

Volume 4

Summer 1977

Number 1

The Journal of Christian Reconstruction



Symposium on
Education

A CHALCEDON PUBLICATION

COPYRIGHT

The Journal of Christian Reconstruction

Volume 4 / Number 1

Summer 1977

Symposium on Education

Gary North, Editor

A CHALCEDON MINISTRY

Electronic Version 1.0 / September 6, 2005

Copyright © 1977 Chalcedon. All rights reserved.

Usage: Copies of this file may be made for personal use by the original purchaser of this electronic document. It may be printed by the same on a desktop printer for personal study. Quotations may be used for the purpose of review, comment, or scholarship. However, this publication may not be duplicated or reproduced in whole or in part in any electronic or printed form by any means, uploaded to a web site, or copied to a CD-ROM, without written permission from the publisher.

Chalcedon

P.O. Box 158

Vallecito, California 95251

U.S.A.

To contact via email and for other information:

www.chalcedon.edu

Chalcedon depends on the contributions of its readers,
and all gifts to Chalcedon are tax-deductible.

Opinions expressed in this journal do not necessarily reflect the views of Chalcedon. It has provided a forum for views in accord with a relevant, active, historic Christianity, though those views may have on occasion differed somewhat from Chalcedon's and from each other.

THE JOURNAL OF CHRISTIAN RECONSTRUCTION

This journal is dedicated to the fulfillment of the cultural mandate of Genesis 1:28 and 9:1—to subdue the earth to the glory of God. It is published by the Chalcedon Foundation, an independent Christian educational organization (see inside back cover). The perspective of the journal is that of orthodox Christianity. It affirms the verbal, plenary inspiration of the original manuscripts (autographs) of the Bible and the full divinity and full humanity of Jesus Christ—two natures in union (but without intermixture) in one person.

The editors are convinced that the Christian world is in need of a serious publication that bridges the gap between the newsletter-magazine and the scholarly academic journal. The editors are committed to Christian scholarship, but the journal is aimed at intelligent laymen, working pastors, and others who are interested in the reconstruction of all spheres of human existence in terms of the standards of the Old and New Testaments. It is not intended to be another outlet for professors to professors, but rather a forum for serious discussion within Christian circles.

The Marxists have been absolutely correct in their claim that theory must be united with practice, and for this reason they have been successful in their attempt to erode the foundations of the noncommunist world. The editors agree with the Marxists on this point, but instead of seeing in revolution the means of fusing theory and practice, we see the fusion in personal regeneration through God's grace in Jesus Christ and in the extension of God's kingdom. Good principles should be followed by good practice; eliminate either, and the movement falters. In the long run, it is the kingdom of God, not Marx's "kingdom of freedom," which shall reign triumphant. Christianity will emerge victorious, for only in Christ and His revelation can men find both the principles of conduct and the means of subduing the earth—the principles of Biblical law.

The Journal of Christian Reconstruction is published twice a year, summer and winter. Each issue costs \$4.00, and a full year costs \$7.00. *Subscription office:* P.O. Box 158, Vallecito, CA 95251. *Editorial office:* P.O. Box 1608, Springfield, VA 22151.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Copyright

Contributors

Editor's Introduction

Gary North	8
------------------	---

1. SYMPOSIUM ON EDUCATION

The Lost Tools of Learning

Dorothy L. Sayers	20
-------------------------	----

A Christian Philosophy of Method in Education

William N. Blake	40
------------------------	----

Tasks of the Christian Educator

T. Robert Ingram	62
------------------------	----

Distinctive Features of the Christian School

T. Van Der Kooy	68
-----------------------	----

Accelerated Christian Education:

An Alternative to State Schools

Edward C. Facey	82
-----------------------	----

An Evaluation of ACE From a Reformed Perspective

Charles D. Grant and Kirk W. House	88
--	----

Educational Vouchers: The Double Tax

Gary North	104
------------------	-----

The Failure of Seminary Education

Rousas John Rushdoony	125
-----------------------------	-----

Trinity Ministerial Academy: Prospectus

Is Public Education Necessary?

