of this chapter it was found that the life of the Christian is a participation in Christ's life through divine grace. That the end of this life may be achieved it is necessary to live it on the lines followed by Christ Himself. Looking at His life from a social standpoint, that is, examining Him in His relationship with His fellow men, one comes to the conclusion that all His thoughts, words and actions can be summed up in this one word: charity. It has been said already that this is the addition of the New to the Old Testament, and was the reason why a strict religious system found itself transformed into Christianity, a religion of love, compassion and forgiveness. In order to understand what is meant by charity, it is necessary to study it in Christ, for He is undoubtedly the proto-type of the perfect Christian. It will then be possible to remove the popular misconception of charity and find how it is to be applied to this life midst the variegated mass of beings that constitute mankind.

It would indeed be useful reading of Holy Scripture, if the pupils in our schools and people in their homes were to make this examination of Christ's charity as shown in His relationship with

those who lived around Him. The one great discovery they would make is the certainty that Christian charity cannot be anything but an active participation in the charity of Jesus. And this charity is of two kinds. In its most heroic aspect it made the Saviour lay down His life for mankind. To this extent very few are asked to go, although the early Christians gladly sacrificed their lives. This intensive charity animated those great men who sold themselves into slavery to ransom some Christians from captivity, who devoted their lives to the care of lepers when little was known of sanitary and hygienic means to avoid the disease, and by all those, in short, who risked their lives in their endeavour to ameliorate the lot of humanity. "Greater love than this no man hath, that he lay down his life for his neighbour." The second kind of charity is of the every-day type and it functions in the interaction of men upon men. Of Christ it may be said in this respect, that He went about doing good. To the bereaved mother He gave back her son outside the town of Naim; Jairus' daughter and Lazarus were also brought back to life to console the afflicted; at the wedding of Cana He changed water into wine; the ten lepers were healed; in the hills away from the town He fed the multitude that was following Him; and, as He told the disciples of John, the lame walked, the deaf heard, the blind saw.

In practically every case when Jesus relieved men of their physical pains, He did this as an exterior sign of what was actually being done to the soul. Thus He says to the woman suffering from an issue of blood: "Thy faith hath made thee whole." The man sick of the palsy is advised to sin no more. The miraculous multiplication of the loaves was but a means of strengthening the belief in the spiritual food He was to give to the millions of His followers. The same feature is revealed in many other instances. Christ's charity, then, had two objectives: the soul and the body of man. Good faith was the condition of a cure and a cured body became the means to ensure continued good belief. From His teachings concerning the soul and the body of man it may be gathered that He considered the soul of an infinitely greater worth, although He did not condemn good eating and drinking in a moderate way, that

is, He did not condemn taking a reasonable care of one's body. Of ~~JESUS~~ the greatest teacher and philosopher of all times, nothing but sound logic could be expected. He came to save the soul of man and for this reason He always stressed its superiority over the body. "What profiteth it a man to gain the whole world, if he were to suffer the loss of his soul?" Hence it is that Christ's charity was primarily directed to further the welfare of the soul and secondarily that of the body.

In order that this charity be true, the Christian cultivates a relationship with his neighbour on the pattern presented in the life of Christ. No line of demarcation can in his eyes be drawn between corporeal and spiritual charity. Wherever this is done, charity ceases to exist and becomes mere humanitarian benefaction. Now, it must be remembered that this Christian charity comprises the whole of man's relationship with his neighbour. It is not the giving of alms to the poor, the caring of the sick, the teaching of the ignorant, the praying for the enemy and the friend; but rather all of these works, together with others that man has occasion to do as a member of society. Those who work on strictly humanitarian principles generally object to the spiritual element in charity on the grounds that this charity to the body is practised as a means of reaching the soul, that is, to indoctrinate the individual. This is not true, at least it is not the practice of the Church. ^o Objection is sometimes taken to the visiting of schools and hospitals by ministers of religion, because it is feared that they may produce a narrow-minded outlook or disturb the patient's peace by talks on God and eternity. Even if this were the case, there should be no reason for fear. The child and the sick naturally incline to dependence on someone stronger than themselves; they are ready to acknowledge their impotence and the authority of God. However, as a rule, the intelligently religious man does not dispense charity to ensnare the soul in the net of his religious beliefs and practices. For, corporeal charity is an end in itself, albeit only a secondary end. The body is treated independently of the soul. The latter functions better in a normal body, the health of which is, then, on its own merits, of great importance. This question

of neutrality in charity will be more fully dealt with subsequently in this section. Just now it is essential to form a clear idea of what Christian charity, the Christian's relationship with his neighbour, really includes. Briefly, it may be said to comprise the education of the young, the instruction of the ignorant, the relief of misery and suffering, the acceptance of the principle of justice as of fundamental importance in society.

Christian charity was mutilated at the hands of materialism which spread over Europe after the Reformation. Original Christianity, the religion which had made Western Civilisation possible, and which had produced the great saints, philosophers, painters and poets of the middle ages, found itself abandoned by many and replaced by a vague cult of the mind by some and the cult of material substance by others. Its spirit was lost for centuries. What had once been the glory of the West was now attacked, ridiculed, or ignored by intellectually great men. The effect of this stupendous betrayal of true values became evidenced in the relations between men. A new outlook on life, generated by the exaggerated value attached to things of this world, killed Christian charity in the hearts of many. However, the preachers of the new gospel, the makers of the new order, had to deal with a population greatly imbued with Christian ideals. The main ideal had been that of charity. They could not be unreasonable and deny this universal tendency in man to do good to his fellow man. In their dilemma they found refuge in the subtle and for the masses almost imperceptible substitution of Christian charity by humanitarianism. Humanity, spelt with a big capital H, found itself transformed into the noblest of ideals, one worthy of the undivided allegiance of the individual. Perhaps it was on account of its long name or the vagueness of its meaning, that this new ideal of modern man was gradually surrounded with the respect and veneration of all those who had drifted away from Christianity. The personal element in this religion, for every individual vaguely felt that he was part of it, naturally favoured the rash acceptance of humanitarianism in place of the disinterested Christian charity of the earlier period. If it had meant a revival

or an increase in Christian charity, it would have met with universal approval. But this is far from what actually happened. The Church, for one, could not associate herself with the movement. The reason for this refusal is to be found in the function of humanitarianism which implies the separation of the soul from the body. This the Church can never tolerate. She has never separated these two aspects of human nature, teaching that the soul cannot function normally in an abnormal body, and hence caring for the body that it may present no obstacle to the life of the soul. Humanitarianism, on the other hand, disregards the soul, ignores it, and confines itself to the welfare of the body and the mind. In dispensing corporeal charity to the needy and in instructing the young in secular science, the lover of mankind discharges a work praiseworthy in itself. This can never be condemned and will always meet with universal approval. The faux pas is made when the benefactor, whoever and whatever he may be, puts the body and the soul in water-tight compartments and maintains that the soul is the concern of the individual alone and lies, therefore, outside the field of charity. Charity, according to him, is confined to the things and needs of this life and cannot influence the soul because of its supernatural status. Humanitarianism, then puts secondary before primary values, prefers non-essentials to essentials, and makes a mediate and ultimate end.

The results of this divorcement of charity from religion have become more and more evident during the last seventy-five years. In individual relationship charity is practised for human motives. Acknowledging the fact that there are some disinterested benefactors it must, nevertheless, be admitted that most philanthropists seek glory and popularity in their works. While Christ said: "Let not your left hand know what your right doeth." Such works are not Christian, they are merely good in the natural order of things and will not be rewarded in eternity. As to social relationships, secularism has become their characteristic mark. This tendency is thus called because it has greatly done away with the religious side in institutions which were founded by the Church; schools, orphanages, hospitals and homes for the aged.

Their modern champions no longer ask themselves the typically Christian question "Quid hoc ad aeternitatem?", but rather the materialist question "What temporal good can be derived therefrom?" However, this zeal for the temporal welfare of man is not to be condemned, for the impartial observer must acknowledge that the modern institutions discharge their duties efficiently, that the buildings housing them are hygienic in outlay and accomodation, that the schools educate all the children, that the orphans are generally well cared for, and so on. All this is very good and most praiseworthy; it would be completely satisfactory, if man did not also have a soul with his body. Some zealous individuals may find that the State has deprived them of the poor, the sick and the ignorant, and has thus removed the object of their charity. They may find this unjust, as they can no longer do themselves those works which were formerly cherished for the eternal reward attached to them. Whatever ground there may be to their complaint, it is not wholly justified. They also are wrong in their conception of charity, which must be done out of love for God and the reward should be considered as incidental. They can, however, if they so choose, still be charitable, more unostentatiously perhaps, but all the more in the true Christian spirit for that. Their complaint, as well as the rash condemnation of the secular institutions by the fanatical bigot, is totally unjustified when it is understood that the present system cares for all, which would be an impossible task were corporal charity dispensed in a less organised and very less efficient manner. While, then, admiring the organisation and the efficiency of the modern hospitals and the modern school from a secular point of view, the Christian yet feels that he cannot entirely approve of the system. And this because of its almost complete disregard of the most important part of man. It may even be maintained that these institutions no longer function normally, although they have increased in efficiency and have extended their spheres of influence to cover the whole land. A social institution functions normally when it fulfils the purpose for which it was founded. Now it must be admitted that the hospital, the orphanage and the

home for the destitute are essentially Christian foundations. The school itself, as it stands to-day, is the descendant of the Christian school of the middle ages; many are still housed in the same old buildings. All these institutions were founded with the double purpose to provide for the body and the soul of man. If, then, the agents of these institutions have discarded one of their *raison d'être*, they can no longer be said to function normally.

And an institution which no longer fulfils the purpose for which it was founded, an elementary principle of sociology states, must disintegrate and become a hindrance to the progress of society. This has been demonstrated time and again in the case of many old institutions which have ceased to exist for no other reason than the one mentioned above. But the school, the hospital and the orphanage must not disappear, for they are the key-stone of modern civilisation. It is reasonable, therefore, to suggest that they should be allowed to function according to their nature, if their disintegration and finally their disappearance is to be avoided. The nurse, the teacher and all those men and women called the public benefactors, must indeed be given the chance to be true public benefactors. If they are not urged on in their tedious work by an inner love for their fellow beings, they may well lose all devotion and work like parts of an automatic organism. And if the remuneration offered no longer appeals to them because it is lower than what is offered elsewhere, then it may well happen that the hospital and the schools still stand there in all their architectural splendour, but their rooms may no longer resound to the voice of the teacher and their corridors to the soft step of the nurse. For the best equipped school and the most modern hospital do not fulfil their purpose if the body and the mind alone are tended. This will soon be discovered by the agents. For a time they may yet remain faithful to their work, but, when they find how empty their lives and how purposeless their efforts are, because they may not occupy themselves with the spiritual welfare of their protégés as well, they will inevitably turn to more lucrative professions or abandon the pursuit of a noble ideal and make themselves the slaves of an institution which is not what it

was intended to be.

It is not astonishing, then, and, on the contrary, it should appear most reasonable that the good Christian, be he Protestant or Catholic, maintains, in the face of the marvellous secular institutions, that the school, the hospital, the orphanage, in which Christ's charity, that charity which has body and soul for objectives, still reigns supreme, is superior to its secular counter-part, no matter how well equipped and richly endowed the latter may be. Moreover, it is reasonable for the Christian to maintain that the man and woman in religion makes the best teacher, the best nurse, the best agent of those institutions that dispense charity under one form or another. This, be it understood, if they do everything in their power to qualify from a secular point of view as well. As teacher and as nurse, the good Christian will work far more effectively than a host of indifferent or agnostic people. To instruct and educate and to nurse the sick are praise-worthy callings indeed; but, when to the efforts of the body and the mind there is joined the humble prayer of the teacher or the nurse, they become of an inestimably higher value. The Christian agent of a charitable institution considers the spiritual life of the child or the patient of more import than that of the body and, when the day's work is done, a fervent prayer is sent to God that He may preserve little Johnny from evil ways or grant that old miser, dying fast in NO.12, the grace to make a Christian death. And this, it must be admitted in no way hinders the efficient running of an institution. On the contrary, it may be reasonably assumed that this spirit of Christian charity makes the lot of all concerned a good deal easier. Neutrality or undenominationalism, as it has been called in the schools, is the enemy of Christian charity and for this reason it can never be approved of by the serious Christian. It gives the death-blow to his religion which is essentially one of charity. It separates God from His characteristic mark in Christian religion and places Him afar off; But God is charity, and without God charity is a misnomer.

It may appear that too much has been said about the professional man. They are, of course, not the only people to practise

charity. But, when the wider meanings of advising and edifying by example, of helping and consoling, are applied to the terms of teacher and nurse, it will be granted that every Christian has occasion to become teacher and nurse, and thus to cultivate this virtue. Most of his acts can, in fact, be brought under these headings; they are the two important aspects of social relationship. However, from what has been said above, it follows that in present-day society the individual has to rely on spiritual charity mainly, although the days of corporeal charity are by no means over. This true Christian charity which makes man pray for those who hate him and for those he does not even know, which makes him forgive insults and treat the other man fairly and justly, is more worthy of the nobility that is in man than corporeal charity, which, too often, is dispensed with a feeling of condescension that it makes the receiver quail with anger and humiliation. And the great interest which the Christian shows in his neighbour is due to that man's immortal soul. Knowing the answer to that cynical question. "Am I my brother's guardian?" he must constantly be on the alert, lest his influence upon others be in any way detrimental to the spiritual life of that soul. The people whom the Christian meets in his every-day social round may be placed in two categories. There are those who live the same life as he and those who do not. To the former his charity will be a source of encouragement, of happiness and of edification; it will spur them on to greater efforts still; in any case, it will greatly help them to persevere in the path of righteousness which they are following themselves. To the latter, the indifferent and the ungodly, the Christian will be an obstacle, or perhaps, just an old fashioned joke, a survival. If he is an obstacle, the person may be set a-thinking, and, if his honest intention is clearly proved, this obstacle may yet mean the beginning of a better life. But, whatever the character and reputation of the person whom the Christian meets, that person will be the object of that charity, based upon justice, which has the life of the soul, that is, religious culture, for its ultimate end. Thus it is that the Christian gives what is due, respects the property and good

name of his neighbour, helps where help is needed, and counsel is required. As a member of society he may have to condemn certain actions called crimes, because these tend to disorganise the community, but he will never condemn the man that is in every criminal. Filled with the charity of Christ, Who forgave sinners and told them to sin no more, the Christian prays for the unfortunate delinquent, rather than pass judgment upon him.

What has been said in this chapter is by no means an exhaustive study of religious culture; it suffices, however, to show that the culture of the soul is not something which exists in vacuo, but must and can be worked out by the individual in that social circle into which he is born. For the Christian life is not an ideal for the mind alone; it is a new line that embraces both body and spirit in a vital synthesis. Once the correct relationship between God and man has been established through Christian religion, its effects will manifest themselves in the life of the individual in relation with his fellow men. Christian religious culture is, for this reason, a social pursuit. It is a part of the sum total of the cultureal goods accumulated by mankind, which society, at every stage of its development, must include in deliberate education, whereby the rising generation is made acquainted with those goods.

Bibliography.

C. Dawson:- " Enquiries into Religion and Culture."

D'Arcy :- " The Life of the Church."

J. Leclercq:-" Back to Christ."

CHAPTER 3.

INFLUENCES ON RELIGION IN EDUCATION SINCE THE REFORMATION.

University of Cape Town

In this chapter the main influences which worked on the educational system from the Reformation onwards will be considered. It will be seen, on the one hand, how the conception of secular education gradually developed and, on the other, how the religion was retained in education owing to the efforts of the various Christian Churches, and to the uncompromising attitude in favour of religious education adopted by the Church of Rome.

It remained for the Reformation to introduce a period in which the adjustment of religious and secular ideals is a fundamental and increasingly acute problem in the whole Western World. The Reformation is not to be thought of as chiefly the contest between two conceptions of the Christian religion. It was also and rather a stage in the splitting up of the medieval theocratic State into free religion and free State. Making an entirely false dichotomy between State and religion, this politico-religious movement is of profound significance for education. Should the secular State control education which has up to now been the prerogative of the Church? If so, what should be the content of instruction, and what the aim of the school controlled by the civil power? These questions, which are the logical outcome of the spirit of the Renaissance-Reformation period, are answered by the general tendency first to reduce or remove ecclesiastical administration of schools, and then to reduce or even eliminate religious instruction. On the other hand, this awakened in the Churches a fresh consciousness of their own educational responsibility and made them devise fresh means for supplying what the modern State does not provide.

The problem created could not be solved in a short time; several centuries were to pass before the secular State school was largely to take the place of schools founded and controlled by the Churches. To-day the schools of the various Churches are to be found side by side with the secular State school, but the number of the former has grown out of all proportion to the latter. The obstinacy of the Churches in holding to their traditional rights, the opinion of a Christian public, the lack of qualified teachers, the increasing number of the secular schools of

the State: these difficulties had first to be removed before the modern educational institutions could come to fruition. As it is wont to do, the State moved slowly, but once it had education within its grip, it strengthened that grip with all the vast resources at its disposal.

The Influence of the Protestant Reformation.

Luther, and other Reformers after him, substituted the authority of the Bible in religious matters for the authority of the Church, individual judgement for the collective judgement of the Church, and individual responsibility for one's salvation for the collective responsibility of the Church.

This new religious teaching had direct bearing upon education. Under the old system of collective authority, judgement, and responsibility for the individual, it had not been necessary that all be educated. Under the new system it became very important in theory at least, that a certain degree of education be attained by all men and women. It was now necessary that every person should be able to read and have a fair amount of knowledge in order to interpret the Scriptures and assist at Church services intelligently.

(a) The Schools of the Lutherans.

The curriculum which Luther drew up for his schools included the three R's, the study of the Bible and the Catechism for the primary schools, and Latin and Greek for those who received secondary education. Religious instruction was the main subject of study in his schools; reading and writing were necessary preparatory acquirements, while Latin and Greek were to be studied by the abler pupils, who would be the future ministers, chiefly for the light they could throw upon the Bible.

The aim of this education was to make the children good citizens as well as religious men and women. Luther repeatedly stressed the point that the purpose of education involves the promotion of the State's welfare. This stress upon a double purpose tended to separate the claims of the State and of Religion. This differentiation was a new feature of the Protestant Reformation. Before the Reformation it was considered impossible to be

a good religious man without at the same time being a fervent supporter of the State.

As a result of his agitation for universal education, Luther asked that educational institutions be maintained at public expense. But in education, as in every other field, the one who pays the piper calls the tune. It appeared, therefore, reasonable that the State should assume greater control as the years went by and finally take over education altogether. Having to bear the financial brunt of educational enterprise, the State might very well insist on a curriculum that would further its own secular ends and pay but slight regard to the other purpose of education, namely, the formation of religious citizens. It may, therefore, be safely concluded that the Lutheran school could not in justice refuse allegiance to the State system, when this was created, but that through its stress on religious instruction it helped to prevent the secular school from becoming indifferent in matters religious during its first decades of existence.

(b) The Schools of the Calvinists.

In the educational programme which Calvin drew up for the religious republic at Geneva he held that learning was "a public necessity to secure good political administration, sustain the Church unharmed, and maintain humanity among men". Being an astute man of public affairs himself, it is not astonishing that Calvin should place the welfare of the State before that of the Church. By doing this, he stressed the difference between State and religion even more than Luther had done before him. This is an unfortunate trait in all reformers, one that proved detrimental to the educational system they introduce; they cannot see the Church and the State in one and the same light, and they go out of their way to draw their followers' attention to their differences. They do not foresee that in a few generations the secular ideals will assume an importance out of all proportion to the equally important ideals of religion.

Calvin outlined a system of elementary education for all. Instruction here was to be given in the vernacular. The

the liberal arts were powerful aids to a full knowledge of the Word, Calvin realised the necessity of secondary education; as a result, his colleges came into being. Students had to spend seven years in these schools. The curriculum was a correlation of studies having the Bible as core. The aim of this secondary education was to form men well versed in theology and rhetoric that they might propagate Calvinism in other lands. However, Calvinistic education did not help considerably in the spread of Calvinistic religion. Nevertheless, it proved to be a powerful factor making for permanent adherence to this religion in those lands where it had been established. From a secular point of view, the results have been well marked and lasting, for, due to its well defined programme making for political, economic and social progress, Calvinism has left a deep impression on mankind. Its schools became more secular than those of the other sects in so far as the Church tended to identify itself with the State. As a result of this tendency the Calvinistic schools passed under the control of the State without, at first, realising that they were losing their religious character. This is well illustrated by the transition from Church to State school which took place in South Africa during the 19th. Century. In this country the religion of the people was and still is, preponderantly Calvinistic. The Volksraad and the Kerkraad often comprised members sitting on both Councils. When the first S.G.M. proposed the establishment of State-aided schools he gave proof that he had previously well studied the attitude of the people. Plenty of local control and plenty of Government assistance was exactly what the Dutch inhabitants wanted. Once the State had acquired a foothold in the educational arena, it was child's play for the civil authorities to increase their influence and finally to assume complete control. Nor did the people object even then. The local committee consisted of the minister and well-known members of the Church; in the Free State and the Transvaal the governments were wholly Calvinistic; the teachers were largely recruited from the ranks of local youth; so that most people firmly believed that the schools were still a Church affair and that they were as religious in character as

they had been. To-day the realisation has come that this is not the case. As a result, a movement has been set on foot for the establishment of Christian National Schools. The agitation is for more Church control in education, but the State is expected to shoulder the financial burden.

(c) The Schools of the Anglicans.

The schools which survived the Parliamentary Suppression Acts adopted the Northern ideals of humanism and furnished a curriculum of classics and religious training. The latter was based upon the teachings of the Church of England.

The Anglican schools were modelled on St. Paul's, founded in 1509 by Colet. This institution introduced its pupils to the knowledge of certain Latin authors and the Church Fathers. During the whole time spent at school, every student had to learn the English catechism.

The aim of this training is expressed in the following words of Colet: "..... for my intent is by thys scole specially to increase knowledge and worshipping of God and our lorde Crist Jesu and good cristen lyff and maners in the children".

From the beginning Colet specified that the control of the new schools should be in the hands of married laymen. Not being organised into a system, they soon passed under the control of the National Church. With the advent of the Board schools in England, the Anglican Church made great efforts to save its schools from extinction. Owing to a liberal and far-sighted Government, it was allowed to maintain them and to-day there are still many Church schools within the greater national educational system. They are controlled by the Church, but are subject to State inspection, from which they also receive financial support.

The effects upon education resulting from the formation of new religious bodies within Christendom could have been far-reaching and of great value. The reformers realised the tremendous influence which early indoctrination can have on the life of the people and they therefore did their very best to devise such educational systems as would secure the best results. Great strides could have been made in education with all this rivalry

and competition for the most efficient system. However, it is well known to-day that education evolves gradually and not by sudden revolutionary changes. Luther's proposals were mostly not understood by his followers; the view of Comenius, the great Moravian educationist, was two hundred years ahead of his time. Consequently, their theories were forgotten or at least greatly altered by their successors. The first Protestants, as a result of the new religious teaching, had advanced the ideal of universal education. But, freedom of thought in religion made people dream of freedom of thought and expression in things political. It thus came about that the ideal of education for all was shelved for three hundred years, while the fights for religious and political freedom were raging. The same happened to almost every other educational ideal put forward by the Churches at the time of the Reformation. When the originators had passed away and the first religious fervour had cooled down, educational methods sank once more into the rut of pre-Reformation times. Education became formal and little progress was made until the State took over.

In the meantime most Protestant Churches had undergone a gradual process of secularisation. With the exception of the Anglican Church, they quickly came to an agreement with the State as to the content of the curriculum. Having been given the right to visit the schools through their ministers, and Bible study having been included in the curriculum as an optional subject, they expressed their satisfaction with the new system and thought that everything would work out as the champions of secular education had foretold.

The Influence of the Church of Rome.

"The decrees of synods and councils of the Church from the sixth century onward show very clearly that there was a definite policy on the part of the Church favouring the expansion of popular education. While the Popes and the Church were concerned first of all with making provision for the education in the sacred sciences of those who were to be members of the clerical body, they were also at pains to encourage and promote the education of

the laity". (1).

The schools of the Church were at first attached to the Bishop's and the Priest's houses. With the foundation and spread of the monastic orders, education became a function of the monks. By the time of the Reformation there were thousands of these schools attached to Benedictine and other monasteries. Unfortunately, many of these monasteries were closed down during the religious upheaval in Europe, and education suffered a partial eclipse through the loss of many schools. With the progress of the Reformation it became increasingly evident that education in religious and secular knowledge could not be neglected by the Church. It also became clear that the ordinary clergy and the monks would not suffice to cope with the new educational developments. A few far-seeing members of the Church decided, therefore, to found Orders of men and women for the sole purpose of educating Catholic children.

In the field of primary education especially, these Teaching Orders were well ahead in theory and practice of the contemporary Protestant schools. This is notably the case with the Christian Brothers, founded by John Baptist de La Salle, in so far as they instituted teachers' training colleges centuries before such a step was made anywhere else. While the Protestant Churches trained their teachers by an intensive course of studies, the Christian Brothers studied education itself and formulated specific teaching methods to be applied in the classroom. The Jesuits concentrated mainly on secondary education. Their teachers were all eminently qualified through a long course of studies and their method of school and class management was clearly detailed in the "Ratio Studiorum."

What distinguished Catholic from Protestant education in these times was chiefly the fact that it never became national. It was not intended to serve purely secular ends by a confession of adherence to a political party. Wherever the Jesuits, the

(1) J.J. Walsh: High Points of Medieval Culture.

Brothers, and the Sisters went, they adapted themselves and their method of procedure to the prevailing local conditions. In doing this, they made it quite clear to every one that the chief purpose of their schools was to ensure the salvation of the individual soul. No considerations of nationality or even of individual religious differences were permitted in face of this divine motive. There was no French or Dutch soul, but only the immortal soul of man, in the eyes of the religious teacher.

The curriculum of the Catholic school was in many respects similar to the Protestant. Religion was the main subject of instruction throughout the school years. But it was in the method employed that Catholic education distinguished itself from the Protestant education. The authority of the Church was still the highest and, therefore, the characteristic mark of the Catholic method was its dogmatic and doctrinal teaching. Through dogma and doctrine the school attained the aim of Catholic education, namely, an intensely religious life serving as a preparation for eternity.

The Catholic schools would not tolerate any encroachment upon their rights by the secular powers. They have been suppressed for a time in some countries, but they have always flourished again when freedom of religion has been given. When the national system of secular education became the order of the day, they were justified, more than any other body of private schools, in taking their stand apart. Where the State permitted them to function normally, the Catholic schools willingly allowed themselves to be amalgamated with the other schools into a national system. In other countries, there are to-day still many great and small Catholic private schools, existing independently of the State system.

Since the 16th. century the Catholic Church has, by a process of internal reform, become less and less secular. She has, moreover, always maintained the religious principle in education and has been willing to make great sacrifices for her schools. For these and other reasons the Church of Rome was justified in her attitude to secular education, and in her

condemnation of the undenominational school as being a proper substitute for the old Catholic school. This attitude will be fully revealed in a special chapter. At the present stage, the conclusion may be drawn that the main influence of the Roman Catholic school upon educational developments from the Reformation till the State's assumption of control in education has been (1) to demonstrate that secular and religious education may proceed simultaneously and (2) that to separate the two is to make education incomplete.

The Influence of the Rationalism.

The struggle between the religious factor and the tendency towards the secularisation of education was influenced by two philosophies which seized hold of men's minds as a result of the extended interest in the reason of man and in the natural sciences.

While the various Christian denominations set up and developed their educational systems making for inculcation of specific views on religion, a movement was set on foot by a group of intellectuals, having for aim the total elimination of traditional Christianity. The Protestant reformers had replaced the authority of the Church by that of the Bible. The intellectuals of the 17th. century went one step further: they overthrew all external authority and put the human reason in its stead. The reason of man was so magnified that, finally, these men announced that each individual must depend entirely on his intellect to work out that philosophy of life which suited him best. Church, Bible and other authorities were set aside so that the individual could decide his attitude to society and God. The chief exponent of this movement, known as Rationalism, was Voltaire.

Rationalism was the outcome of the Reformation, in so far as it stressed the reliance to be placed on personal judgement. The movement was influenced by the development of the natural sciences, which stood as a triumph of man's liberated reason, and was in tune with the rationalistic outlook which characterised the time.

It showed a complete disregard of religion, which came to be more and more considered as a human institution by which the

Churches endeavoured to shackle the reason of man. The great achievements of man while he had thus been 'enslaved', were ignored and the doctrine spread that only now was man beginning to enjoy the full use of his intellectual capacities. In his accustomed cynical style, Voltaire said of religion that it was an illusion to the believer and a deception by the priesthood. Illusion and deception were not rational processes; therefore religion must be abandoned as being unworthy of a rational being. Voltaire and his followers were too bigoted against the Christian religion to admit that it was in any way 'reasonable'. They were further actuated in their irrational wish to eliminate all religion from man's life by the contempt they entertained towards the 'rabble' the 'scum' of mankind, as they called the lower and uneducated classes of the people. The real purpose of their philosophy was to deprive the great masses of men of every right whatsoever. The only right most people were then enjoying was that given to them by religion in the eyes of God; and for this reason Voltaire could attack in these classes of people nothing but their religion. Having dealt with the uneducated, the scheme of the Rationalists was to make for the erection of a polished, intellectual society, preserving its identity by a cold formalism and its morality by a punctilious observance of stiff rules. It accepted reason as a guide in thought, and materialism as a standard of morality. In fine, what was aimed at was the undisputed reign of the intellect, with adherence to a set of rules making for conventional decency and politeness to regulate the social intercourse of the ruling class.

Rationalism committed a basic error by assuming that the recent revolutionary upheavals in Christendom would favour its anti-religious attitude. It opposed all Christian Churches at once and thus it could look for followers only among those who had already abandoned all Christian beliefs. The masses of the people had been promised a certain amount of religious freedom, the individual had been drawn out of the collective system of the Catholic Church. Moreover, education was to become universal, thus assuring to all the development of those natural endowments

full realisation of their inner selves. Great things were expected to happen as a result of the Protestant Reformation. It was therefore, unreasonable on the part of the Rationalists to ask the masses to give up what they had just received, the future possibilities of which were yet to be realised. Besides, the people were still too religious by nature to accept materialism as a standard of morality. This acceptance was to be given later, but now, when religious fervour was driving men to fanatical extremes, any theory opposing the religious principle in education and in adult life, was doomed to failure. As a result, Rationalism remained with a number of intellectuals, and was soon to be superseded by the next movement in the perpetual flux of human events. The philosophy of Rationalism achieved, however, a partial success in so far as the adherents and the priesthood of the Christian religion, exhibited obvious failings in the eyes of those who rejected Voltaire and his teachings. Voltaire had foreseen this when speaking the words: "Mentez, mentez, il y restera toujours quelque chose".

The Rationalist movement known as the Enlightenment, soon came to an end. But its influence did not die with the movement. In the subsequent centuries, and even to-day, it can be traced in the attitude of men towards religion, especially towards religion in education.

The Influence of Naturalism.

Rationalism had resulted from an extended interest in the human intellect with its capacity for reasoning. Thus the eyes of man had been brought from the considerations of other worldliness to rest upon the individual himself. It was but one step further in this evolution of a new attitude which made man fasten his eyes upon the environment in which he moved. With a deeper understanding of the natural world came the consciousness that the relation which existed between man and nature was more clearly formulated and understood than that between man and God. In so far as this was the case it might be said that man's

interest in nature waxed while his interest in God waned. The culmination of this change is found in the philosophy of naturalism.

It was left to Jean-Jacques Rousseau to formulate and popularise the doctrine of this new movement. To-day we know what effect his teachings have had upon the social developments of France and, though to a lesser extent, upon the whole of Europe. His influence upon education was not direct, but like that of other educationists it is being felt very much in our modern times. It is for this reason that the naturalism of Rousseau is advanced here as one of the factors which have co-operated in bringing about the present-day situation of apparent opposition between State and Church in the field of education.

With the proclamation of its tenets, a new attitude to religion, different from anything known in the past, was revealed to mankind. For, naturalism advocated "natural religion", a religion which nobody had conceived as being possible even within the enlarged framework of post-Reformation Christianity. By the time Rousseau was acquainting the world with his strange mixture of sense-realism and romanticism, there had developed quite a number of attitudes towards religion. Naturalism condemned them all. It did away with the scepticism that was in rationalism and the supernatural element that was in all the forms of Christian religion. Strange to say, this new philosophy insisted on retaining Christian morality and condemned the materialistic morality of rationalism. (It may be pointed out here that this tendency to separate Christian morality from Christian religion is particularly marked in the modern secular school.)

* Science was constantly bringing the whole realm of nature with its many phenomena closer and closer to man. In his dealings with plants, animals and their organic functions, with the sky and its myriads of bodies, and finally with his own body and its functions, man evolved a whole system of fanciful analogies. Every process of growth within the human being, be it mental or organic, found its counter-part in the world of nature. Man, it may be said, became nature-bound. It was inevitable that

for many, because of the one-sidedness of their ideal, the supernatural character of Christian religion should lose itself more and more.

Rousseau's vain efforts at making a success of his social life in Paris and his spitefulness caused by his failure in this, the great ambition of his life, are well known. Disillusioned and disappointed he turned towards the masses of the people whose lot he sought to improve with his philosophy of naturalism. Appealing to human nature, it taught that both the rule of authority as applied by the Churches and the rule of reason as advocated by rationalism, were forms of tyranny not to be tolerated, ignoring as they did, something within man himself, in the sense that they did not take into consideration the whole nature of man. In particular, as Rousseau is careful to point out, these forms of tyranny took little or no account of man's emotional nature and of natural religious tendencies. Both the religious and emotional element in man were true expressions of his nature, and as such were the true guides to conduct rather than the authoritarian and extraneous impositions of Church and Reason.

This was a far cry from the Catholic and the Protestant teachings about the universality and content of religion. Although condemning the rule of reason, naturalism reverted to reason in order to form a religious system. The individual was directly conscious of the religious urge through his inner feelings, but nothing very concrete would come of this. Reason then, had to supply the structure of the new system. In its final form, this religion comprised the belief in a Supreme Being and in the immortality of the soul; its confession of faith became that of the Savoyard curate, which Rousseau enunciates at some length in his "Emile". This Creed contains practically everything which man is capable of determining by the efforts of his reason. It is in fact a summary of a practical, humanitarian profession of good fellowship. However, the child is not to be indoctrinated in this theology of Rousseau's. Let nature take its course and everything will be provided for in due time. When the religious tendency makes itself felt, the individual may then

choose from among a multitude of competing creeds, or, what is better still, formulate his own; for, religion is after all an emotional experience of the individual to which his reason should give form. Thus did Rousseau discourse on religion; thus do many people of to-day argue on the same subject.

The Influence of the Rise of the Sciences. Materialism of
Herbert Spencer.

The natural sciences had started to develop since the days of Roger Bacon. The new teachings were, however, not received favourably for the following three centuries. During the Renaissance the classics had been revived and the post-Reformation schools had for special feature a great emphasis laid on Latin and Greek literature. This fervour for the literature of the Ancients became the great enemy of the sciences and for many years the natural studies found little encouragement in the schools. But in many private laboratories a number of men devoted their lives to scientific investigation and a remarkable scientific movement was started which, in the 19th. century, had attained great proportions.

The spirit of this century stood for the rule of the physical and biological sciences in all departments of life. The success of the scientific method proved so great from a materialist point of view and it engendered so great an optimism that men believed it capable of universal application.. The leading exponent of the new philosophy was Herbert Spencer, who, in a few essays written on the subject, introduced the spirit of the natural sciences into education.

Herbert Spencer was an enthusiast in the world of science, one who saw unlimited possibilities inherent in the scientific method. For the sake of his specialisation he invaded the field of education and condemned the formal classical curriculum. His influence was such that the traditional education was, during the second half of the nineteenth century, modified so as to find a place for the teaching of a modicum of science. (1)

From an examination of Spencer's curriculum of school subjects, one can at once see what will be the nature of the educational system constructed in answer to his conception of life. Literature and a study of the fine arts, having been left to the last place, indicating that they are of minor importance, appear almost an accessory, that can be dealt with in one's spare time. Thus the culture of the finer feelings of man enters only into education as a small addition in the "leisure" part of the pupil's curriculum of aesthetic subjects. The curriculum comprises the whole gamut of the sciences. Little time is to be devoted to anything else for, as Spencer says, speaking of literature and the fine arts, "as they occupy the leisure part of life, so should they occupy the leisure part of education".⁽¹⁾

Spencer would turn out the complete materialist, but not the 'full' man as he proposed to do. The fact is that we notice a serious omission in the classification of human activities and interests as given by him. While certain of his predecessors in the educational arena had stressed the individuality of man too much, and had given too unpractical a bias to their systems, Spencer may very well be reproached with exactly the opposite tendency. He considers man but in his activities, that is, he speaks of the artisan, the family father, the citizen, the business man, the politician, the economist, etc., and all the while forgets the human personality underlying all these activities. The nature of man appears to be solely concerned with certain activities, all external, which science will render easy and useful. It seems as if he were concerned with those inner qualities and activities which makes man what he is, which develop his intellectual outlook on morality, his conscience, his intelligence, his feeling, and his will. Having received Spencer's education, man would indeed be filled with facts appropriate to the needs of a useful life, from a materialistic standpoint, but he would scarcely be prepared for the obligations of morality, and all those other functions which have their source

(1) H. Spencer: *ibid.*

within him. Such a man would perhaps live longer and also perhaps be more successful in the material business of his life, although even that is doubtful, but he would not have learned to be good, wise, prudent in judgement, strong-willed; in short, he would not be a true man. Possibly he would be adapted to the satisfaction of material and egoistic needs on the one hand, and on the other to the requirements of family and social life. But he would certainly not have been educated in himself; nothing would have been done to insure personal development and perfection.

The shortcomings of such an education were not greatly heeded in the enthusiasm with which this utilitarian interpretation of the teacher's and pupil's functions was received. Later in the century and especially in our own times, educationists acquired a more sober outlook on the value of the sciences. Although they are still intensively studied they are no longer taken as the only means whereby man can obtain knowledge; they are considered insufficient in the making of the 'full' man. As a result, the fine arts, literature, history and other subjects have since regained their place in the school curriculum. They had been treated as of little account by the materialist because of their lack of utilitarian value. When the curriculum advocated by Spencer and his successors was found to be inadequate these studies were re-instated with due ceremony. Religion, on the other hand, had the misfortune of having been completely ignored by the materialist philosopher. And to-day, although religion may be included in the curriculum, it still is regarded as unessential and taught in a perfunctory manner by many of those to whom it is entrusted.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

- C. Dawson:- "Medieval Religion".
 H. Spencer:- "Education; Mental, Moral and Physical".
 Monroe:- "History of Education".
 Cubberley:- "History of Education".
 J.J. Rousseau:- "Emile".