Samuel L. Blumenfeld	140
----------------------------	-----

Our Nation's Schools—A Report Card:

“A” in School Violence and Vandalism

Curriculum, Wichita Collegiate School

Higher Education in America: Fragments of a Dying Culture
Albert B. Friedman188

The Political Economy of Modern Universities
Henry G. Manne192

The Political State as a Teacher of Morality
Zach Montgomery212

Religion in the Public Schools
A. A. Hodge226

Shall We Have a Federal Department of Education?
J. Gresham Machen235

2. BOOK REVIEWS

The U.S. Primary and Secondary Educational Process, by Frank E. Armbruster.
Reviewed by Gary North 248

How to Establish and Operate a Successful Christian School, by Robert L. Thoburn.
Reviewed by Gary North 256

Disaster By Decree: The Supreme Court Decisions on Race and the Schools, by Lino A. Graglia.
Reviewed by Tommy W. Rogers 260

Books For Sale

Books Not for Sale

Publication Schedule Volume 5

The Ministry of Chalcedon

CONTRIBUTORS

William Blake, PhD, is a real estate salesman in northern Virginia.

Samuel Blumenfeld is the author of several books on education.

Edward C. Facey, PhD, teaches economics at Hillsdale College in Hillsdale, Michigan.

Charles Grant is pastor of the Grace Bible Church and principal of Grace Church Academy in Sterling, Virginia.

A. A. Hodge was a professor at Princeton Theological Seminary until his death in 1887.

Kirk House is vice principal of Grace Church Academy in Sterling, Virginia.

T. Robert Ingram, BD, is pastor of the St. Thomas Episcopal Church in Houston, Texas, and the founder of the St. Thomas School. He is the author of *The World Under God's Law*.

J. Gresham Machen was the founder of Westminster Theological Seminary in 1929 and a leader in the conservative opposition to the drift into theological liberalism within the churches of the 1920s and 1930s. He wrote many books, including *Christianity and Liberalism*. He died in 1937.

Henry Manne is the director of the Law and Economics program of the University of Miami Law School. He is the author of *Insider Trading and the Stock Market*. He was the cohost of a twenty-part television series produced by FNBC in Los Angeles and seen throughout the nation: "America the Supermarket."

Zach Montgomery served as Assistant U.S. Attorney General in the late nineteenth century.

Gary North, PhD, is the editor of *The Journal of Christian Reconstruction* and the president of the Institute for Christian Economics. His latest book is *How You Can Profit from the Coming Price Controls*.

Tommy Rogers, PhD, is a refugee from the academic world (sociology) and a practicing lawyer in Jackson, Mississippi. With a little more practice, he says, he is going to get the hang of it.

Rousas J. Rushdoony, MA, BD, is president of Chalcedon. His latest book is *Revolt Against Maturity: The Biblical Psychology of Man*.

Dorothy Sayers was most famous for her many mystery books, but she was an accomplished classical scholar in England. Her essay on education, “The Lost Tools of Learning,” has been reprinted in several formats.

T. Van Der Kooy was a school teacher and leader in the Christian school movement in the Netherlands in the 1920s.

EDITOR'S INTRODUCTION

Gary North

About as much money is spent by all levels of government in the United States on education as is spent by the federal government on national defense, over \$90 billion a year. Primary and secondary education expenditures are now approaching \$65 billion a year. This is up from \$6.7 billion in 1950. Yet the graduates of our subsidized educational system are not what they were in 1950. By every known academic measurement, government-subsidized, secular, compulsory education is a massive failure and getting worse. Yet the American public continues to believe that government-financed education is moral, useful, and basically a great economic bargain. The public school system of this nation is America's only established church. Men have *faith* in it.

Meanwhile, parents of about five million children in America have decided to take their children out of the government school system, at least in the primary and secondary years, in order to purchase an alternative to the bureaucratic, socialist system constructed by governments. They have decided to bear the tax burden, plus the private tuition burden, in order to insure that their children are not run through the educational mill of government education. These students are receiving superior educations, and this position of privilege, in an era of legislated envy, is resented by the educational bureaucrats who are supported by tax dollars. They would prefer a monopoly. The more the government's precollege system shows signs of collapse, the more its administrators want a monopoly, as if forty-five million students were not enough.

Christian education is one of the few areas of American life where Christians are devising true alternatives to the secular institutions of our time. It is one of the few areas where Christians, despite their lack of capital, their lack of experience, and their lack of printed materials for classroom use, are meeting the secular experts head-on, and coming out victors. The movement is tiny at present, pitifully tiny. There is

not enough of a market to create demand sufficient to make profitable the publication of a comprehensive, integrated, and professionally designed curriculum. Even the one science textbook that is Christian in perspective, the creationists' *Biology: A Search for Order in Complexity* (Zondervan, 1970), is written in nontheological terms, since it was designed to be used as an alternative text in public schools. Naturally, this compromising has not impressed most of the school boards of the nation, which continue to indoctrinate forty-five million students a year with the religion of secular humanism. {2}

Given the lack of materials, and the absence of a predictable market for such materials, it is reasonable to conclude that the Christian school movement is a minority movement. But it is growing constantly, indirectly subsidized by the deteriorating condition of the government school systems. Forced integration, busing, violence, declining standards, student apathy, drugs on campus, and all the other blights which are basic to government education are driving the principled parents away from the established church and its well-paid, tenured priesthood.