CHAPTER 4.

THE DECAY OF RELIGION IN THE SCHOOLS.

University of Cape Town

THE DECAY OF RELIGION
IN THE SCHOOLS.

When the State system of schools had been in operation for a sufficient length of time, it became increasingly more evident that the religious teaching given there amounted to very little. The educational authorities were unwilling to provide the men or to go in any way out of their way to enforce the teaching of religion. Men in and outside the teaching profession began to write on "Religion in the school". Quite a literature came thus into being through articles appearing in various educational magazines, such as the Journal of Education, 1883, in which the writers give their opinion on the subject. The drawback to this considerable agitation has always been the uncertainty of the writers when it comes to fundamentals, the 'hedging' when dogma becomes involved, and the absence of practical suggestions for a better system than ^{the} existing one. The education^{al} authorities are rightly unwilling to act on the loose criticism of every corner, and are unwilling to alter the existing provision for religious instruction until something better is put forward.

Up to the present the State has adhered to its original attitude toward religion in the school. The schools themselves have been less faithful, for religion as a subject matter of study has lost practically all its importance. In the majority of State schools a few odd moments here and there are given to it, if it has not been deleted altogether from the programme of studies. Anybody believing that the culture of the soul can very well be attended to by the individual during his spare moments may be entirely satisfied with such a state of affairs. There are, however, many who are not^{at} all happy with the practice of relegating religion into an obscure background. They do not think it right and just that Christianity, the one institution which made our civilisation possible, should be glibly referred to on rare occasions or even be forgotten altogether. Their claim for bringing religion back

into the school is echoed in this thesis; but, neither their off-hand condemnation of the existing system nor their proposed method for effecting the change is advocated here. When a functioning system doing excellent work is faulty in one part, it is unnecessary and wasteful to scrap the whole in order to re-build a new system. The present-day educational system has this one defect of not giving complete education in the eyes of the Christian. Before condemning the system itself, we shall examine how this deficiency arose and developed. Just as children are not responsible for the crimes of their fathers, although they may have to suffer the consequences, our schools of to-day cannot per se be held responsible for an existing evil, although society may have to suffer.

It is, therefore, proposed to determine those causes which have brought the modern disregard for religion. In the previous chapter general tendencies have been traced which affected man's attitude to religion. All of these and other influences must be held responsible. Thus, we shall avoid attributing the decay of religion in our modern schools to one single cause. The object of this chapter is, not to look for a scape-goat, but simply to point out that the various tendencies at work inevitably lead to the loss of religion in the individual soul as well as in society in general.

State's Assumption of Responsibility.

The assumption by the State of responsibility in education was not a deliberate gesture whereby the secular powers meant to deprive the Churches of their rights over the young. It was forced upon the State by the impact of diverse tendencies which had been at work for a considerable length of time. Nor was this assumption of control per se responsible for the decay of religion in the schools. Control of education in the hands of a secular authority became, because of the spirit of the times, an aid to the further progress of those pressures which had effected a change in society since the Renaissance-Reformation period. The State did not say to the Churches? "Education is now a State, and no longer a Church matter."

From a consideration of the theory of the democratic State it will become evident that such an attitude is totally incongruous with the function we now ascribe to it. And yet, a further consideration of the implications of this theory will reveal how the assumption of responsibility in education by the State has indirectly led to the decline in importance of religion as a subject for study.

(a) Theory of Liberal or Social Welfare State.

The theory of State has undergone four stages of development. (1) In its classical stage the main problem was the relation of men to society. The Greeks solved this problem by regarding State and Society as identical and regarding Society as enlarged man. The Greek thought, at least, never made a distinction between the function of the individual, the society, and the State. Plato's three aspects of man are reflected in the three aspects of society. (1) The appetitive faculties of man find their counter-part in the economic phase of Society constituted by the artisan, the merchant; the spirited possessions of the individual are reflected in society by the warrior class; and the intellectual capacity of man is represented in the Republic by the guardians.

(2) The next stage in the development of the theory of State is represented by the medieval concept of State. Political theory was then concerned with ethical values. Because of the close relation that existed between Church and secular State, the source of these ethical values was God. Man's relations to the State were his relations to the Church, that is, to God.

(3) In the early modern period, from Macchiavelli to Rousseau, the characteristic feature becomes the Ruler, prince, king, or emperor. The main concern of political theory lies with the question of sovereignty. Law is regarded as having binding force because it emanates from a sovereign body, who is often invested with divine rights. The thinkers of this period are concerned with the justification of sovereignty and with the relations of the individual to the sovereign; his relations with

(1) Plato:—"The Republic", Chapter, 4.

God becomes more of a personal matter. (1)

(4). In its fourth stage, from Rousseau and Hegel to the modern times, political theory calls itself political pluralism, and speaks of the Social Welfare State. Where Rousseau had demanded political power for the people so that the political State become identified with the people, (2) to-day economic power also is demanded by the people, so that identification of State and people may be more perfect still. (3) The concept of sovereignty as the cause and binding force of law has fallen into disuse. To-day we hold that laws must be obeyed because they serve social purposes. (4) This involves political pluralism and implies that each functioning group in the State should be to a certain extent autonomous, at least internally. The function of the State proper is now merely to regulate the relations between the various groups of activities within it, and its authority rests on its own successful functioning.

As a result of this new nature attributed to it, the State can no longer be seen in dichotomy of sovereign versus subject or in the Augustinian separation of the two cities. The evolution of the theory of State has thus completed a circle, leading back to a concept of State held by the Greek thinkers. Society is now considered an interrelation of functions, each function legitimate in itself, and the State is one of these functions, having for object to regulate the others in relation to itself and among themselves. The State is not antagonistic to or dominating over any one group; it is a function of every group. An apparent antagonism may, however, arise when the State through its power of control thwarts the attempt of a particular group to push its interests ahead to the detriment of other functioning groups.

The State to-day dare not interfere in certain functions, having lost the right to do so. Examples of such a case are the

- (1) McIvor: The Modern State, Oxford.
Phyllis Doyle: History of Political Thought. Jonathon Cape.
- (2) J. Rousseau: Social Contract.
- (3) Hampden Jackson: "The Post-War World"
- (4) H.J. Laski "A Grammar of Politics" Ch.2

internal administration of the Churches, the running of chartered universities, which are social functions outside the direct interference of the State. All the State may do is to regulate their functions and the functions of other groups. In a word, the modern Liberal State is no longer a sovereignty fighting with other autonomous bodies.

The spirit of modern Liberal State can be described in three statements: (a) "Man prefers the dangers of liberty to the safety of slavery". (1) In education local control and initiative are stressed, whereas in the totalitarian State a strong centralised control does not allow such freedom.

(b) "To govern is not to dominate, but to mediate". (2) Applied to matters pertaining to education, this statement would imply a harmonising influence on the part of the State upon the various functioning groups whose main activities are educational, and not the assumption of complete control with the corresponding deprivation of rights possessed by the latter.

(c) "The test of good Government is not efficiency but freedom". (3) In other types of society the educational system may be run most efficiently by an intricate hierarchy of controlled officials, but in the Liberal State a policy of Laissez faire gives scope for a maximum possibility of progress wherever the locality or the district have the cause of education at heart.

The implications of this spirit of the modern Liberal State upon education in general, and upon religion in education in particular, will be further revealed in the subsequent treatment of the topic under consideration. It has been necessary to trace the development of the theory of State and to describe in some detail the present stage, in order to obtain a clear picture of the present-day situation in education. Without this background of reference it would be impossible to trace the causes in the decay of religion with an impartial mind. Moreover, this examination of the State's function will help in the determination

(1) A.H. Murray:—"Die Volksraad".

(2) *ibid.*

(3) *ibid.*

of the rights claimed by both Church and State in education.

(b) Democratic Case for State School.

It has been seen that to-day economic power also is demanded by the people. The wealth of the nation is to be democratized, that is, it is to be used by the people, because of the identity existing between State and Society. The main demand, however, is that it should be used for the people who have accumulated it. This application of wealth to the people proceeds by way of the various functioning groups within the State. Education is perhaps the greatest and most important of these functions and it has therefore just claims upon a great share of the common wealth.

When the modern Liberal State took over the control of education, it thereby assumed the right to condition what is the most important single function in society. Now, a society which makes provision for participation in its good of all its numbers on equal terms and which secures flexible re-adjustments of its institutions through interaction of its different forms of associated life is in so far democratic. Such a society must, therefore, have a type of education which gives individuals a personal interest in social relationships and control, and the habits which secure social changes without introducing disorder. And this type of education is to be received in the State school, which must fit into the democratic system of State.

Educational administration faces many difficulties, but especially so in the Social Welfare State, where the individual is considered rather than the whole population for the interests of the dominating party. The variety of human interests, the diversity of customs and traditions in the sections of the State, the multitude of political and other associations, the number of religions, and other factors make it necessary for the State to lay down certain fundamentals in educational requirements and, at the same time, to allow a large measure of freedom in view of the existing differences.

The State school in the modern Social Welfare State is justified on the following grounds; (1) It provides free education; (2) State and local initiative combined make for the solution of those problems arising from the mental and physical defectiveness of a number of children; (3) to the large masses of school-going children it assures physical and mental training on the principle that the right teacher gives the right education to the right pupil.

So far, then, the Liberal State school provides for the culture of body and mind. But, can it also provide the third culture stipulated in Chapter I? Does it offer complete education by joining the culture of the soul to that of body and mind?

From the very beginning of Christianity the Church took upon itself the duty to attend to spiritual needs. With the spread of education this duty was discharged to a great extent in the Church schools. When the modern State took over the control in education, it was faced by many problems, none of which proved so difficult as the question of religion in the school. Faithful to its basic democratic principles, the State could not interfere with the function of established institutions; it could not pronounce in favour of one religion, as the medium whereby the culture of the soul was to be effected. The State school could not, however, disregard religion altogether. It became undenominational in character by force of circumstance. The State may not identify itself with any one of the several functioning groups, all pursuing the same end, albeit by different routes. It could not, moreover, alienate one association by favouring another. In brief, the State was placed in an awkward situation. By making the school undenominational it sincerely hoped to satisfy all contending parties. While, therefore, everybody realises the difficulty and appreciates the State's endeavour to preserve religion in the school, many educationists and churchmen of to-day ask themselves whether the best solution was given by the undenominational school.

From further considerations of the present-day situation it will become apparent (1) that the undenominational school does

not provide for sound religious culture; that, on the contrary, (2) it is responsible, together with other causes, for the decay of religion in the school.

2--Education in Social Welfare State.

In past centuries the main concern of the State has been to provide a measure of safety in the sphere of physical well-being. Gradually, its function extended until, to-day, it consists in regulating the relations of other functioning units within it. Because of the great control it exercises over primary and secondary education, it may be said now that the functions of State and education are almost merged into one. This means that the State holds itself responsible for the mental welfare of the great majority of the population.

The chief concern of the Churches has always been to prepare their adherents for a safe and happy transition from this to the life that is beyond.

State and Church have, therefore, well defined spheres of activity: the satisfaction of the worldly and other-worldly aspirations of the individual. It happens, however, that both care for the same man, a being which cannot be divided into halves. The Liberal State must respect the soul of man, for from it arise the many products of its culture. The Church, on the other hand, dare not neglect body and mind, because through them the soul is reached, and also because their welfare ensures the communal welfare of the State. In the process of education all three parts of man are involved. Because of the difference in their interest, it becomes clear that State and Church would quickly assume an attitude of antagonism, if the one prevented the other from functioning normally.

The Churches did not have at their disposal the financial means nor the teachers to provide free universal education. They lacked also the power to make education compulsory. For this reason, the rights of the State in matters educational are those which entitle it to exact universal education for secular motives. The physical and mental excellence of the people are factors

which influence the normal functioning of the whole State. It is therefore lawful of the State to lay down principles and make regulations to organise physical and mental education. In other words it possesses the right to regulate the function of education in its relations with the functions of other institutions and especially with its own function. Beyond this it may not step. For, the State being a secular institution, it can have neither the power nor the authority to concern itself in the spiritual welfare of its citizens. For this it lacks the dignity given the Churches by their close association with the supernatural, as well as the means and the trained personnel at the disposal of the Churches. For this reason does religious training, the culture of the soul, remain the primary interest of the Church.

The only solution of the problem lies in close co-operation between Church and State. ~~Such a solution has not been reached for the simple reason that the State.~~ Such a solution has not been reached for the simple reason that the State, as is only natural for one tremendously interested in his enterprise, emphasises the necessity for mental and physical well-being at the expense of religious culture.

Apart from the above consideration, the type of education given in the democratic State school was largely determined by the factors entering into the assumption of control by the State. These factors will be examined only in their bearing upon the issue at stake, viz., religion in the school.

(1) Economy.

On the staff of the secular school there are, as a rule, few men willing to take it upon themselves to give religious and moral teaching. They feel themselves incompetent to do so, not having been trained toward this end. Others refrain from giving religious teaching because they are too honest to ask of others what they themselves do not do. If the State wishes to insist on a complete education, by the inclusion of religious and moral training it would have to provide the means for the training of specially selected men. Furthermore, considerable expenses would accrue by

by the purchase of religious literature, maps and other apparatus, all of which would be required by the principles of sound method. As it is, shortage of money and of men has prevented education from progressing to the entire satisfaction of the State. Rather than lay additional burdens upon itself by placing religion in the school on a par with other subject matters, the State has therefore decided that religion is a concern of the Church, a fact which everybody knew already long before such a declaration was made.

The State has left the matter at that, instead of consulting the Churches on the means whereby religion can be given its full status of other studies. (1) After all, the State controls education, and the lead must come from that side.

(2) Efficiency.

Since the original split within Christianity caused by the Reformation the number of religious bodies has increased. As a result of this, there is no land with a uniform religious system; even small towns show up this diversity of religious beliefs. Bitter controversies have estranged the Churches, preventing them from co-operation even in those problems that admit of a common basis in all. Wherever the Church was strong enough to maintain its own schools, it has done so. The smaller religious societies, as well as the greater, have rights in the democratic State which no one wishes to deny. However, it cannot be expected that the clashing of the many sects will be satisfied by the introduction of a uniform system. This is impossible.

- (1) In South Africa the Cape Provincial Council for one, consulted a representative body of various Protestant denominations. But the permissive character of the clauses inserted in the 1921 Ordinance relative to religious instruction and the lack of any provision for training the teachers in giving religious instructions, have rendered these well-meant regulations well-nigh farcical.

The very nature of the problem presented by the contradicting claims of the many Christian Churches rendered an immediate solution impossible. Economy had to be observed. Expediency therefore asked that the State school keep outside the controversies of the Churches, by making it undenominational. Moreover the modern State does not intend to provide separate schools for Protestants, Catholics, Jews, and Atheists. It would mean, not one educational system but dozens. While the Liberal State does not necessarily deny the importance of religious instruction, it cannot accede to claims of one Creed, for it would have to grant similar privileges to the others. In this way the control of education would slip out of its grasp and it would be left with no other function but the supplying of the necessary financial assistance.

The Church schools had functioned for particular Christian bodies, with the definite purpose of fostering in their pupils their particular religious views and thus secure permanent members. This function of the Churches cannot be assumed by the Liberal State, which, for this reason, is unable to dispense complete education. Economy and expediency made the present school a necessity, but they also forced the agents of the educational function to abandon all serious endeavour towards religious culture.

The total process of education was thus rent in two. On the one side we now have physical and mental culture, while on the other we sometimes find a little formal religious instruction, but more often than not no religion at all. The Churches and religious-minded educationists maintain that this division is unsound, on the ground that education should result in the "Full" man, that is, the one whose mental and spiritual capacities have been developed apace and with, at least, an equal emphasis being placed on both.

(3) Naturalism and Religious Education.

Simultaneously with the evolution of the theory of State proceeded an evolution of man's attitude to life. From being at first fixed by his relations to God and then to the Sovereign, it has in the Liberal State turned towards Society and the environment in which it lives and perpetuates itself. Objects and values have

gradually assumed different standards. Whereas religion, eternal life, the religious virtues, and then loyalty to the Ruler, physical courage and fortitude occupied man's mind in former times, to-day the economic power of society with its possibility for the immediate enjoyment to be derived from it, the means whereby the natural environment may be adapted more and more to this life, occupy the average person almost exclusively.

The new attitude towards life is expressed by the word "naturalism". It has for features the consideration of practically everything from the utilitarian point of view and the disregard for those things which do not allow of such a consideration. Physical culture and mental pursuits assume importance because the former makes man fit to live enjoyably and the latter because it provides the means for a more complete subjugation of the natural environment to this life. Religion loses its appeal because it appears to offer no immediate material advantage.

The philosophy of naturalism had been enunciated when the State regulated the function of education in its relation with other functions. Apart from the Churches, the other functioning groups within the State had their purpose of activity precisely in one and the same objective; the material welfare of man and society. It is well known that education reflects the spirit of the times. Education in the Social Welfare State is no exception to this rule. The results which the State wishes to achieve lie entirely within the order of social values. The men employed in the task are laymen, representative of current tendencies, and therefore strongly imbued with the naturalistic outlook upon life. Under these conditions, it was patent from the beginning that naturalism would soon become a characteristic of State education. The State was not directly responsible. Its action simply made the outcome inevitable.

The naturalistic conception of education in the democratic State is seen directly in its effects upon the curriculum.

(1) Utilitarian Subjects.

The old classical curriculum of formal education had little chance of survival when naturalism became the unconscious

philosophy of the poor and the rich, the gifted and the average. Strangely enough, the Churches held on to the narrow classical curriculum, longer than a prudent policy would dictate. Thus they indirectly forced the hand of other associations and specially that of the State, to do what was not done in their schools. The progress made by the laboratory sciences and the application to actual life conditions of inventions and discoveries made by the natural scientist gave a new face to society. Since education is the process whereby society renews itself, this new constituent of society had to be included in the deliberate education given in the school.

Had the Churches been able to provide universal education, and willing to secularise their curricula sufficiently to meet the demands of the times, they would have been in a position to effect a compromise between the old and the new. A satisfactory arrangement would have resulted. The classical studies would, no doubt, have been curtailed to make room for the natural sciences, but religion would have kept its place in the reformed curriculum. Under the control of the State, unable to do anything in matters religious, and too much concerned with natural aims, the curriculum assumed an entirely different form. The classical subjects lost in importance, while the laboratory sciences assumed an importance in proportion with the ends they were to serve. That is, they became the kernel and the flesh of the whole system.

A brief examination of the modern curriculum will reveal its two salient features: it is utilitarian in the first instance and then it offers a few subjects a knowledge of which will make the life of body and mind safe and pleasant. The utilitarian feature can be traced in the various departments of the curriculum which train the pupil directly or indirectly with a view to making a livelihood. The other feature is of a mixed cultural-recreational-utilitarian nature and is revealed by the studies of literature, the sciences dealing with life and body, and the finer arts of drawing and music.

Religion is left out, not because it is disliked or despised. Many people of to-day may be said to be mildly interested in this curious survival of the past. Schoolmasters neglect it because the

time which religious teaching would require, can be given more usefully to some other subject; also, they maintain that it is no business of theirs to teach religion. But, since as a result of this attitude on the part of the teacher most ministers of religion are preaching to absent congregations, the question may be asked: whose duty is it to teach religion? During his years at school the growing youth develops his mind and body. In this double process he receives expert guidance from his master. His whole life experience is therefore either physical or mental. If, on entering the adult world, he at first tries to live a conventional Christian life, he soon finds that religion bores him; this cannot be held against him, because his training in this respect has been completely neglected.

Again, it must be said that the utilitarian curriculum cannot per se be blamed for the decay of religion. The natural sciences are a necessity in modern life. The curriculum is a powerful instrument in the hands of society wherewith it is able to train the young successfully to carry on its own work. The fact that modern society lays an undue stress upon the utilitarian subject matters of study may be considered as a coincidence. If an antagonism between the claims of the Churches and those of Society exists, it is due to misunderstood tendencies on both sides, and especially to the uncontrollable influences which bring about changes in human society. Neither side can be reproached with intransigence. But this does not mean that such an apparent antagonism can or should not be removed. On the contrary, in the Social Welfare State honest endeavours should be made by both sides to reach a peaceful settlement.

(2) Scientific Method.

Naturalism postulates empiricism; all knowledge comes through the senses; some may be indirectly acquired through the inner feelings which are dependent upon sense-perception.

The physical and biological sciences progressed along a path of wonderful experiments, of assumptions brilliantly defended, of discoveries and inventions, all of which tended to rivet man's eyes more and more to this world of matter and mind, and make the human

intellect assume colossal proportions. Man became capable of dissecting the smallest organism into its parts, to examine them, to separate substances into their elements, and recombine the elements to form new substances. By means of powerful instruments man can now observe the world of microscopic dimensions as well as that of the immense universe around the earth. The forces of nature have been harnessed to do his work; and behind all this activity the man of to-day sees the power which make it all possible: human intelligence, with its power of systematic analysis and synthesis, with its power to think and argue lucidly and logically, with its power to organise and arrange according to plan. To be a scientist one must possess all these powers. But without being a scientist one may adopt his method of inquiry, one may take his method into fields other than those of the natural sciences. Because the scientist is so important a man to-day, and because his interests have become the interests of almost every man in modern society, the method of the scientist has also become the method of the inquirer in almost every field of human experience.

This is particularly the case with religion, a field of experience which the naturalist of to-day likes especially to bring within the boundaries of his philosophy. To start with, he concedes the universality of the phenomenon; he even calls it an essential part of the human life. But, almost in the same breath, he maintains that it is awakened in man by his inner feelings and, thereafter, rests on and is conditioned by the proper functioning of the senses. This means that in the eyes of the naturalist, religious knowledge and religious experience alike are acquired through sense-perception. Consequently, religion with all its numerous implications is classified and systematised, by the reason of man. Natural religion is the result; a religion centred in the ego of the individual, with no supernatural element in it, lest the allegiance of man to the material world be divided by an attachment to certain beliefs stipulating existences, creatures and happenings of which science has no knowledge and which cannot be proved by the efforts of unaided human reason.

Most religious-minded people will agree with naturalism in its

first stipulation concerning religion, viz., that there is an emotional element in it. However, the emotions have per se nothing to do with religion. Beyond this, the Christian refuses to remain in naturalistic company, He maintains that the religious experience is not acquired from a contact of the senses with the material world, and that the inner feelings play but a minor part in the development of religious culture. Christian religion, being Man's relationship with God, is supernatural in character. The physical and the mental experiences help in this acquisition, but only as channels communicating with the soul.

The factual knowledge made available by the sciences proceeds from the material universe and comes to rest within man's life experiences; it helps him to adapt his environment to his mode of living, to force the riches and the powers of nature into his service. The whole cycle of the origin and goal of scientific knowledge lies within the scope of the senses and the mind. It is different with religious knowledge. It proceeds from another world and rests on a supernatural level within the soul and helps man in his ascent towards God.

From the above consideration it must be concluded that, although the scientific method has proved ~~x~~ successful in many ways, the assumption that it is of universal applicability cannot be defended reasonably in the field of religion. , It is quite true that the subject matter of the natural sciences should be approached in this spirit of analysis and systematisation, for physical phenomena are best studied by scientific means. Before however, using the method employed successfully in one study for the study of another subject, it is only reasonable to examine whether the two studies have common ~~x~~ elements, upon which the common method may be based. If no resemblance exists between the two subject matters, a new method of investigation and treatment must be found for the second one.

Between religion and the natural sciences there exist certain relations, if the former is taken in its broadest meaning. In its more specific sense, however, of being the relationship between man and God, religion is not in the same category as the

sciences. It deals with beliefs, with worship and with prayers, with the culture of the soul which is taken as given, while the natural sciences find their *raison d'être* in the establishing and proving the laws that govern the material universe. Religion works on the supernatural, science on the natural level of existence. The method applicable to scientific processes can, therefore, not be used in the religious process. The Christian experience cannot be compared with any other, it stands apart in its own order of things. This is what some exponents of modern education do not seem to realise. They would divide the whole human experience into two: physical and mental, and thus be at liberty to absorb religion in the teaching of literature and the sciences.

The issue between the two contending parties is whether education to-day should have a Christian foundation with religious teaching and what has been described as the culture of the soul, or whether it should be purely secular with moral and social training for basis. The struggle involves further the acceptance of either the scientific or the religious method in the culture of the soul. The modern school with its emphasis on the sciences teaches but one method, that of the scientist. For this reason religious culture in the State school is impossible, for it differs radically from that of body and mind. In the process of training the soul, the religious method is called for.

(3) Effects of this Education upon Child & Society.

The immediate objective of education is the temporal and spiritual welfare of the individual. The educand is the core around which is built the whole elaborate structure known as the educational system. The forces which are at work on Society in general will not lose their impetus while penetrating the outer walls of this system, but will certainly reach the inside, that is the great masses of children in the schools. To-day, Society is engaged in the production of the sciences; it is so absorbed in this task that but little time is devoted to culture and aesthetic pursuit. In education, Society has found the instrument necessary to regiment its youth for the purpose of continuing the task it has set itself.

But this task is concerned with temporal values only. The effect upon the child of a narrow utilitarian policy pursued by Society, leaves no doubt as to its nature in the mind of the Christian. He puts Christ's question " Can figs grow on thornbushes?" into modern terminology and makes it read " Can religion flourish in the present-day school?" Bearing in mind that religion is neither a conventional acceptance of some form of Christianity nor that "moral tone" striven after by some schools, the Christian observer is justified in saying that it is impossible for, the education in the modern Liberal State will have for effects upon the child;-

(a) A Critical Attitude of Mind.

The education provided for its children by the modern Social Welfare State, with its stress on the scientific method and its emphasis on utility, engenders and fosters a critical attitude. For purposes of secular studies this attitude is commendable when these studies prepare for the solution of problems met with in actual life. As a result, the adolescent and the adult of to-day are less gullible perhaps; in any case, they take very little for granted. They must see for themselves, investigate and analyse a proposition, and then draw their own conclusions. Moreover, a critical attitude is a powerful factor in character formation. Only what appears to be a certainty is accepted; this makes for all-round solidity and prevents a constant re-shuffling of man's whole attitude to life. In this case, transference of training has evidently taken place on a large scale. Unfortunately, however, this transference of training in critical attitude has been taken to other than the fields of physical and mental phenomena.

One unwarranted outcome of this critical attitude is a resentment against all authority. The only authority which seems to have escaped this resentment is the despotism of the sciences which gave it birth and growth. If the authority of the teacher is resented, he has himself to blame in his predecessors and the imperfect education which his pupils receive in the school. What concerns us here more questioned than the authority of the

teacher is the fact that even the spiritual authority of Christianity, through its priests and ministers, is resented and brought into doubt. The teachings of the Churches, the contents of the Bible, the Sunday morning sermon, are all brought into the searchlight of what is called rational thinking. They are analysed into minute parts which are then examined, as it were, under the microscope. And, because the modern analyst of God's word believes in the infallibility of his unaided reason, many teachings of the Church, many passages of the Bible are found to be lacking in something or other; they are turned down one by one, and of the little religious knowledge gathered during the childhood years less is left over when the process of critical examination has done its work.

Not that Christian religion does not brook investigation and criticism; it has been subjected to both for nineteen centuries. But never before has there been such a wholesale rejection of Christianity as to-day, churchmen assure us. The reason for this rejection or non-acceptance of Christianity is not far to seek. The earlier critics were Christians and they were, therefore, examining their own religion. The critics of to-day are not Christians, having received practically no religious training and approaching the religious experience from a materialist-utilitarian standpoint. Moreover, the former critics were men trained in thinking rationally. The children in our schools unconsciously adopt a biased attitude to every religious question and become unable to judge impartially on points of religious and moral observance. This prejudice in favour of immediate over ultimate values is slowly but surely instilled in them by the whole attitude of society towards Christianity. This religion has become the great piece of research in our modern times. It is spoken of, thought of, but not practised. Divided and split up, examined by untrained intelligences, balanced in the scale of prejudice and ignorance, it has been found wanting. Thus, the criticism to which Christian religion is now subjected is essentially destructive. And the child cannot help but adopt a similar attitude. The

critical is the only method of approach to a problem which he knows, it having been demonstrated successfully to him during the years of his formal education at school. Were the culture of his soul to receive the same attention as that of his body and mind, he would come to the conclusion that the religious experience cannot be approached as any other, that religious knowledge may not be examined in the same way as a geometrical proposition, and that the acceptance of Christianity rests on its own inherent lucidity and rightness and is based on spiritual reasons.

(b) Divorce of Religion and Morality.

In the previous chapter it has been pointed out that in its attempt to assume a semi-religious character naturalism professed adherence to Christian morality. Modern education being thoroughly impregnated with the philosophy of naturalism, it has endeavoured to do the same. When formal religious teaching became impossible in the undenominational State school, educational authorities introduced "moral teaching".

It is hard to say what exactly is meant by this "moral instruction" given in some modern State schools, and near to impossible to find rational grounds on which it can be based. For, Christian morality and Christian religion cannot be separated. Churchmen know this. Apparently, teachers also know it. This is borne out by the fact that when a few years before the last war, an Education Committee in England, charged with collecting the views of prominent teachers on moral instruction and training in English schools, it vouched the information that "teachers with remarkable unanimity volunteered their conviction that the root of all morality lies in religion and that to divorce the one from the other is impossible."

This fundamental principle must be kept in mind when the question of religion and morality is approached. By force of circumstance the tendency has arisen and increased in recent years to do away with direct religious teaching in the democratic State school and to train the children in morality through the indirect medium of the other branches of learning. Speaking on this point,

the headmaster of an English Public School said: "Evil will dawn the day for the moral state of this kingdom, when the state is forced to proclaim the statutable divorcement of simple Christian teaching from English schools of any grade, and when religion is officially declared an extra. There is at present the danger lest the State be forced to organise education no longer on an undenominational, but on a non-religious basis." (1) So far the State has not deemed it necessary to banish religion from the schools; for it has been forced out by the spirit of modern times referred to above. Education is not officially organised on a non-religious basis: this has been done by the schools themselves. The policy pursued by the schools has, in other words, done what the Liberal State could not do. As a result of the pressures at work upon society, the State was forced to have secular schools with freedom to include religion in the curriculum. The undenominational school, like a dutiful child of the spirit which called it into life, has produced, or rather has evolved into the school without religion.

Religion as an educating force has been gradually eliminated, so that to-day one can no longer speak seriously of religious life in the school. The training in Christian morality has for this very reason become an impossibility. Religion stands first; then come morality, which is strongly influenced by the former. This applies to every religio-moral system, but especially to the Christian in which morality rests entirely on religion. Divorced from this religion, Christian morality has neither basis nor sanctioning power; in fact, it has lost every hope for even a short survival. The separation of morality from religion could not have been possible at a time when sound religious instruction was given in the schools. For this reason is such a step not even contemplated in the church schools.

(1) H.B. Gray:—"Public Schools and the Empire".
Williams & Morgate, London, 1913.

The divorce was brought about by the necessity of supplying a substitute for religious teaching, when this could no longer be given properly. Then, it is true, this divorcement of morality from religion greatly accelerated the movement that was to oust religion almost completely from the school.

Morality consists in attributing the quality of good or evil to the actions of man. In a civilised community there exist a moral code which man may not disregard if he does not wish to incur the disfavour of his fellow men. This moral code is the product of man's interpretation of what is good and what is bad. In primitive society the good is associated with the things that tend to preserve the integrity of the tribe, while those actions which would endanger the common welfare or call the ire of the gods upon the tribe are termed immoral. The morality prevailing in those countries where Christianity has been received is not an arbitrary approval or condemnation of certain specified actions; its rules have resulted from the endeavour of man to confirm his conduct to the commandments of God and the precepts of Christ. It is, so to speak, a fruit of Christ's religion. And just as a fruit cannot exist except it be produced by a tree, so also is there no Christian morality in vacuo, that is, it cannot be without having been generated by Christian religion.

However, Christian morality can easily be taken away from Christian religion and be presented to men as an ideal worthy of their attention and efforts. This is precisely what modern society strives to do, not out of sympathy with the Christian religious ideal, but because Christian morality and Christian ethics are the best yet devised to maintain the steady humanising progress of mankind or, in a time of crisis, to prevent it from slipping back into barbarity and chaos. Purely selfish motives have actuated the State to base its system of laws upon Christian principles. From an economic and utilitarian point of view they were the best. It had its own preservation in mind rather than the ultimate spiritual welfare of the individual.

But the individual is also selfish, thinking of his rather

than the common good. Moral conduct is not always pleasant to human nature; at times it is definitely annoying, because of the necessity it imposes of foregoing an immediate pleasure for the sake of a vague idealism preached by the State. Eternal reward and eternal punishment are stipulated by the teaching of the Christian Gospel. But if the individual lacks acquaintance with the knowledge contained in this book and the firm belief in its being the word of God, because he has not developed his religious experience while at school, it is very probable that he will act immorally whenever such conduct yields pleasurable returns. The believing and practising Christian often acts immorally, although his actual fear of a very real and eternal hell fire must act as a tremendous restraint from such conduct. If in the face of such a preventative, human weakness is so great, it is only reasonable to assume that the man, without such a restraining influence acting upon his behaviour, will more readily fall into immoral ways. Again, many of the virtues such as honesty and charity, included in the "morality programme" of the undenominational school, may possess some power to appeal to the young; but the adolescent and the adult, whose reasoning power is not influenced by religious motives, will soon realise that in this life honesty and charity are often detrimental to one's getting on. Having been taught to see everything in the light of its immediate usefulness, the adult members of society will be honest and charitable and otherwise "virtuous" in so far as the action brings them nearer a utilitarian objective. Religion would make them prefer an eternal reward to a transitory satisfaction. But, in the absence of the religious motive, we cannot blame man for acting according to the dictates of his reason. Standards of values, though they be set by God, are no longer accepted as a universal ideal, once man has deprived them of their background and presents them as his own remedy against the woes of mankind.

From this consideration it may be concluded that the remedy to the present state of decay in the religious activities of our

schools will not be found in vague, unfounded, and meaningless moral instruction. This is a waste of time; it is putting the cart before the horse. Morality does not make man religious; it is religion which makes man moral. Especially in these days, when the morality abstracted from Christianity has degenerated into something bearing no resemblance to the original, is the approach to religious culture through morality impossible.

As to the effect of this divorce upon society it may be maintained that, since the influence of the schools on the capacity of the adolescent for citizenship is of undoubted importance, and since correct citizenship in a Christian country is greatly assisted by Christian morality, it would seem necessary, if not for the sake of the individual, then at least for the sake of the State, that religion coupled with morality should once more be reverted to as a socialising power.

(c) Disappearance of Religion.

In concluding this chapter it is maintained that, as a sequel to the two effects of modern State education upon the child already mentioned and as a result of the spirit by which this education is animated, the third and final effect upon most children is the disappearance of all religion.

One should really speak of the non-development of religion because, as a rule, the children in the State school do not lose their religion, but fail to become sufficiently interested in it to devote any length of time to its acquisition. The little religious knowledge acquired in the home and at school, the early religious practices and the emotional experience attached to the first assistances at divine service, are pushed out of their lives by the attitude towards religion unconsciously developed during the years at school. For, the emphasis put on utilitarian subjects, the exclusive use of the scientific method and the separation of morality from religion, involve the transference of an attitude of mind from the school to the pupil which is fundamentally different from that developed in the school where religious teaching has really religious observance as its aim.

The teaching of religious truths, if it is at all done, does not

necessarily lead to the culture of the soul if it is not accompanied by an insistence on religious living, just as lessons on morality do not necessarily make a man moral.

This attitude leads the pupils in the school, and through them the adults of society, to develop a conventional indifference in all matters pertaining to the culture of the soul. As a result of this attitude there has evolved in recent years the theory that it does not matter what one believes, or whether one believes anything at all.

Bibliography.

- "Medieval Religion", O. Dawson.
- "The Boundaries of Science", Macmurray.
- "Public Schools of the Empire", Gray.
- "An Autobiography", A Collingwood.

CHAPTER 5.

CATHOLIC EDUCATION.

University of Cape Town

CHAPTER 5.

CATHOLIC EDUCATION.

University of Cape Town

In Chapter 1 the tripartite psychology as professed by the Catholic Church was stated. The whole man comprises a body, a mind, and a soul. Education proposes to develop the full man. It must, therefore, include physical, mental, and religious culture. Because of the Christian belief that man's soul is immortal, and the fact that his body and mind are temporary existences, religious culture is to occupy first place in the deliberate attempt made by society to educate the young.

In the last two chapters it has been shown that the same forces which determined the stages of the development of the sciences ultimately determined the stages of development of society. The stage of development reached by modern society is characterised by an almost universal absorption of the human mind in the perfection of the physical and biological sciences. An outlook upon life has resulted from this application to matter and to natural phenomena which excludes the supernatural. It is certain that the subsequent stage in the development of society will show a spirit different from the present. Naturalism and the scientific method are at present features of our thinking and as such they react upon our educational theories and practices; but, while they have a place in any consideration of education to-day, they must not make possible the exclusion of a tension on the spiritual side which, from the Christian point of view, is the most important.

It having been determined that the school in the modern Liberal State does not provide a complete education, the following are the requirements from the Christian standpoint for that type of education which includes religious and moral training.

(a) The culture of the soul to be regarded as being of major importance. A religious atmosphere to pervade all school life.

(b) The teacher to be a Christian firm in his religious convictions, and morally of a high standard.

To be efficient, a reform must come from within. In the case of religious and moral training in the schools, enough has been said by persons both inside and outside the teaching profession. If a reform in this direction is really to come about, it rests with

the whole body of teachers to give religious culture its due share of attention, or with the higher authorities to make religious and moral teaching obligatory. The State must first awake to the deficiencies in the present educational system. This can be done only by putting aside, for the moment, immediate utilitarian considerations and examining how the absence of religion and morality in the great masses of the people will eventually affect the welfare and even the safety of the State itself. The modern educational situation must rouse the State to a definite consciousness of educational aims, and to search for correct methods. The doubt, whether religion in this age of science and of social reconstruction is sufficiently sure of its own aims to know what it wishes to teach, is overbalanced by considerations of historical continuity. Religion is an important part of the cultural inheritance to which each individual becomes entitled at birth. The scheme of the State has proved unsatisfactory from the religious standpoint because it has led, not to the teaching of the basic Christian truths, nor to the practice of religion, but rather to no religious teaching and no religious observance at all. Further, there are many signs that the purely naturalistic outlook upon life engendered by the rise of the sciences has not convinced the age. The great number of secret societies, of mystic brotherhoods, as well as the increased membership of at least one Christian Church, tend to bear out the last statement. Man can never be a materialist all his life long; there is too much of the supernatural in him. Direct appreciation of the value of religion carries with it, in a large proportion of the population, the readiness to assert the validity of religious education.