There are still millions of Christian parents who continue to send their children to public schools, for the sake of money, prestige, traditionalism, money, intellectual schizophrenia, a misguided sense of evangelism, money, ignorance, willful blindness, and money. They refuse to admit to themselves that *their* public schools are like all those other schools they keep reading about. This is why we have reprinted the U. S. Senate's special report on school violence. It provides the horrifying statistics, region by region. No region is immune; all are getting worse; and nothing seems possible to reverse it. Every Christian parent in this nation should read this Senate document. Then every parent should give up his fruitless, expensive fight to "recapture the public schools," and devote his energies and funds to building a distinctly Christian educational alternative in his community.

The Christian school movement is a minority movement, because most Christians, meaning self-professed Christians who believe in the Bible as the word of God, are not serious about their faith. Their view of Christianity is dualistic: religion is exclusively an affair of the heart, the emotions, and Sunday mornings. Religion is not seen as the dominant influence in every area of life. Thus, to save money, they send

their children into the atheistic, compromised, bureaucratic pits of secular humanism. Of course, they ask their children to be sure to tell their friends all about Jesus.

Would they send eight-year-olds to the Congo to witness to the little children there? Why not? Dangerous, you say? They might be killed! But the public schools, with their thirteen-year program of godless indoctrination, *are* safe. Right? More important, they are free.

How bad will the public schools become before most Christians take their children out of them? They will be bad beyond all possible belief. American Christians like their religion, but they like it cheap. They would rather tithe than pull their children out of public schools, and American Christians will tithe, to quote Khrushchev, when shrimps learn to whistle.

We must face reality. We are a minority of a minority. We do not believe in neutrality. We do not believe in using force to extort money out of the pockets of one group, or even one man, in order to subsidize the schools that teach doctrines which the taxpaying individual despises. We believe {3} that the established church principle is wrong, and that every criticism used successfully against the principle of the State-financed churches of the eighteenth century can be used equally well against the State-financed churches of the twentieth century.

Because men fail to see that ideas have consequences, that education is always moral and religious, and that neutrality in education is a total myth, they have not recognized government-supported education for what it is. Because the tradition of public-financed education goes back to the Puritans, who thought they could use the schools to promote their religion, and to Presbyterian leaders in the South (such as Thornwell, who was the president of South Carolina College and a foe of denominational or independent Christian liberal arts education), who also thought the schools could be kept Christian, the modern-day Christian is left without a tradition of true educational independence. The socialist educational tradition began when Christians were in power; by the time the schools had been universally captured by the enemy, the Christianity of this century had become defeatist, retreatist, and most important, dualistic, in its view of education. Chemistry is chemistry, after all ("you say my son was caught brewing up *what?*"). Literature is literature ("you say they're reading *what?*"). Psychology is

psychology (“you say my kid was shown a movie of people doing *what?*”). All truth is one. Private schools are expensive. Jesus saves (on tuition).

Let us put the matter bluntly. Where there is no commitment to independent Christian education, there is no serious faith. There is only an emasculated compromise with the principles of secularism in the world outside the institutional church, and sometimes inside as well. There is only a short-term perspective, a commitment to low-budget Christianity that results in the loss of the church’s most precious earthly resource, its covenant children. It is a weak version of Christianity that has abandoned the principle that the family is responsible for the education of its own children. It results in the abdication of parenthood, from morning to afternoon, and then, given the T.V. schedule, well into the evening. It is *weekend parenthood*, at best.

There are alternatives, and these alternatives, being based on a Christian view of man and the principle of full parental responsibility in education, produce far better products. The classic essay by **Dorothy Sayers**, “The Lost Tools of Learning,” presents a compelling theory of how children learn. There are three stages of educational development, she argues, paralleling the three educational disciplines of the Middle Ages, the *Trivium*. The first stage of the *Trivium* is *grammar*; the second is *dialectic or logic*; and the third is *rhetoric*. Children master memorization when they are younger. This is the time to teach them Latin, the multiplication tables, names and dates, and all the songs and Bible verses they can cram into {4} their skulls, which is considerable. Then they start questioning everything. Fine; teach them logic at that age. Finally, they put things together into coherent wholes. This is the time to teach the principles of civilization, the interrelationships of religion and culture, and other broadly used concepts. When we abandon the *Trivium*, we abandon proper method.

William Blake extends Miss Sayers’s comments. Christian teaching has lacked an explicitly Christian methodology of education. He is convinced that Miss Sayers has rediscovered it, but he extends its applications. Evolution, as a concept, is destructive; it leaves man without a concept of order or purpose. Christianity has both concepts. Man is to subdue the earth in terms of law, and to train true craftsmen, a system of learning must be developed. We really do need tools—basic skills—

as well as training to perfect our use of these skills, and creativity once we master their use. Our working model for education should be that of a *workman*. We learn facts; then we learn how these facts fit into a system; finally, we learn how one subsystem is related to others in God's total system of creation. Blake provides a preliminary curriculum for private schools based on Sayers's outline.

T. Robert Ingram, whose successful Episcopalian parochial school in Houston has become a model of this form of organization, also focuses on tools, in this case, the tools of the Christian educator. As far as textbooks go, he says, there are not many. A good teacher can do without them, but it is hard to locate young, competent teachers. He traces the concept of neutral education back to Horace Mann, the father (or at least midwife) of modern, coercive, secular instruction. The common school of Massachusetts has become the lowest common denominator school of today. The principle of coercion is wrong; the school based on coercion must fail. Every academic discipline has been influenced detrimentally by compulsory humanism. We must reeducate our teachers.

We have reprinted a piece that is over half a century old. **T. Van Der Kooy** was an educational pioneer in the Netherlands. He discusses method, though not so clearly as Miss Sayers did two decades later. A teacher holds out the possibility of approaching truth; without truth, we sink. The good teacher will reach down to the child and pull him upward. He will use lectures, but he will also use the Socratic method. Students will be allowed to ask questions (like the children of the Hebrew Passover, who would ask their fathers about the meaning of the rituals). Teachers need not explain every step every time; the mind can grasp wholes—indeed, must grasp wholes, since knowledge can never be exhaustive—as it strives to learn. Let the student memorize; he will learn meanings later on. Let the student *find* knowledge, not just seek it endlessly. He should not be passive. The teacher should not be afraid to discipline students, either. Evil must be checked in the student. The teacher is the hired servant of the parents, {5} and he possesses a legitimate sovereignty to act as a parent should. The important educational factor is human interaction; both discipline and methodology must recognize that the child is a true individual. Teachers should

be cheerful, fair, and never cruel or sarcastic. Prayer must be basic to the school if Christ's goals are to be accomplished by His servants.

Two articles deal with the Accelerated Christian Education program of Garland, Texas. **Edward Facey**, a college teacher, describes the program and the students, and he approves of its commitment to free-market economics. He is impressed with its accent on student discipline and deportment. The national administrators responded to respectful criticism, he relates. Pastor **Charles Grant** and **Kirk House** look at the program's theology and methodology. They find that it can be used successfully by Reformed churches and schools. The great benefit of the program, they conclude, is its flexibility and comparatively low cost. They offer some possible alterations that local schools might make in the ACE curriculum.

In my essay, I oppose the much-lauded "voucher" system of school financing. The central question is this: who is sovereign in the educational process? Answer: the parents. Conclusion: parents of specific children should finance their children's education if they wish to preserve their sovereignty. They are responsible, having God-given power over their children's education. They, not their neighbors, should pay for their children's education. By abandoning this principle of parentally financed education, the parents today have given the State enormous power. The State has become a substitute parent. The voucher system is a tool that can be used by State bureaucrats to license all private schools. Thus, the voucher system is still essentially statist, despite the seeming freedom it grants to parents to choose schools for their children.

R. J. Rushdoony criticizes the modern seminary for its narrow vision of theological education. Its practical courses are not really practical, and its strictly theological courses are seldom relevant to the world that the young pastor will face. The seminary is too much a graduate school of theology—narrowly defined theology—and not a training ground for pastors. Eschatologies of withdrawal have also tended to limit the vision of seminaries. It is the irrelevance of modern seminary education that concerns him most.