The Catholic Church has always shown this readiness and her adherents in many countries have been willing to uphold this attitude. At great cost and at great sacrifices to themselves they have maintained their own schools whenever the State did not provide for religious teaching adequate according to their principles. For all this they are bound to have solid reasons to give.

In this chapter, the Catholic School is presented as the type of school in which religious teaching and training in morality

occupy the foremost place in the curriculum. The reasons which have made the Catholic school necessary will be stated directly or will indirectly become apparent from a contrast between the method and substance of Catholic and secular education. It is in no way suggested that the State should model its schools entirely on the Catholic institution; this would be impossible. The purpose of this exposition will be served if the supporters of secular education, as provided in the State schools, having admitted the incompleteness of the present educational system, find in the Catholic school the means and the method whereby a good Christian up-bringing can be given to all our children.

A-The Theory of Catholic Education.

At the very outset it must be stated that Catholics are not opposed to the State system as such. If their demand for a complete education affecting body, mind and soul, were granted, they would be willing to merge their schools with those of the national system. Their contention is that an education which does not include religious and moral foundations is incomplete and inadequate. Therefore, as this essential is lacking in the system of the State, they feel bound in conscience to provide one of their own in which religion and morality will find their proper place. The claim of the Catholics is that religious and secular education cannot be divorced, education being a unitary process, but that they must go hand in hand in order that the future citizen may be properly trained to discharge his duties towards himself, the State and God. In the studies pursued in the Catholic schools the acquisition of other than religious knowledge is not neglected. This knowledge, however, is to serve as a basis to that higher ideal of education whereby the children are to become good and conscientious Christians.

The Catholic Church at its very inception inaugurated and for nineteen centuries has consistently maintained the religious principle in education. Her charter, as a teaching institution, is laid down clearly and concisely in the words of her Divine Founder, "Going therefore, teach ye all nations ---- teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you". While it is plain that this divine command refers primarily to the doctrine of

salvation, and consequently to the dissemination of religious truths, it nevertheless carries with it the obligation of insisting on certain principles and sustaining certain characteristics which have a direct and decisive bearing on all educational problems. The great principle that underlies all educational endeavour is that of the dignity of man. This dignity of man is due solely to his possession of a soul and not to any other kind of superiority which he possesses over the other creatures. From the pulpits and rostrums the Church has constantly taught that just as surely as man has God as his origin so certainly is God his ultimate end. She has made it quite plain, by her doctrine of salvation, her teachings on the sacraments, and her irrevocable decisions in matters of faith and morality, that the soul of man, which reflects the very likeness of God, is immortal, indestructible and is, therefore, more important than his body, the mortal and perishable element of his composition. The soul is given supernatural life through Baptism and thereafter its inherent qualities are brought out and embellished by the grace of God through the reception of the other sacraments. There is, therefore, over and above the cognitive and appetitive functions, the capacity to function as sons of God, which must be considered in the education of man. This is not a metaphor but a reality. The Church consistently teaches that life here below gets its highest value by serving as a preparation for the life to come. The Church insists that no system of education is "a preparation for complete living" which ignores man's ultimate end. It is precisely this completeness in teaching, in harmonising all truth, in elevating all human relationships, in leading the individual soul back to God, which is the essential characteristic of Christianity as an educational influence.

The fundamental truths concerning the origin, the nature and the destiny of man form the basis upon which the Church has formulated and promulgated her educational principles. These principles have been clearly stated in the encyclical letters of Popes Pius IX and Leo XIII, especially in "Quum non sine", of the 14th July, 1864, "Summi Pontificatus", of the 20th August, 1880, and they have been re-affirmed by their successors in various

occasions.

First Principle:- To impart knowledge or develop mental efficiency without building up moral character, is not only contrary to psychological law, but is also fatal to the individual and society. No amount of intellectual attainment or culture can serve as a substitute for virtue.

In various places in this thesis reference has been made to the ultimate effect upon individual and society of the modern neglect of early training in religious-moral habits. To avoid repetition, this first principle will be examined only on the statement that 'to impart knowledge or develop mental efficiency without building up moral character, is contrary to psychological law'.

Catholic psychology and secular psychology are diametrically opposed; it follows that Catholic education and secular education must be fundamentally at variance.

With a few exceptions, modern psychologists (1) deny mind and soul, and determine all human experience in terms of mechanism and behaviour. The instruments of the mind are examined and analysed, but the mind as a whole is denied its reality. Beyond this recognition of the functioning aspects of the mind lies nothing for the modern psychologists. Having thus brought man down to the level of other functioning material organisms, they find it not incongruous to shelve religion as a thing apart. As a rule they are quite frank and confess that it is not their task to treat of either mind or soul. But by their attitude to the mind, which is a functioning instrument of the soul, they render the above confession quite insincere, as it is tantamount to saying that they do not concern themselves with what does not exist. Reason is to them only one of the products of sense. Morality is evolved out of animal emotions. Almost all their logic is induction from material particulars. Abstraction and generalisation are supposed to spring

(1) W.G.H. Sprott:- "Mind" Vol. 49 p. 63

Spearman:- "Psychology Down the Ages." Ch. 4

only from multiplied observation. Thus their whole work tends more and more to begin from below. Their highest thinkers are scientists, and "mere" philosophy is despised, because it is not empirical. Even morality is taught from below, and the ethereal virtue of chastity, for instance, is supposed to arise from a correct knowledge of physiology.

By putting a few psychological notions together, we can construct a kind of map of human nature, and we shall then see the agreements and differences of Catholic and secular psychology.

Beginning from below, it is obvious that we have an organic existence of which we are only partly or dimly conscious. We become aware of it through the nutritive, augmentative, and reproductive functions of the body. These issue in activities which we call appetites and passions. Thence we rise to the distinct sense, whereby we gather knowledge with the threefold net of sense; memory, perception and attention. Upon sense are based the activities which we call emotions. Then, on the intellectual side of feeling, partaking of both, we have the aesthetic capacities, also threefold, in memory, perception and production. Upon this again are based the art-instincts of our nature. And finally, rising fully into the regions of cognition and cognation, we have the threefold powers or rational memory, reason itself, and moral action. And this rational side of our being expresses itself in the activities which are called the intellectual and moral appetites.

Here it would seem we might stop. Man is a rational animal and we have planned out both his animal and rational functions. The accepted books of secular psychology certainly do not give a hint of anything beyond. Even up to this everybody need not agree with psychology, but beyond this there is no question of agreement or disagreement for the Catholic, for here the limits of secular psychology have been reached. And of course, secular educationists follow suit. If they can train the body, the senses and the mind, and can give culture and character, they have achieved their object.

On the other hand, the Catholic recognises a higher aim

than this. For this secular aim, from the Christian standpoint, omits the highest objective altogether. This is clearly brought home to every Catholic by the consideration of the virtues which correspond to the mental activities we have so far laid down. The passions are ruled by temperance, the emotions by fortitude, the intellectual and moral appetites by prudence and justice. These are the four cardinal virtues which go to perfect humanity. So far the educationist is right; if his education up to this mark is perfect and has perfect results, he will have produced a perfect human being. The Catholic, however, looks beyond and is not satisfied with this. Not because he does not aim at perfect humanity, but because he knows that human nature cannot become perfectly human without first becoming divine. In other words, it is only in the light of the theological virtues of faith, hope and charity that the cardinal virtues can have their perfect work. Every Catholic will therefore at once ask, what in the educational system corresponds to these virtues. This is the main point at issue. Secular psychology, and therefore secular education, practically ignore the whole spiritual side of humanity by ignoring these virtues.

Therefore, to complete our scheme, above rational memory, which is mainly concerned with the orderly preservation of principles, connected but detailed, there is the spiritual memory which may also be defined as the continuous conscious life of the mind, a power which never so fully finds its feet among the currents of this life as in the life of "recollection" in the presence of God.⁽¹⁾ Above the reason, which is mainly occupied in comparing and arranging things from below, there is the understanding or intellect which looks into the heart of things from above. And above the mere rational aspect of moral action, towers the spiritual will, which never finds the fulness of its freedom except in the freedom wherewith Christ has made us free. Memory

(1) This point has been developed in Chapters 1 and 11.

is the home of hope; understanding of faith; will of charity. And upon this, the highest portion of our soul, are based those activities which form our strongest and most absorbing appetites, instincts, emotions, passions, all in one, and which we may sum up in one word as the Godward tendency.

Let this be fully understood. Although this spiritual aspect of our nature finds its fullest expression in religion, that does not mean to say that it is absent when religion is absent. Man is a spiritual being whether he likes it or not; and secular education ignores the fact.

It is the more important to remember this in matters of elementary education, because the spiritual faculties seem to awaken before the rational. It is a long time before the child can reason properly, but he soon shows signs of spiritual insight. By the loving kindness of God, a child knows how to believe and hope and love before he knows how to sin. And under the influence of Grace many persons have reached a high level of spiritual intelligence long before their rational powers had any chance of displaying themselves. Ruskin says somewhere, "Childhood often holds a truth with its feeble fingers, which the grasp of manhood cannot retain -- which it is the pride of utmost age to recover." And the Christian cannot forget that our Lord thanked His Father because things hidden from the wise and the prudent, and the secular, had been revealed to babes. Therefore already in the infant school, Catholics begin from above as much as from below. Like everybody else, they give their children games to train their bodies, kindergarten exercises and reading and writing. To this they also add the catechism, so that the earliest use of reason may be directed towards Almighty God. Yet teaching the catechism is not teaching religion, as some people suppose. It is only teaching religious knowledge, which is a very different thing. What then do they do for the spiritual training of childhood? They teach them to live lives of prayer. Intercourse with the world of grace and with God is interwoven with all the actions of their school life, as it ought to be also in their own homes. Children take to prayer easily; the possibilities of the higher

life in their innocent little souls would astonish those who have never observed children closely.

Now this result cannot be obtained, either in the elementary or in the secondary school, by an occasional half hour class. The religious atmosphere, must be present and permanent. For this reason Catholic education is so much in the hands of Religious Orders, bodies of men and women who, having consecrated themselves to God, bear about them a perpetual odour of sacrifice. And there is a further special appropriateness here. In the religious life, the threefold virtues of faith, hope and charity and therefore the whole spiritual portion of the soul, is perfected by the threefold virtue and vow of poverty, chastity and obedience. Now let it be observed that these are just the essential virtues of childhood. The vows of the Religious are in all their extent the strict obligation of the child; and it is immaterial whether we say that the child must be as obedient, chaste and poor as the nun, or that the nun must be as obedient, chaste and poor as the child. That we must be as little children in order to enter the kingdom of Heaven reaches both ways; it tells us that the spiritual are childlike and that children are spiritual. Thus it is the Catholic custom to provide the children with a kindred atmosphere for their early growth.

The writer is aware of the criticism which will maintain that this is conditioning. But how can the psychologist speak of soul conditioning when he does not believe in one? The Catholic believes in the human soul, just as much as he believes in free will. He does not condition man's will and soul, but trains them and cultivates them that they may function normally.

It is upon considerations such as these that the Catholic Church bases her scheme of higher education as well. A reference to the curriculum of the Catholic College will show what position is assigned to the Physical Sciences; to the Arts; to the Abstract Sciences; logic, mental and moral philosophy, theology and religion; and how endeavours are made to evoke enthusiasm, ingenuity, originality, character and sanctity, which embraces them all. In fact this gives a sketch of a Catholic University. A Catholic may

of course specialise in any way he likes, but he is taught to remember the essential relations of things and not arrogate to himself the results of the higher branches while he chooses the lower. A knowledge of biology does not make him a theologian, as is so often thought by the non-Catholics. So long as he relates his specialisation to the spiritual, he will avoid a crude mechanistic outlook and will exemplify the fact that the highest results of education are always attainable per viam connaturalitatis.

In order to reach the Christian ideal it is not necessary that man be thoroughly acquainted with the natural and the mental sciences. This is in any case impossible. On the other hand, specialisation in any science is a purely intellectual process and need not be excluded from the Catholic School. The sciences deal with material, with functioning organisms and with abstractions. Their spheres of activity lie in the world of matter, and of conjecture. Religion has for its objective the establishment of correct relationships between man and God, and between man and society. At no point should the two processes clash; nor will they clash if the scientific and the religious methods are used in their respective fields of application. Because of the distinction made between religious and mental culture in Catholic education, it follows that religious culture is of such a nature that it need not stultify the culture of the mind.

The Catholic school has, however, to be careful in the matter of philosophies. When the child begins to build up his Weltanschauung it should not be influenced by a one-sided conception of the worth of this life. After all, the main immediate problem of education is the "here and now", and the solution must not be shirked because of a drilled-in notion that life is short and that eternity will never end. Other than supernatural considerations must necessarily enter into one's philosophy of life, which should embrace both the temporal and the after-death existence of man.

Here then we may stop and summarise. As stated before, the complaint of the Catholics against secular education is that it

is partial and defective, resulting in trained intelligence, without religious background. Even if thought be aimed at merely for its own sake, it always wastes itself away in the wilderness of doubt. The Catholics complain moreover that the highest and strongest passion of the soul, the "God-ward" tendency, is completely ignored and therefore undirected, leading the soul to practically as dark an idolatry as any paganism the world has seen. Undirected energies mean spoiled characters. It has been well said that one aim of education should be not to let one Giotto be lost among the shepherd boys. Secular education is losing many spiritual Giottoes to the world. And this because of its wrong conception of man's growth, which is from the surface and strikes at once downwards and upwards.

If the Catholic Church with this theory of education were to adopt the secular method, it would establish in the soul of its members a conscious inconsistency which would eventually spoil both their religion and the best results of their education. For this reason Catholics say to the supporters of secular education: "Act by all means as you think, but leave us free to act as we think. It is a pity we do not all think alike; but since we do not, and since all are agreed that thought should be freed, we ought at least not be hampered in trying to act logically in accordance with our thoughts".

Second Principle:- Religion must be an essential part of education for on it morality is based. For this reason religious instruction should form not merely an adjunct to teaching in other subjects, but should be the centre around which these subjects are grouped, and the spirit by which they are permeated. Sound moral instruction is impossible without religious education.

The tripartite psychology of the Catholic Church lays a greatest stress on the soul of man. Every man receives his soul from God and it is therefore part of him right from the beginning of life. Man without a soul is unimaginable. This soul has a specific function, namely, to bring man back to God from whom he was separated in the sin of his first parents. The soul alone is capable of this function, because it is spiritual in

essence. Neither the body nor the mind can take over this work of the soul.

Education is the deliberate effort on the part of the adult society to make the young capable of discharging correctly the functions of the whole man. These are the organic functions of the body, the mental functions of thinking and reasoning, and above all - the Catholic Church maintains - the spiritual function of the soul. Complete education must make adequate provision for the culture of the agents responsible for the three functions of man. It must comprise physical, mental and religious culture. To neglect one agent, to minimise the importance of one culture, is wrong, but especially so with that of mind and soul, for these agents are really the distinctively human in man and raise him above the animal.

The culture of the soul can proceed only by way of a progressive religious life, which develops in intensity through the acquisition of religious knowledge, the participation in worship, and the co-operation with the grace of God. The first two factors, religious knowledge and religious observance, are learned in the early years of life. Most of these early years are spent at school. It is therefore, the duty of the school to provide for an uninterrupted growth of the spiritual life by instructing the children in the truths of religion and training them in the observance of the Commandments.

The observance of the Commandments leads to morality. In the eyes of the Catholic Church the two are synonymous and for this reason she holds that morality is based on religion and that the two cannot be separated. She teaches that without religion, morality is impossible, and that without morality there can be no safe foundation to any human institution. Education makes for the maintenance and proper functioning of human institutions, from the State down to the least important. It may not, therefore, confine itself to the imparting of knowledge concerning these institutions, but must assure their stability by training man to devote the energies spent thereon upon their proper ends. These ends are mostly moral aims. Education must, then, train in morality. And this is possible only through training in religious

thought and practice.

This is precisely what Catholic education sets out to do. It does not rest satisfied when the culture of body and mind are attended to, but proceeds one step further to attend to the culture of the soul as well. Whereas, in many modern State schools religion is looked upon as an extra, the Catholic school places it in the centre of all its activities. From this place of eminence religion throws light upon all the other studies, which are thus prevented from casting doubts upon religious issues. While in the State school the children are unconsciously made to understand that what really matters is a pass in the final examination and a good position in life, in the Church school the importance of loyalty to the Christian faith and to Christian morality is stressed. The natural sciences and other subjects matters are not neglected, it is true, but they are not allowed to assume proportions in the eyes of the pupils which make fade into insignificance a subject which they need not "take".

Third Principle:- A system of education which harmoniously joins the intellectual moral, and religious elements, furnishes the strongest motives for conduct, and the noblest ideals for imitation.

The Catholic school can produce good scientists and good philosophers because of its tenets and premises. It holds that the sciences can be no hindrance to the development of the religious life and that philosophy is the queen of human achievements. Because of the usefulness of the natural sciences through their application to the life of the body, the Church has always encouraged those engaged in scientific work and has publicly expressed her admiration for those who achieved outstanding results. As to philosophy, the Catholic Church sees in it the valiant effort of human reason to treat with universals and pure values, an endeavour worthy of the highest regard. The intellectual analysis by which the scientist achieves his ends is not incompatible with the creative, synthetic method of religion. The two can exist side by side in the same intellect, although they can not be used for other than their specific ends.

Because of the compatibility of the two methods, Catholic

education provides for mental culture to the same extent as is done by secular education. Its chief aim, however, is to develop the spiritual capacities of the pupils. And, although this concentration may have a beneficial effect upon the mind in all its extent, it will certainly happen that students in the State school beat Catholic students in the sciences or excel them in culture, simply because they have devoted all their time to these achievements. Over-development of the muscles is a deformity; much more so is over-development of sense observation or aesthetic sense occasioned by too narrow and concentrated specialisation. The pupils from the Catholic schools may lose now and then in a partial test; but they shall certainly not lose in the wide test of humanity, if they are faithful to their principles.

It remains to be seen now how this system of education furnishes the strongest motives for conduct. The aim of the Catholic school is to provide the child with those experiences which are calculated to develop in him such a knowledge, appreciations and habits as will yield a character equal to the contingencies of fundamental Christian living. The conduct of the Christian is determined in the following way:- First, the intellect reasons out a mode of behaviour, one that is suitable to the situation. Sound reasoning on the part of the individual presupposes intellectual training. Both the Catholic and the modern public school offer this to their pupils by due application to scientific and other studies. When a mode of conduct has been decided upon, morality intervenes either to approve or disapprove. A certain course of action may be of immediate usefulness, but it may at the same time be immoral. Training in morality is therefore necessary to every man to enable him to decide between good and bad conduct. The innate conscience and the deliberate instruction in Christian morality given in most schools are sufficient for this purpose. So far, then, Catholic and State education offer the same guidance in conduct. It is on the third stage that divergence occurs. When morality has approved or disapproved of a mode of behaviour a third element enters into action by sanctioning the decision of morality. This is the religious element. Utilitarian

considerations will often make man disregard the verdict of morality. Religion offers the necessary incentive to act in accordance with that verdict. Catholic education trains in religious knowledge and observance; it does not leave morality unsupported. The knowledge (the intellectual element), the appreciations (the moral element), and the habits (influenced by the religious element), which the student acquires in the Catholic school form, therefore, the best foundation to a strong character. This character, fostered by truth which comes from revelation, from observation, and from experience, will offer the maximum guarantee of correct conduct in every eventuality.