The **Trinity Ministerial Academy** has been established to answer some of the problems of the modern seminary. Its goal is to produce pastors, not licensed theological scholars. It is geared to pastoral train-

ing exclusively. It recruits mature men, places them in a setting requiring actual service, and does not waste resources on dormitories. It is the ministry of a church, just as early Puritan theological training grew out of local churches. It wants men who have already demonstrated some ability to speak—reminiscent of the early Puritans' criticism of conventional Anglican prelates who {6} could not preach. ("Dumb dogs," they were called. University training in the colonies proved that even Puritans could be taught how not to preach, and our seminaries continue this tradition.)

Samuel Blumenfeld is one of America's tireless defenders of independent education. In this essay, he traces the origins of the public school tradition back to New England of the 1830s. He shows that compulsory State education was the product of politicians and bureaucrats working as a team. It was intended to be a socialized education. The public school is a major institutional force which erodes personal freedom. That is its goal. Its model was the Prussian system, and that model was not one geared to the expansion of personal liberty. Today, the schools' administrators are not agreed about goals, methods, or academic content, but they do agree that the schools should receive more money. The whole structure is disintegrating. Yet even the critics of public education are unwilling to get government entirely out of the education business. They really do not believe that education is the responsibility of parents. Public education is antieducation.

How bad are the public schools? **Senator Birch Bayh's** subcommittee on juvenile delinquency provides a horrifying answer. (Bayh once enrolled his children in the Reverend Thoburn's Fairfax Christian School—but only once.) Violence has reached unprecedented proportions. Every region of the country is confronted with the problem of violence. The statistics are voluminous. Over one-third of our nation's public school teachers in 1973 reported at least one incident of teacher-oriented assault in their schools. In Chicago, for example, assaults increased from a reported 135 to 1,065 between 1964 and 1968. Vandalism is costing schools over \$500 million annually, and this figure is rising rapidly. Between 1971 and 1973, the figure rose by 250 percent. Anyone who has not read this report before will be shocked. Yet there will still be those who deny the argument offered by **Zach Montgomery** back in 1886: public schools lead to an increase of crime.

For an alternative to collapse, take a look at part of the curriculum of the **Wichita Collegiate School**, operated by Robert Love, who has published a fine paperback book on operating a private school. See how well your local junior high and high schools stack up against this program. In fact, how did your education through college stack up against this program? More importantly, compare the program with the reports of incredible nonsense coming from some of our colleges in the collage, *Higher Education in America: Fragments of a Dying Culture*. Then, if the contrast impresses you, read **Henry Manne** [MANee], on college financing. Find out why it is that *nonprofit* education, coupled with government subsidies, has led to the transfer of power (but not responsibility) to faculty members and away from trustees. Find out why parents have {7} never been the source of power on campus: *they have always received full or partial subsidies*. In another version of this paper, Manne proposed an alternative: turn over the ownership and financing of universities to faculty members, and let them meet the market directly. It will not be done. To link ownership (control) and responsibility would be too radical an idea for today's faculty members.

Zach Montgomery's essay is taken from his 1886 book. He shows how it is impossible to combine coercive taxation, education, and religious instruction. Yet this is what all public education must do. All education involves moral principles, yet some members of the society will be financing a school system that is not built on the principles they believe in. The State cannot teach morals effectively. Since no one can agree on these first principles of education, the schools must be financed by parents, not the State. The State has usurped parental authority, and this is illegitimate. In a later essay, however, Montgomery did advocate tax-supported vocational schools for the poor, indicating that he could not fully shake the concept of educational neutrality and the pseudo-parent State.

Even more embarrassing is **A. A. Hodge's** defense of public education. Hodge has become famous (within a narrow circle) for the following perfectly accurate statement:

The atheistic doctrine is gaining currency [in *both* senses, he might have added—G.N.] even among professed Christians and even among some bewildered Christian ministers, that an education provided by the common government should be entirely emptied of all religious

character. The Protestants object to the government schools being used for the purpose of inculcating the doctrines of the Catholic Church, and Romanists object to the use of the Protestant version of the Bible and to the inculcation of the peculiar doctrines of the Protestant churches. The Jews protest against the schools being used to inculcate Christianity in any form, and the atheists and agnostics protest against any teaching that implies the existence and moral government of God. It is capable of exact demonstration that if every party in the State has the right of excluding from the public schools whatever he does not believe to be true, then he that believes most must give way to him that believes least, and then he that believes least must give way to him that believes absolutely nothing, no matter how small a minority the atheists or the agnostics may be. It is self-evident that on this scheme, if it is consistently and persistently carried out in all parts of the country, the United States system of national popular education will be the most efficient and wide instrument for the propaganda of Atheism which the world has ever seen.¹