Conclusion: The Catholic school, professes to teach the true philosophy, the true interpretation of history, the true background and reason of the Christian Faith. Such instruction is necessary to enable a Christian to remain a Christian. The way of the humble soul is as serene and lovely as ever, for its trust lies in God, the one unchangeable Reality. Not so serene is the way of the soul when the true background and reason of the Faith are unknown to him; this is especially the case to-day, when true values are no longer regarded as being superior to fanciful, ephemeral theories called into existence by what is termed "free thinking". Men with little religious experience, but with a strong tendency towards naturalism, developed by an over-emphasis on the scientific method and by an exclusive cultivation of the intellect, become sceptics. Thus while the education received in the public school does not prepare man for his religious conflicts in later life, the Catholic school imparts the Faith, with its beauty, its splendid traditions and its light and strength. And this Faith, it may be taken, has been known to make men superlatively happy, and superlatively good.

Looking at the Catholic and the State schools as educational systems in the broader meaning of education, they do not appear to be rivals. To be sure both aim at education. But one aims exclusively at an immediate and worldly goal, the other at an ultimate goal as well. One busies itself with shadows, like Plato's inhabitants of the cave; the other with the Great Reality also. One teaches no God, or neglects Him; the other tries to draw the

soul out towards Him. One teaches a sort of humanistic religion; the other teaches a divine religion. One is largely a laboratory of scientific guesswork; the other a stronghold of the Faith. If one could say that the Catholic school teaches the whole truth, and the secular school does not, one could possibly avoid a distasteful distinction. The two institutions move in opposite directions. They may compete in the sense that both hold up their systems as the right ones and that both seek students. But as systems of education preparing the soul for its normal function, they do not compete. One places spiritual values first; the other neglects or ignores them.

It may seem very unfashionable and other-worldly on the part of the Catholics to argue in this manner for their schools, but it is no less correct even if it does introduce those somewhat embarrassing elements of personal conduct and of eternal salvation. The Christian, however, does not think such an argument to be old-fashioned, nor are these matters disturbing to him. Catholics and such Protestants as hold to Christian religion give the answer to the question: "Why the Church school in our modern times?". Because many people still insist on having their children educated in a Christian atmosphere, taught the truths of Christian religion, and trained in religious and moral practices.

B. METHOD OF CATHOLIC EDUCATION.

From what has been said in Section A it becomes clear that the approach made to total education by the Catholic school cannot be that of the secular school. In Catholic education, religion is kept in the foreground of the child's consciousness, and the secular curriculum assumes a character of secondary importance. This attitude to the educative process has characterised Catholic education for centuries. No specific method has been imposed on the Catholic educator by the Church, to be followed out in every detail and in the same manner in every country. As a matter of fact, the Church has been concerned with method only, in so far as she gave her approval for its use in the schools. The Jesuits

had theirs given to them by their founder and his early companions. Their method electrified the world of education by its efficiency. The various Christian Brotherhoods received their methods from St. John Baptist de La Salle, one of the most eminent educationists of the 17th. century. St. Peter Fourier drafted a constitution on which the various Teaching Congregations of Sisters modelled their method of instruction.

(1). - Disciplinary. The Catholic method, under its various forms, has often been the subject of controversy. The main objection raised against it is that it advocates a discipline which is too strict in its application and too narrow in its aims.

The discipline which the Catholic Church exercises over thought is not a limitation on the intellectual activity of its members, but the means of enabling that activity to be of real value. This activity is mainly concerned with the knowledge, revealed and speculative, of God. And since our knowledge of God must necessarily be very obscure and limited, unless we be given some sort of direct information, the ruling of the Church in this matter is authoritative. The Catholic Church claims to have received from Christ Himself the right of interpretation of all religious truth contained in the Revelation. She acts in accordance with this power when exercising control over all speculation concerning matters of Faith and morals. In all other departments she gives the individual complete freedom. Moreover, Catholic theology and its complementary philosophy have remained substantially the same throughout the ages; yet the Church has never ceased to be vital and vigorous, and to attract the attention and inquiry of all sorts and conditions of men and to convert, ^{to} her faith many who by tradition or temperament were originally hostile. From age to age the Church seems to generate new life and to evoke from the human mind new activities. And this is due to the fact that freedom of thought is permitted within the framework of authority outlined above.

One purpose of Catholic education is to impart to the children together with a knowledge of their religion an unquestioning obedience to the decisions made by the Church. By virtue of its

very complexity, religion needs a central authority in order to keep it uniform in teaching, and to prevent the individual from setting his authority over that of God, as happens so frequently in the private interpretation of the Bible. Moreover, in every human institution we find a central authority with whom lies the final say in matters vitally affecting its existence. The Church is then justified in exercising a disciplinary vigilance over those sayings and writings of man which deal with matters upon which she has already pronounced herself.

(2). - Dogmatic. Many non-Catholics agree that religious teaching should be given in the schools. The point on which they differ from the Catholic attitude is well made in the following objection often made against religious teaching in the Catholic school: 'It is your method of teaching to which we - the non-Catholics - object; you should not teach one view more than another; you should leave your children to make up their minds for themselves

Were this criticism levelled against philosophy or any of the other speculative sciences, it would be quite reasonable. In these fields the findings of several men need not coincide, and yet each one may be satisfied that his interpretation of a particular question is the right one. It appears reasonable to him and he is, therefore, justified in discarding the findings of other people. In the field of the empirical sciences such an attitude is unjustifiable. Certain theories of the past have, no doubt, been disproved by further investigation, but this fact does not warrant a critical attitude towards every statement made in physics or chemistry for instance. When a fact has been conclusively proved, it should be accepted by all men. For this reason, when teaching grammar, arithmetic, and most other subjects, the teacher does not give his viewpoint first, and then those of other men. A proposition in geometry is stated and then proved. The children are not asked their opinion as to the validity of the proof; they would be foolish to entertain some after-thought that the proof might be wrong all the same.

Now, to the Christian, his religion falls into this category of established facts. For it has been given to him by God Himself

and man must take it as God gave it to him, or leave it altogether. Within limits, however, it is possible to understand and sympathise with the theory advanced by non-Catholics, if put forward by one who believes that truth appears in different forms to different people and who does not therefore think it of high importance to which, among competing interpretations, the children come. To such an objection the Catholics can only answer that such was not the teaching of Christ. The truths of the Christian religion are the same for all Christians and Christ's command cannot be ignored. He said: Go ye into the whole world and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be condemned." In face of such a plain command the Christian dare not do otherwise than teach dogmatic truth. The Catholic schools would deserve to be condemned if it could be proved that they concealed or slurred over the difficulties of the Christian Revelation. It would be a foolish policy if they did so, and it can be taken for certain that they do not. On the other hand, the secular schools are in a different position altogether.

In them the masters do not know what the religious views of their pupils and their parents are, and sometimes they do not dare to take the risk of putting 'ideas' into their pupil's head. The result is that they evade the discussion of such subjects. At a Catholic school the teacher knows what he believes and why he believes it; he accepts the validity of the appeal to reason; he knows what the parent wishes his child to be taught. The result is that, where at the one there is evasion and platitude, at the other there is definite, dogmatic teaching in all matters concerning faith and morals.

(3). - Religious Observance. Yet, the Catholic Faith has not only to be learnt, it must also be practised. It is not in his words but in his actions that a man professes his religion. A mere intellectual acceptance of the fundamental truths of Christian religion is not the aim of Catholic education; Catholicism being above all a practical religion for everybody, its followers must have faith and charity which manifest themselves through

their conduct towards God, themselves and their neighbours. And more important than any course of apologetics, more compelling than any argument to establish and prove the veracity and divinity of the Christian religion is the atmosphere in which the Catholic schoolboy lives. His masters are men who have bound themselves by the vows of poverty, chastity and obedience to the service of God and their fellow men. That is to say, they have given up, in some cases, it may be, great wealth or the prospect of a brilliant career; in all cases the normal comforts of the family. The atmosphere of the Catholic school is not one of priggishness, and the life of every day is filled with its petty jokes at the little idiosyncracies of those masters. Yet, whatever casual chatter may suggest, no pupil can seriously fail to understand that here is a life that is not chosen for the fun of it. These lives have been chosen for the sake of Jesus Christ and His religion, and the lesson which the children learn from them is that His is a cause great enough to be worthy of sacrifices. The pupils go out from school, having learnt that theirs is a religion which demands of them sacrifices - of their masters the particular sacrifices of the religious life, of all of them, whatever their fortunes, sacrifices of one sort or another.

At the Catholic school teaching and practice of religion go forward side by side. Mass, of course, occupies there the place which is taken in Protestant schools by the morning or evening service. At all Catholic schools the pupils attend Holy Mass as often as possible and Benediction on Sundays and certain week-days. At the beginning of the scholastic year, they make a retreat for spiritual exercises during which time they are reminded of the proportionate values and ultimate purpose of their life. Many schools have societies or guilds, to which pupils are elected when they attain a certain seniority. Boys play whatever part they can in the religious life of the Church by serving at the Ceremonies in the Sanctuary, by guarding the Blessed Sacrament on exposition days or at the Corpus Christi processions. In the latter half of Holy Week all normal school life is suspended and the pupils are taken to the parish churches to assist at the impressive ceremonies

which are symbolic re-enactments of the tremendous mysteries of the first Holy Week. Right through the year there are the many religious festivities, holidays of obligation in some cases, when the great events of Christ's life on earth are vividly brought before the pupils by the liturgy of the day, and a talk or a sermon on the event commemorated. Besides all this there are many old customs which unite in countless little ways to remind the pupils that the service of religion is ultimately the main *raison d'être* of their school.

The ordinary pupil is almost without exception enormously grateful for the good fortune which is his in receiving a Catholic upbringing. He is intensely proud of his religion. Nevertheless, it would be false to pretend that each time he is in church, he is in a condition of spiritual ecstasy. There are of necessity many little distractions while he is trying to concentrate upon the significant religious service at which he is assisting, for there is the day's work and the day's fun in his mind just as in that of any other boy. Again, the Catholic pupil understands that he is under obligation to learn as much about his religion as he is capable of learning. But it would be false to pretend that apologetics dominate his mind to the exclusion of more normal topics.

(c). - Contents of Catholic Education. The Catholic school is conducted primarily in the interests of the children; the secondary aim, permanent membership of the Church, is usually attained as a concomitant of the first. Education is the process of leading the child to the full and right use of the natural powers of man so as to derive therefrom welfare and happiness here and hereafter. The natural endowments to be unfolded and perfected by instruction and by training, although affected conjointly by the process of culture, are to be classified as corporal, mental, moral and religious.

(1) - Physical. To the training of the body by way of gymnastic and sport, the Catholic school gives just as much attention as the average secular school which does not make a fetish of this part of education.

(2) - Intellectual. Grammar, mathematics, science, mechanics, engineering, medicine, and philosophy, represent the unflagging striving of man to raise himself above his animal nature. Philosophy especially stands for man's endeavour to leave the things of earth far behind him and work his way up towards the Good, the Absolute God. Now, throughout the ages, and especially in those ages when the ordinary man of the world cared very little for intellectual attainments, the Church has championed these sciences, these efforts of man to raise himself above the animal level. Knowing that the findings in these fields of knowledge have become man's by virtue of his mental endowments, the Catholic school does all it can to keep alive the sacred flame of man's own knowledge.

(3) - Moral. In this same school, the pupils learn more than the natural sciences, they acquire more than fluency of speech, they are taught more than to reason logically. Their natural endowments making for morality are also cultivated. Morality or imputability of merit or demerit, belongs to every deliberate thought, desire, word, action or omission of man because of conscience and free will. Man's will, the Catholic teacher assures his pupils, fails only through man's weakness. Man is placed by his Creator in the hands of his own counsel, not in the hands of his environment; before him is life and death, whichever he will shall be given to him. By reason and by conscience men know the course of duty to themselves and to others, the course leading to righteousness and peace; but they are free to follow this path of blessedness or some other less trying or more attractive as dictated by self-love. Training the reason of man only will never lead to morality; his conscience cannot be left out of the process of total education. Conscience tells man when he acts contrary to the commandments of God. These commandments comprise the ethical and moral system of Christian religion. If the conscience is neglected and allowed to become warped, it ceases to function normally. As a result, morality loses its sanctioning powers whereon to base its teachings. It is for this reason that the Catholic school cannot approve of the tendency to separate

morality from religion. Hence one of its main aims is to build up in its pupils a sound conscience, through religious teaching and practice, so that Christian morality may be, not only clearly conceived by them, but also possess an appeal strong enough to secure for it authority and permanency.

(4). - Religious Knowledge. Knowing that "the just man lives by Faith" the Catholic educator carefully explains the summary of Christian belief and ensures that it is learnt by heart and repeated at least once every day. Thus the child is exercised in acts of faith in every article of the Creed; God the Creator and Supreme Lord, the Blessed Trinity, the Incarnation of God the Son, the Virgin Mother, the life of Jesus Christ, His passion and death, His resurrection from the dead and ascent into Heaven, the future judgement of the good and the bad, the Holy Spirit and the Catholic Church, the union of all Saints, the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the dead, as to their bodies and reunion of them with their own immortal souls, Heaven for the good and Hell for the wicked in life Everlasting. In this way every child at the Catholic school knows at a very early age what his religion asks him to believe. But the adult man, due to the weakness of his nature and the many fallacious conceptions of religion the modern world has popularised, will easily fall away from the beliefs of his childhood, unless there be in his life some power-station, some strength giving source, to which he can flee in time of necessity to find new energy in his lifelong battle against the powers from below. And because his beliefs are not in themselves a sufficient safeguard of his religion, the Catholic child also learns of the means which the Church has put at his disposal to preserve the life of his soul intact. The participation in these means, which will be mentioned now, may account for the fact that the number of Catholic children who abandon their religious practice on leaving school is just as negligible as the number of children coming from secular schools who remain active members of their various Protestant Churches. The words of the Church reveal how it is possible for a Catholic to remain a Christian at all times and under any conditions. "The doctrine of sacramental grace and the regular

reception of these channels of the graces of redemption, preceded by worthy preparation, enables the faithful to realise the nature of that spiritual life by which we are adopted children of God and co-heirs of "Heaven together with Christ our Saviour." These channels of grace are called the Sacraments.

Received into the Christian Church by Baptism, Catholics remain members of that Church through a worthy reception of the other sacraments. Most of the average Catholic's knowledge of his religion centres in these means to remain faithful. Faith is a gift of God given to every Christian when the waters of Baptism cleanse him from original sin. This gift may be lost; it is, so to say, thrust upon us, but we are free to accept or to deny it, when we are old enough to reason for ourselves. In order to keep it, God's assistance is necessary. This help is given through the reception of the sacraments. The Catholic child is carefully prepared for his Confirmation, when the Holy Ghost strengthens all his spiritual make-up. In later years some young men receive Holy Orders, if they choose the priesthood as their vocation. Those who prefer the family life have its happiness enhanced, its obligations sweetened, its burdens lightened, by the sacrament of Matrimony. And finally, when life's term draws nigh, Extreme Unction is administered to the dying Catholic. At school the child learns all about these sacraments: what special graces they confer and how they are to be received. But by far the most important in every Catholic's life are the two sacraments of Penance and Eucharist. These two are special features of the Catholic religion, occupy also the most important place in the religious instruction given at school. In them lies the secret of the Catholic Church's constant power to generate new life, to make her children faithful in the practice of their religion, to make saints of all classes and conditions of men.

Bibliography.

Report of "The National Catholic Educational Association
of the U.S.A., 1932."

Encyclical Letters of Pope Pius XI and others.

"The Catholic Way in Education", W.J. McGucken, S.J.

"A Catholic Catechism of Social Questions". T.J. O'Kane.

University of Cape Town

CHAPTER 6.

OF THE STUDY OF THE BIBLE.

University of Cape Town

OF THE STUDY OF THE BIBLE.

Introduction.

Having examined the state of decay into which religious teaching has fallen in many modern State schools, and having mentioned some of the reasons given to justify the present-day neglect of religion in education, it is now proposed to deal with the study of the Bible.

In the preceding chapter Catholic education has been discussed in broad outline. From what was said it can be seen that Catholics rely to a great extent on the study of Holy Scriptures in order to achieve the predetermined ends of their education. In the books of the Old and New Testament are contained the knowledge, the counsels, and the morality necessary for a good Christian life.

Protestants rely entirely and solely on the Bible, for in it they find everything necessary for the culture of their souls. Because the Holy Book is of paramount importance to every Christian, its proper study must be considered an absolute necessity. Without a knowledge of Christ's religion it is impossible to be a Christian. All Christian Churches meet here on a common basis, although they may have different ways of approaching the study of the Bible. For these reasons, this chapter is written with a threefold objective in view:-

- (a) To indicate a method for the study of the Bible.
- (b) To point out differences between the Catholic and the Protestant approach.
- (c) To demonstrate that the Protestant approach is such as to favour religious teaching in the undenominational State school.

NATURAL RELIGION.

As far as is known to the adult world, the child is born without any conscious ties of relationship between himself and God. If in later years he were to receive no formal religious instruction, and were to live as normally as possible in those circumstances, it is probable that the adolescent would feel an inner urge driving him toward something keeping for ever out of reach. By completely disregarding the laws of natural life and by wilfully remaining ignorant of all religious knowledge, the adult may fail to reach the conclusion that there is a Being transcending the understanding of man. Man can, by the natural light of reason, be forced to the conclusion that there is a God, and that he has duties to Him, since he owes everything to Him. In the same way man can find out that he has duties to society and duties to himself. Thus, by the efforts of the mind, it is possible to discover what is called Natural Religion. But, while man can learn to know many things by the light of reason alone, he never reaches a level of understanding that satisfies his craving for a union with God. This is well illustrated by the confession of failure in this respect of some great pagan thinkers and by great philosophers of the Christian era, who finally renounced their own in favour of the Christian philosophy.

CHRISTIAN REVELATION.

The Christian child is nearer a union with God than the greatest pagan philosophers; he finds himself placed in a most favourable environment, for he has at his disposal the word of God concerning everything of importance to his developing the religious life. This word of God he finds in Revelation, through a study of which he may gain a satisfactory understanding of supernatural Religion. Revelation is that body of religious truths made known by God; it embraces truths which the mind is unable to discover, and truths which the mind could discover only with great difficulty or with a mixture of error. Here is to be found the one possibility for a strong foundation to that religious culture to which every Christian must devote his life. Religion must necessarily proceed

from God, a being outside this world, if it is to receive the universal sanction of mankind. For, even if natural religion of full and accurate knowledge were possible, its leaders would still lack authority with their fellow men.

Revelation is not brought into doubt here; it is accepted as a fact by every honest Christian. There follows one important corollary, which must be accepted on the same grounds as Revelation itself. Since God has revealed to man all that is necessary for him to know in matters pertaining to the life of the soul, it is most important that he acquire this knowledge, and seek it at none but the true sources. For the Christian these sources are the Bible, Old and New Testament, and Tradition. It follows as an application of this to the world of education, that the educational system in a Christian country should offer such facilities to every child as will enable him to gain knowledge of God and His religion through His revealed truths. Where this is not done, education is faulty; the individual is left groping in the dark passages of doubt and anxiety that do not lead to the clear light of revealed religion; at best, the unsatisfactory state of natural religion; at the worst, the abandoning of all attempts at religious culture.

METHOD OF PROCEDURE.

The Bible being of the greatest importance to the Christian, it is necessary that its study be well regulated and directed along channels of sound practice and method. This method, just as in the case of every secular subject, is to be governed by certain principles. The first of these principles is that the presentation of the Bible content should be made in different ways at the four great stages of life. The manner of instruction in an infant class cannot be that of the middle classes in the primary school, while the adolescent and the adult must receive Bible instruction of a higher nature than that given to children. In other words, the study of the Bible should be suited to the intellectual standard of the student.

As an introduction to scriptural ^{studies,} writings, there is a certain number of chosen stories which are given the world over.

The child lives in a land of fancy and story-telling is the chief means of imparting knowledge at a tender age. Teachers will notice that children are naturally pious; they eagerly accept the Christian story and the impressive story of Christ. This is the time, then, to form the right attitude towards the word of God which, they may be told, is contained in the Bible. The good Christian teacher can, at this stage, by the respect which he shows for the Scriptures, lay the foundation of solid faith; the casual teacher, on the other hand, will do the opposite.

From standard 3 to standard 6, the method employed should adapt itself to the growing intelligence and the awakening reason of the children. During these years they begin to ask questions; they show interest in the things they see and hear; they come into contact with reality and develop a sense of good and evil. All this can be used in the Scripture class, where the lessons should now be presented in a manner that will at once strike the children with its emphasis on the concrete and its appeal to reason in support of judgments passed on different kinds of actions. Thus a beginning is made with the teaching of Christian morals. To be logical in teaching religion and morality, Christian schoolmasters have to make morality appear an inevitable consequence of religion; to do otherwise would be unreasonable and have a detrimental effect on the whole process of religious culture, for in Christianity religion and morality are most closely related.

Proceeding from the primary into the High School, the young pupil expects religion to be regarded with the same importance as it was in the junior classes. He is now traversing that very difficult period in his life, adolescence, during which great resolutions are made. It is not rare to find adolescents thoroughly dissatisfied with existing conditions, and prepared to rebuild the whole social structure. This is the time when the maturing mind, as yet very emotional and unstable, must find in religion at once a balancing power and a universal remedy to be applied to many of the weaknesses he notices around him. Scripture lessons, which at this stage should be mainly on the New Testament, will now converge on one ideal; the presentation to the adolescent of true Christian

life, based on the teaching of Jesus Christ and the morality which it postulates. To confine himself to cursory readings and disconnected talks on certain passages would be futile and quite illogical on the part of the teacher.

A second principle underlying the method of scriptural teaching is the one which stresses the necessity of love and respect for Bible study, both on the part of the teacher and the pupil. Taking it for granted that the teacher understands the value of his subject sufficiently to have it at heart, it remains with him to awaken in the pupil the right interest, that is, to bring about the right mental attitude towards this study. It is quite unnecessary to discuss the importance of interest in a subject, if it is to be done seriously and successfully; every educator understands this elementary point of educational psychology. In the next few paragraphs some means will be pointed out, by which an interest, that is, love and respect for Bible study, can be cultivated.

The inculcation of reverence and respect for the Holy Book is by the explanations which have to be given when the gospels and other parts of the Bible are read and studied by the more advanced pupils. In the study of literature the children are often given a liking for a particular book through a knowledge of the life and the eminence of its author. It would be reasonable, therefore, to stress again and again that the Bible is a collection of books which the Christian Church recognises as having been written under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost and that, when it is said that the Bible is an inspired book, this signifies that God is its real and principal author. It is God's word presented through the writings of men and it must, therefore, contain all the knowledge necessary to man from the religious point of view.

During the final year at school, the student may be given certain historical facts which support the statement that inspired writings really exist. There is, first of all, the tradition of the Jews, in which it has always been maintained that the Old Testament is the written word of God. This belief could not have originated as a counter to certain Christian claims, because such a novelty

would have been condemned by the more conservative elements of the Jewish community. Then, there is Christ's own approbation of Holy Writ. The stability and veracity of that book are proclaimed by Him in no uncertain manner. Not even the smallest letter of the Law shall be abolished until everything be accomplished. In His quotations Jesus never refers to pagan philosophers; by His many references to the Old Testament He draws man's attention to the excellence of this book. Finally, there is the universal belief among mankind that certain books are sacred, that they were written under inspiration by the Divine Being. This belief, then, is by no means characteristic of Christianity; other religions make similar claims.

There is yet another means whereby the teacher of the Bible can cultivate in the pupils the love and respect so necessary for this important study. These feelings can be strengthened by acquainting the children with the great efforts that have been made in order to save Holy Writ from destruction. In the turmoil that followed the fall of the Roman empire and during the many wars in all parts of the world, it was difficult, indeed, to preserve the Bible for future generations. And because there were very few copies, the Church made it her special duty to multiply them. Let every one take a look into those ancient monasteries where men devoted themselves to the service of God. Many of them spent their whole life there, busily engaged in transcribing and multiplying copies of the Bible. In many instances the work^{was} done in letters of gold and silver on the rarest and richest of parchment. Numbers of copies made by the monks were beautifully enriched with characters superbly delineated and with illustrated designs of the most delicate colouring. No penwork of to-day can be found that will even approach the elegance and beauty of the work done by these copyists of the Bible. The children will draw their own conclusion and will, no doubt, show greater esteem for their Scripture book and bring a greater enthusiasm into the learning of its content, on learning of the vast effort that went into the preservation and spreading of God's word.

The third principle regulating Bible study is that a good translation is essential. The originals are of no use to the masses of Christians. It is, therefore, imperative that they should be given copies in their own vernacular language. Translations, however, are difficult to make and those engaged in this work tend to render certain passages with a strong colouring of personal opinion. This has become evident especially since the Reformation. Founders of numerous small Christian sects have tried to justify their own brand of Christianity by producing translations of the Bible that would be in agreement with their teachings. The problem, then, is to find a Christian church which has always fought for and insisted on genuinely correct translations of the sacred books.

The earliest translations were made by St. Jerome, who compiled what is now called the Vulgate. To this the Church of Rome has clung to this day, on the ground that in it are contained the inspired books of the Old and New Testaments. As eldest trustee of this treasure, this Church possesses certain rights, which justify the decrees she has issued on the translation of the Bible. She requires that every translation into the vernacular be faithful to the original and that explanatory footnotes of the more difficult passages be appended. This, it must be admitted, is the part of prudence in order to prevent false meanings from being introduced into the Scriptures and also certain men from turning them against the Church's own teaching. The explanations she demands may be likened to the sign posts which are found at crossroads, because they point out to the reader in what direction lies the true sense of the word of God. The difficulty and obscurity of certain passages, even in the original, are pointed out by St. Peter himself. They are necessarily increased when the Bible is translated into the vernacular. It is, therefore, reasonable that somebody should see to it that Christians are not led into error by corrupt versions. Knowing that man tends to change the letter as well as the spirit of the Holy Book, the Church of Rome, for one, takes particular pains to thwart such an evil. She is unwilling to allow the ungodly to mutilate this sacred writ and the sectarian to prove his particular

form of heresy by a false translation.

The versions in use among the greater Protestant Churches may not be read by Catholics. This, however, means only that they have not the sanction of Rome. Some of these translations, without agreeing entirely with the Catholic version, are very good from a broad Christian point of view. They give the reader the teachings of Christ as faithfully as possible. This should, after all, be the main consideration in the Christian non-Catholic school. If the Roman translation is objected to it seems to be the most faithful and should therefore be preferred—the authorized version of the Church of England or the approved version of the prevailing Protestant religion should be adopted for study in the school.

DIFFICULTIES AND PROBLEMS.

When a good translation has been placed in the hands of the pupil and the study of the Bible is proceeding by sound methods it must not be thought that everything will go on smoothly. Every man reading the Bible understands what an arduous task is set to the teacher of Holy Scriptures, and that he must expect difficulties and problems to crop up every now and then.

The difficulties and problems besetting the study of the Bible will now be considered under three main headings:-

(a) Those due to science and philosophy.

The progress made by the natural sciences since the Renaissance has developed in man a naturalistic outlook on every aspect of life. This naturalism has crept into religion, a field of human experience that is higher than the natural order of things. Adults, and even children, have become empiricists and place everything they read and hear in the wide context of the knowledge they have gained from natural experiences. If something does not harmonise with their stock of factual knowledge, it is quickly rejected as untrustworthy. This is but reasonable when things of the same order clash; but, when experiences of widely different orders are thus rejected one for the other, this process of rejection is no longer reasonable. It is then due to prejudice or to a false apperception of the new presentation. As regards the Scriptures,

every reader meets with passages that appear to convey nothing but the sheerest nonsense. At the best, some might be pages torn out of a book of fiction; at the worst, they are definitely below the standard of the popular magazine or scientific publications. They are statements that are diametrically opposed to certain scientific facts which every child knows to-day.

These difficulties must not be avoided; they should be met in the classroom when they arise. It would never do to quieten the honest objector with the remark "It stands in the Bible", and in the same breath tell the class of the thrilling experiences of a certain man in the stomach of a huge fish. Avoiding difficulties and passing them over with glib words may very well lead the children to unbelief. Difficult passages in the Bible are best dealt with by:-

1-placing them into their context;

2-a clear explanation leading to the conclusion that the difficulty is only an apparent one;

3-appealing to Faith.

The Scriptures are for believers, not for unbelievers. They are for those who, up to a certain point at least, have some knowledge of the teachings of the Christian Church concerning them. In countries like South Africa, where every shade of religious belief may be found in one school, the above statement raises the question: should every child receive instruction in religion? Many children come from homes where neither parent shows an active interest in religion. They are materialistic in their outlook upon life. The children grow up in this atmosphere of religious indifference and it is very probable that the Scripture lessons will have little effect upon them. The possible future failure of an endeavour should, however, not dissuade from its pursuit any man who is intent upon its success. The odds may be very great against wholesale improvement of the religious life of the people, but the few chances there are seem to be worth while taking, even if the result is negligible when compared with the great number of failures. Bible study will reveal some of the teachings of the Church

concerning faith. Jesus often asked people to have faith; it was the one condition under which miracles were worked for them. The children in the schools will soon understand the reasonableness of the act of faith, especially when they understand the motives upon which it is based, and the nature of the things to which it is to be applied. And, because religious faith is a gift from God, it should often be asked for in the daily prayers. At least, nothing should be done to imperil its continued existence within the soul.

When the will to believe is present, and when apparent difficulties are met by upright and thorough investigation, most children and adults will readily agree with the fact that true religion and true science and true philosophy can never be at variance; all three pursue truth, the source of which is in God.

(b) Difference in Approach.

There is a fundamental difference in attitude to the Bible between Catholicism and Protestantism. This difference in attitude is well brought out in the following extract from Mr. Mallock's "Doctrine and Doctrinal Disruption". For an outsider from the Catholic Church, his judgment is a very shrewd one:

"The Church of Rome, when asked on what grounds we are to believe in the Bible, and by what means, believing in it, we are to discriminate its true meaning, answers us that these grounds and means are the Roman Church itself, which is an ever living and ever infallible teacher, the same Church to-day as it was on the day of Pentecost; and which, though it speaks officially at distant intervals only, so speaks, when it does speak, in a manner which all can recognise, thus progressively defining the faith, as successive definitions become necessary. This claim to a living infallibility, with a definite organ of utterance, which is made by the Church of Rome, is denied by all Anglicans equally".

The attitude of the Protestants toward the Bible is expressed by the well-known historical fact, that all the sects, since the time of the Reformation, made the Bible the only supreme spiritual authority in the world; and they did this because, being but human themselves, they were unable to look into the distant future, to discern the signs of the times, and to see how soon it

was destined to crumble away. "Slowly, and yet inevitably, the centuries have wrought their changes. That old foundation, the Bible, has ceased, in itself, to be a foundation any longer. It moves, it shifts, it totters. It will support no structure, unless something outside itself be found to support it. That something the Roman Church has supplied." (Mallock).

This control which the Church of Rome exercises over the Bible and this putting of the authority of the Bible above its own by the Protestant Church have led to the following practical implications in the teaching of Scriptures in the schools.

(1) The Protestant Church gives the complete Bible to school children; the Catholic Church does not.

The Bible is a very comprehensive volume treating of many and varied subjects. Much of its contents is unintelligible to children, much is open to discussion and speculation, of which any but trained men are incapable. It would, therefore, seem useless and futile to place a complete edition into the hands of any but the advanced Bible student. On the other hand, there is much in the Bible which is eminently suitable for children; stories of the Old Testament and the simpler teaching of Jesus, the whole constituting a summarised edition of Christian religion and morality. This is what the Catholic Church causes to be taught and learnt in her schools.

(2) The Protestant churches advocate a free interpretation of the Bible; they present their adherents with what is termed the 'Open Bible'. Catholics have to accept the teaching of their Church on certain points; on points which the Church has not commented upon they are free to think as they like, provided their deductions do not run counter the general doctrines of faith and morality promulgated by the Church.

To the outsider, the atheist, for instance, the 'Open Bible' appears at once as the main reason for the continuous splitting up process going on within the Protestant Church. The numberless sects bear this out. Replying on their own powers of understanding, men are likely to read meanings into certain passages which the Author of the Bible did not mean them to have. St. Augustine discourses

thus on the independent universal reading of the Bible "They are deceived by many and manifold obscurities and ambiguities who read rashly, mistaking one thing for another, and what they wrongly look for in certain places they find not, to such an extent do many obscure sayings involve in deepest darkness." It appears, therefore, reasonable to deduce that the Bible, when left to the individual, is likely to foster an unlimited number of interpretations, the product of a weak, changeable human reason. Opposed to this liberty and freedom granted by Protestantism, stand the regulations and restrictions which Catholicism has deemed it necessary to make with regard to Bible study.

(3) From a truly Protestant standpoint there appears to be no necessity for a teacher of religion. In the Catholic school this is absolutely necessary.

Having placed the Bible above every other authority, Protestants retrace their steps when insisting that a qualified man should teach the Scriptures in their schools. Since the word of God is evident in its meaning to the reader, all men must presumably be authorities in this matter. But, if the clergymen of the Protestant Churches are not prepared to agree, they must subscribe to the view taken by the Catholic Church and insist on religious teaching by those suited to and trained for this work. Principals of Government schools have not acted unreasonably when disregarding such an attitude as this and leaving religious instruction entirely in the hands of the members of their staffs. After all, teachers need act in a supervisory capacity only. In the Catholic school, however, the qualified man is necessary. To expound the Scriptures to young children and train them in Christian practices can only be the task of the highly trained person. Hence the necessity for proper qualification for religious teachers. From a secular point of view, there can be no doubt that the implication discussed here favours the teacher in the Protestant undenominational school, who need not possess a thorough knowledge of the Bible. A broad Christian outlook upon life, derived from the fundamental Protestant beliefs, will serve him sufficiently well in his dealings with the children of many sects.

(4) Closely connected with the preceding is the fourth implication arising from the difference in attitude of Protestants and Catholics to the Bible, namely, that the presence of different creeds in one school can be no excuse for leaving Bible study out of the curriculum altogether.

Scripture, as a school subject, has often been condemned under the specious pretext that somebody's feelings might be hurt. Rather than incur a pupil's disfavour, teachers will make Scripture a perfunctory study. Such an attitude is unreasonable. The Protestant teacher may neither dogmatise nor indoctrinate in accordance with his accepted beliefs. There can, therefore, be nothing to prevent him from telling his pupil: "Here is the Bible; Christianity is in it; find it." And he should, of course, help them to find it. He may, in this endeavour, get hold of his pupils' own religious views and help them on a basis of that residuum of Christian truths common to all Protestant beliefs to proceed with the culture of their souls. The propagandist, of course, can find no admittance to the undenominational religious class. Here again, it is seen that the Protestant attitude to the Bible favours its study in the secular school. In the Catholic school, on the other hand, no allowance may be made for the non-Catholic pupil's feelings and beliefs. The teacher has to teach one uniform religion to all. Doctrine and dogma must be accepted by all. For this reason it is necessary to form sections during the religious instruction period, or to ask all the children attending the school to follow the Catholic teachings.

CONCLUSION.

The Catholic attitude to the Bible and its treatment thereof appear to offer better exercise for the soul than the Protestant approach. That is perhaps a reason for the greater practical loyalty to their religion found among Catholics. At the same time, the requirements exacted by the Protestant method are such as to definitely favour Bible study in the undenominational school; This study should be carried on very vigorously there, because the Protestant has to depend largely on his Bible for salvation.

A sufficient aim from the Protestant viewpoint is to make good Protestants and for this a knowledge of the Scriptures is sufficient.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

Morrison:- "The Catholic Church and the Modern Mind."

O'Connell:- "The Catholic Church, the True Church of the Bible".

Dowd:- "The Gospel Guide".

CHAPTER 7.

THE PROBLEM IN REVIEW
AND SOME SUGGESTIONS.

University of Cape Town

THE PROBLEM IN REVIEW AND SOME SUGGESTIONS.

When a social institution ceases to function normally, it is customary to determine the forces which have made it veer from its original course. If the institution is of no great importance to the community as a whole, and if the forces acting upon it appear too strong to allow for a successful counter action, the only solution of the problem thus created lies in the breaking up of its organisation. But if the institution serves a vital interest of the whole community, without which it could not possibly exist for even a short period, another solution must be found. Nor, in such a case, can a power be attributed to the extraneous forces working on it which they really do not possess.

Education affords an example of a social institution which, in the eyes of the Christian, has ceased to function normally. For to-day, education as a State service confines its attention almost exclusively to physical and mental culture. From the Christian point of view such a restriction is an anomaly, in as much as complete education should comprise the culture of the soul. In previous chapters of this work it has been shown that the causes underlying the transition from full to partial education lie outside the field of education itself. It was also pointed out that the forces at work on society, and making for a constant change in the social attitude, influenced the objectives of education owing to the close relationship between the two.

From the nature of this relationship it is evident that upon education depends the proper functioning of every social group. For the sake of its own preservation society must go on with the task of educating its children. It is, therefore, unreasonable to condemn the modern educational system on the ground that it provides for only two sides of man's nature. The body and the mind, in any case, are cared for to-day more universally and more efficiently than probably at any other time. On the other hand, it would also be reasonable to confess to an inadequate education in these days and leave the matter at that.

For the claims of the Christian with regard to the culture of the soul are true claims, justified by the nature of the religion on which they are based. Moreover, they cannot be disregarded in any State in which freedom of religion, with all its implications, is a very real thing. It would seem, then, that the solution of the problem arising from "religion in education" is to be found, not in substituting a new system for the present one, but rather in completing it, in making up for its deficiency by including the culture of the soul once more in its primary aims.

The purpose of education should be to make each individual capable of adjustment to environment. The environment in which we live is threefold; physical, intellectual, and spiritual. An adaptation to the natural environment is made possible through the culture of body and mind. The same culture enables man to enter into his intellectual environment, represented by the accumulation of cultural achievements. The spiritual environment religion and its functions, unless man is to become one-sided, must not be left out of the process of teaching the young adaptation in life. Many situations will be meaningless, many experiences unknown, many enjoyments impossible, if the spiritual side of man is not developed. Nor must it be maintained that religion is incompatible with other studies. On the contrary, it is by joining the culture of the mind with that of the soul that education becomes natural, that is, that education is allowed to remain true to its function which is to ensure the harmonious growth of the whole man.

Rights in Education.

The maintenance of the religious element in education is justified, not only from a pedagogical point of view, but above all by the rights which parents and children have in regard to its function.

It may be laid down as a principle, founded on a belief of Christian religion, that the child belongs to its parents, and that the State, no matter what the form of government may be, has no direct dominion over, nor ownership of the child. In pagan times and in pagan countries the children were supposed

to belong to the community and the poor were considered what the name given to them implies - proletariat, mere bearers of children for the benefit of the State. Christianity, which brought with it "the liberty wherewith all are free", put an end to such slavery. It tells us that the child belongs to its parents, who stand for it in the place of God. God, and not the State, gave the child to its parents, and until the parents by their conduct, forfeit this right to their offspring, nobody has the right to deprive them of it. "In the first place comes the family, instituted directly by God for its peculiar purpose, the generation and formation of offspring; for this reason it has priority of nature and therefore of rights over civil society." (1)

From this Christian standpoint it follows that the education of the children is the duty of the parents. It is a parent's obligation to nourish and care for the child from the very moment of its birth and for many years after, through infancy and childhood, parents must provide what is necessary for the bodily life. This is not the duty of any but the family, and when it is sometimes thrown on the shoulders of the State, this institution welcomes the voluntary assistance of charitable organisations. But the body is not the only part of the child requiring nourishment and care. The intellect, the heart, the will, must be cared for, formed, educated; and here again, nobody has the right to usurp these latter functions any more than he had the obligation of being saddled with the former. No one, then, may deprive parents of these rights without grossly violating the law of nature.

In addition to the natural rights of parents to form and educate body and mind of the child, there is the divine right which Christ exercises over the souls of both parents and child, through the Church. When parents place their children in the arms of the Christian Church at Baptism, they acknowledge the

(1) Pius XI:- "Divini Illius Magistri".

rights which Christ and Christianity have to share in the education of the child. In addition, then, to the child's natural right to be educated, physically and mentally, it has a supernatural right, when born into a Christian community, to acknowledge of Christ and his religion, while the parents, in addition to their natural obligation to care for the child's body and mind, are under the further obligation to give it a Christian education.

Now, though much of this education can be given at home, and should be given there, this is not always possible. For this reason, the State steps in to supplement parental deficiency, "Nevertheless, the family is an imperfect society, since it has not in itself all the means for its own complete development; whereas civil society is a perfect society, having in itself all the means for its peculiar end, which is the temporal welfare of the community; and so, in this respect, that is in view of the common good, it has pre-eminence over the family, which finds its own suitable temporal perfection precisely in civil society." (1) The obligations of the family are supplemented by the obligations of the State. These are to help the parents to educate their children, by giving from its resources help where it is needed, so that parents may be enabled to make Christians of their children and good citizens for the State. From this it follows that the State has real rights in the educating of the young.

There is, however, a third society which claims to possess rights in education. It is the Christian Church, a society of the supernatural order and of universal extent. Man becomes a member of this society when he is baptised. The church thereafter will do everything in its power to discharge its obligation to the individual, by instructing him in those truths of religion and training him in that life which is necessary for the salvation of his soul.

(1) Opus citatum.

Consequently education, which concerns itself with man as a whole, individually and socially, in the order of nature and in the order of the supernatural, belongs to all three societies mentioned, the family, the State and the Church, in due proportion, corresponding to the co-ordination of their respective ends. The estimation of the importance of these respective ends will change from time to time and in accordance with the spirit of the age. In our own times the ends of civil society are stressed more than those of the others. Such fluctuations in man's judgement will always occur, for instability and changeability are characteristic of the human being. But such a state of affairs is no excuse for depriving one society of its rights, or even for allowing them to be forced out of education by extraneous influences. The equilibrium is upset and man becomes unbalanced in his total outlook upon life.

The Present Situation Analysed and Criticised.

This is precisely what is happening to-day. Modern education, by weighting mental culture more than that of the soul, has become, so to say, a false balance. Even where the attempt is made to measure out equal amounts to mind and soul, this cannot be done. Utilitarian subject matter is credited with such importance that it has become very difficult to discuss the culture of the mind and the culture of the soul without bias towards the former. A comparison between the times allotted to these tasks reveals the comparative neglect of spiritual training.

In the preceding chapters we have seen how this has come about and how it has become possible for many people to be entirely satisfied with modern education. Their attitude can be explained by the fact that man is never afraid of dangers of which he is unaware. But there are people who become aware of a danger long before they are confronted with it. They are the thinkers, the philosophers, those whose views are not limited by the "here" and "now". They are the men who can tell what will be the probable consequence of this action or of that omission. The philosopher is able to say what is likely to happen to society if, for instance, religion and morality are

suffered to drop out of deliberate education, not because he is a prophet, but because he has learnt to gauge the effect from the cause.

It is not necessary to be a great philosopher in order to gauge the effect of those causes which make religious and moral training occupy the least important place in the school. If religion and morality do not disappear altogether even during the years spent at school, they have but a scant chance to survive in later life. For, should the time come, when youth is schooled in the natural sciences and other secular branches of knowledge to the exclusion of everything else, it will grow into an adult society in which these subject matters are regarded as ^{ends} ~~made~~ in themselves, while the religious ideals, so necessary for a full enjoyment of this life, are forgotten. As to the other life, which is to begin after death, it has neither dread nor attractiveness, because it is a reality of which these people would be totally unaware, as it belongs to that order of things to which their thoughts have not been wont to rise.

Every society considers education as the spring of its eternal youth. It has the right to do this, for society must be preserved. But to force upon education a demand for the perpetuation of one particular mode of life is a totally different thing. To do this, society can have no right, for it would imply the exclusion of many values which at that particular stage of evolution are no longer appreciated justly. If this attitude were adopted, progress would become impossible. No two stages in the development of society are exactly similar. This is due to its progressive evolution. There are, however, certain standards of value which must remain as common features of each stage of development, for they bring out the truly human in a society of men. To deny these values is not a mark of progress, but a sure sign of disintegration in society. What distinguishes any one stage of social development from another is the stress laid on one aspect of life, caused by the chief preoccupation of the majority of men living at the time.

In modern society this stress lies on the achievements of science.

Science is the instrument to which modern society looks to solve the problems set for it by the conditions of its life. The production of science has resulted in an attitude of mind which can express itself in scientific investigation. But the achievements of science still leave us with social problems. Like every other stage of development of society, the present one will pass into another; its particular feature will be replaced by that of the next. The problems of that stage will be different from those of to-day. Consequently a new attitude will be required, one that will best be suited to the type of investigation necessitated by the new problems.

Because of the transitory character of the main feature of society, at one stage of its development, it would be unreasonable to allow this temporary emphasis to interfere with those standards of values which are basic in human life. The Christian believes that the real, though remote, Christian life after death outweighs in importance the material life of the body. There exists every likelihood that very soon man's interest will turn to something different than the making of science. For these two reasons, modern society is entirely unjustified in its attempt to force its attitude of mind, that is, a materialistic outlook upon life, on the next generation. Not that we can have a quarrel with the spirit of our times. This is something which escaped our grasp. Nor may we reasonably condemn science, the product of this spirit. "Modern Science represents one of the finest achievements of human activity and constitutes a final and unassailable value in human history. To condemn science is as absurd as to condemn architecture." (1)

Because the production of science is itself but the expression of an attitude of mind and a direction of interest which is not usual in society (2) it cannot be accepted as the only foundation upon which modern education is to rest. The spirit of the times should be reflected in education, but education need not necessarily

(1) J. Macmurray:- "The Boundaries of Science".

(2) Ibid.

embody that spirit to such an extent that more enduring interests of man be excluded from it. If this happens, education becomes narrow; it no longer proposes to deal with the whole man, but trains him towards that specialisation which will make him typical of his times. And specialisation can proceed only by way of concentration on one topic with most other topics excluded as irrelevancies. The result is that man becomes narrow-minded, and he is inadequately equipped to deal with situations lying outside his field of knowledge. If the religious and moral interests happen to be excluded as unimportant or irrelevant, man must become irreligious and immoral.

While modern education can, then, not be condemned for reflecting the spirit of the times in its emphasis on the sciences, it must be reproached with other defects arising from too exclusive a concentration on them. These defects, as pointed out previously, are (a) the application of the scientific method to the sphere of religious and ethical values, and (b) a disregard of religious and moral values, and (c) transmitting to the rising generation the attitude of mind created by the first two. In so far as education achieves the culture of mind and body, we can have no quarrel with it. But at this point the Christian must part company with the supporters of education as given in the modern State school and insist that the whole system be re-arranged in such a way as to provide for all the needs of man.

As a rule the school does not set out to determine what the next generation will or should be like. The school does not introduce elements into education that will or may result in a predetermined future state of society. On the contrary, it tends to be very conservative. Society, on the other hand, continuously strives to introduce such changes into education as will make for a complete representation of its own spirit. Since modern society strives to make the school into a ~~hook~~ with which it may fashion in every individual a replica of the prevalent attitude of mind, it seems that the school would be justified in opposing to this attempt a conservatism which will secure that religion and morality retain their proper place in the process of total educ-

ation. It is left to the school to save society from disintegration, when society unwittingly heads in that direction. And the school will achieve this by preserving those values which Christianity has declared the most important and most worthy of human achievement. In a Christian country deliberate education can receive no better justification than in its endeavour to make provision for the whole man, even if, by doing this, it disregards the spirit of the times.

Most people representative of our times find it difficult to decide in how far the spiritual and religious sides shall be provided for. They stand for independence of judgement, freedom of interpretation, liberty of conviction, disregard of the supernatural, criticism of authority, and a loosening of traditional morality and ethics.

Whatever succeeding generations may think of the spirit of our times, it is quite certain, however, that none will blame the men of to-day for having endeavoured to oppose in their schools what was bad in this spirit. Perhaps the redeeming feature of the "modern times" when the men of the future will judge them in the light of subsequent events, will be the effort made by some to produce the whole man, through the tripartite culture of the body, the mind, and the soul.

Some Suggestions.

"Not in Britain only, but all over the world of the English-speaking races, there is dissatisfaction with secular education. It is felt to be pretty good at producing what the great Duke of Wellington called 'clever devils', but it is leaving out something that is badly wanted. Regarded as a preparation for the serious business of living in the drift of this disillusioned world it has nothing to offer." (1) The dissatisfaction with modern education voiced in this extract from the writings of a leading educationist of England, is entirely justified in the light of the various considerations previously made, for they reveal the fact that modern education is leaving out something

(1) Sir Cyril Norwood:- "The Journal of Education" April, 1939.

that is essential, namely, religious training.

But now that the shortcomings of the present educational system in regard to religion in the public school have been pointed out, some means must be indicated by which the situation may be remedied. It is easy enough to criticise destructively a system which is found wanting in part, especially when many minds concur as to the validity of such criticism. To be of use at all to education every criticism must be followed by suggestions a working out of which may remedy the defect. Such suggestions must then be tested in the light of sound educational theory and practice, for otherwise they may very well lead to greater evils than they are designed to eradicate.

1.- Co-operation between the Three Societies.

In one concerted effort, the family, the State and the Church should endeavour to educate man as a whole. The body, the mind, and the soul of man are so inter-related that it is unwise to attempt a separation in order to deal with each part individually. Neither family, nor Church nor State should press its claim upon education to the extent of trespassing on the rights of the others. The various claims made upon education by these three societies do not necessarily clash; this happens only when one party assumes rights to which it is not entitled. Harmonious co-operation will result from a mutual recognition of and respect for reasonable claim.

2.- Choice in Education.

While it is generally agreed to-day that parents have the greater rights in the education of their children, it is also known that home education is incomplete. In many families both the father and the mother work away from home, with the result that they have very little time to bestow upon the education of their children. Moreover, parents are often badly educated and are unable to give real help in the instruction of the child. This is where the State steps in and supplements the parental deficiency. By doing this, the State does not, however, acquire the right to force upon the parents an educational system which does not meet with universal approval. The parents still retain the primary

right to determine the type of education their children shall receive.

In modern society the majority of parents are denied this right. In the upper classes the father and mother usually visit several schools before they decide upon the one to which they shall send their child. Such freedom of choice is certainly of advantage to both school and the educand. But the people placed in less favourable circumstances are willy-nilly compelled to send their children to the nearest public school where education is free. They have no choice in the matter. The privilege of choosing their children's schools is reserved to the well-to-do. This is an unsound and unfair system. Freedom of choice should be extended to all in a democratic State.

3. - What has been done.

The reason why parents wish to send their children to other than the secular State school is found in the unsatisfactory religious and moral training given there. Again, they may be very fervent adherents of one specific religious denomination and wish their children to be brought up in the atmosphere of that belief.

In some places the Government has been aware of this, as well as of its obligation to give some sort of religious instruction. As an example of what has been done, wherever the Government was not anti-religious, the Cape Ordinance No.5 of 1921 may be cited. In this case the Church ministers, representative of several Protestant denominations came together, and drew up a programme of Christian instruction. A catechism was arranged containing questions and answers on what they considered to be a residuum of common Christian truths believed by Christians the world over. This catechism was then published with a view to introducing it into the State schools. The 1921 Ordinance even specified the time to be allotted to religious instruction. The men responsible for it were undoubtedly moved by the best intentions.

4. - The Ineffectiveness of this Step.

This measure has proved ineffective. Nothing was done to train the teachers in giving religious instruction. While in other branches of teaching high qualifications are to-day required of

the teacher, it was evidently assumed that every man and woman is qualified to speak on religion and morality. The men who have been in charge of religious classes know that thorough training is necessary before anybody should be allowed to explain and comment on the truths of Christian Revelation, and Tradition. In some schools teachers frankly confessed to their incompetence, and very often the principal was burdened with the impossible task of giving religious and moral instruction to the whole school.

5. - Religion to be made a Compulsory Study.

Attempts at introducing sound religious teaching into State schools have further been rendered abortive by what is called the "Conscience Clause". This recommendation stipulates that parents are free to permit their children to attend religious instruction or to keep them away from it. In other words, the "Conscience Clause", while it sets out to safeguard denominationalism, really comes to mean in the eyes of many parents "freedom to withhold all religion from their children".

Such freedom is first of all detrimental to the true interests of the child. Every child is a human being and possesses the right to become a full man. From the premises of this thesis it follows that no human being is fully developed without the culture of his soul. He has a right to that culture, for it is part of the cultural possessions of mankind which are the common patrimony of all men. Parents, then, who would wish to deprive their children of religious and moral knowledge and training, act against the natural rights of the individual. In many cases such parents do not belong to any Christian denomination. Being therefore outside the jurisdiction of the Church, they can only be restrained by the State, which in such an eventuality must assume both the right and the obligation of giving complete education, comprising religion and morality, to their children.

Furthermore, the wish of a parent to have his or her child brought up without religion is anti-social. If it is admitted that society functions normally only through the sum total of the normal functions of its component members, and that in order to function normally each component member be religious and moral,

it becomes evident that such a wish is directly apposed to the welfare of society. As has been ^{stated} previously, religion is basic to morality, and morality is the basis on which a Christian society rests. For the sake of its own welfare and preservation the State must therefore make religious teaching compulsory for all the children in its schools.

6. - Two Parties.

In Holland, where the problem of religion in education had caused much controversy and strife, the Government has introduced what is called the "Group System". A group of responsible persons, having the same religion and tradition and wishing to preserve those, are thereby entitled to ask the Government for a school, provided they put down 15% of the cost of the building. Such groups of people also have the right to appoint teachers to their schools, all of whom have, of course, been trained in the Government Training Colleges. The "Group System" has now worked satisfactorily for over two decades. In it has been realised the ideal that schools belong first of all to the parents and their children.

Such a system is, however, not possible in every country, some people maintain. Before coming to such a conclusion, it would be well to make the experiment first. However, if the State thinks that the "Group System" is really impossible in one particular country for reasons of economy and expediency, it can still solve the problem by approving of a system which is denominational. To-day there are many people who have pinned their faith on denominational schools. One need but look at the flourishing state of the many private schools to assure oneself of this fact. Others, who are indifferent in matters religious or even anti-religious, are acting against the best interests of the State, for the reasons given earlier, and they must therefore be brought to bow to the furtherance of the common good.

(a) One of the parties will be ^{the} Catholic population. From the account given of Catholic education it becomes clear that the State school can never satisfy completely the demands which Catholics make on education. They do not expect that it should.

But they do insist on having their own schools. Their ideal is: Catholic schools for Catholic children managed by a body of Catholic teachers. No other Christian denomination has maintained the same unhesitating and unwavering attitude towards religion in education as the Catholic Church. Catholics are in conscience bound to send their children to Catholic schools. And the State, is equally bound, not only to allow Catholics this freedom of choice, but also to support their schools, thus avoiding the imposing of an extra financial burden upon them. Naturally enough the State is expected to support such schools only when they are run efficiently and do not neglect physical and intellectual education. But, when these conditions are being fulfilled, no amount of reasoning on the part of secular authorities can absolve the State from the guilt it incurs in not supporting that private denominational school which is absolutely necessary.

(b) The second part will be made up by the Protestant population. The Protestant approach to religion differs from the Catholic. This has been seen already in "The Study of the Bible". Protestants do not make the same claims as Catholics. They are able to sink individual differences and agree on a programme of religious instruction consisting of those truths of religion which they all believe. They are satisfied with a less detailed Christianity than the Catholics, and hence such a syllabus of religious instruction would be concise, including whatever is necessary for salvation from the Protestant point of view. Catholics agree with this, for they also believe that man can be saved no matter what religion he belongs to.

It is this Protestant Christian religious teaching that the State should make compulsory for all in its schools. This will entail the training of teachers in giving such instruction. If this step is not taken, the whole scheme will collapse. Should certain Protestant Churches find defects in the system, they would always be free to organise special religious classes to remedy these defects and to supplement the fundamental religious knowledge acquired in the school.

In this way schools would be arranged on a denominational basis. The State would incur no extra expense in the long run. It would have a uniform system comprising two groups of schools, all inspected by its inspectors and all giving the best education to every child. Above all, the State would have the type of schools which will provide the best citizens possible.

7.- The School.

Once religious instruction has been made compulsory in the manner indicated, it rests with the school to discharge its duty towards the souls of the children in the best way possible.

Besides imparting a knowledge of the Christian religion to their children, the teachers in the State schools should constantly insist that they attend the Church services and be faithful to all practices of religion. Immoral practices indulged in by modern society should be condemned and it must be pointed out how much they are a negation of Christianity. In other words, attempts should be made to join practice to theory.

The school can excellently induce children and adolescents to realise the practical side of religion by placing before them such Christian characters which will offer strong motives for imitation. But more valuable an aid than even this, is to let the children "live" their religion. The school can provide for the emotional aspect of religion by what may be called prayer-meetings. For this purpose every school should have a chapel or at least a special room. There the whole school or a class at a time, could meet in prayer and meditation. The architecture of the chapel and the whole atmosphere should be of such a nature as to naturally raise heart and mind to God. During these meetings the teachings of religious knowledge should be avoided, so as not to introduce the secular element associated therewith. Moreover, in their quiet communings with God, the children would probably learn more than from the mouth of any Preacher.

Bibliography.

- Pope Pius XI:—"Divini Illius Magistri".
Macmurray:—"The Boundaries of Science".