Unfortunately, Hodge was not arguing for independent Christian schools and the abolition of tax-supported education. He was arguing for the continued {8} domination of public schools by Christians. He was arguing for a reversal of the obvious trend he sketched—the same trend sketched by Zach Montgomery. Hodge was unable to answer Montgomery’s basic questions. He called for cooperation among Christians of all persuasions to ignore the “irrelevant” differences dividing them for the sake of their control over the public schools. We have reprinted Hodge’s essay to contrast it with Montgomery’s, and to show how futile Hodge’s position was in the history of American education. The lowest common denominator principle is still operating to drag all public education into the tar pits.

Finally, we end with the 1926 speech by **J. Gresham Machen** [MAY-chen], the founder of Westminster Theological Seminary in Philadelphia, and the founder of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church. His speech is a remarkable example of the older orthodoxy. He was a nineteenth-century classical liberal in his political and economic views, and unlike his politically conservative heirs in the church he founded, he was not afraid to voice his opinions in the name of God. There is one

1. Cited in Rousas J. Rushdoony, *The Messianic Character of American Education* (Nutley, NJ: Craig Press, 1963), 335.

sad pastor who attended Westminster in the early years, whose one claim to fame is his constant refrain, "There hath arisen a generation that knoweth not Machen." Yes, indeed there has; it arose about 1936. The classical liberalism that marked the Old Princeton Seminary men was soon forgotten, or never understood, by those who followed their theological tradition, meaning theology narrowly defined. Machen's spiritual heirs are not found delivering speeches like this one; his commitment to social relevance has not been understood or appreciated by those who studied under him. He warned against federally-financed education. He warned against the inefficiency of federal officials. He warned against the federal threat to education, how the dead hand of bureaucratic orthodoxy will smother educational diversity. He did try to defend state-financed education, but only in comparison to federally financed education. At least in each state, or in each county, there are competing views. He called for competition. He hoped that the Supreme Court would continue to defend this principle. (He should have seen the drift of his era more clearly; **Tommy Rogers's** review of Lino Graglia's book on the Court's school decisions would have cured him of his optimism.) He made this crucial point: once you give up your child to the State, why resist when the State calls for everything else?

Hodge and Machen are representatives of the Old Princeton apologetics. They both were committed to the idea that *reason*, even if unaided by biblical revelation, can comprehend *some* facts accurately. This is the basis—the only possible intellectual basis—of Christian cooperation with public education. But the apologetics of Cornelius Van Til indicates that this hope is not a valid hope. Atheists and Christians see *nothing* in the same light. There can be no neutrality. No single fact can be viewed by the Christian and the non-Christian in exactly the same light, in exactly the {9} same perspective. Thus, Van Til has destroyed the epistemological foundation of cooperative, State-supported education.

Now, if we can just get the Christians to stop taking State subsidies, stop lobbying for more subsidies, and start building *totally* independent educational institutions, we can get on with the task of Christian reconstruction. We must get our hands out of our neighbors' wallets. We must also get our children out of the government schools. If Hodge

could not call a halt to the destruction of Christianity in the public schools, and Machen's dire warnings against federal education have now come true, can we not learn from their experience? Must we continue to repeat the same old hopes, call for the same old reforms, after we have been beaten for seventy-five or a hundred years in the "game" of coercive education? Can we not build for ourselves with our own resources? If the salt has lost its savor, what good is it? It is good for being trod under men's feet.

1. SYMPOSIUM ON EDUCATION

THE LOST TOOLS OF LEARNING

Dorothy L. Sayers

Originally published in *The Hibbert Journal*. © Copyright, A. Watkins, 1947, for the estate of Dorothy Sayers. Reprinted by permission.

That I, whose experience of teaching is extremely limited, should presume to discuss education is a matter, surely, that calls for no apology. It is a kind of behavior to which the present climate of opinion is wholly favorable. Bishops air their opinions about economics; biologists, about metaphysics; inorganic chemists about theology; the most irrelevant people are appointed to highly technical ministries; and plain, blunt men write to the papers to say that Epstein and Picasso do not know how to draw. Up to a certain point, and provided that the criticisms are made with a reasonable modesty, these activities are commendable. Too much specialization is not a good thing. There is also one excellent reason why the veriest amateur may feel entitled to have an opinion about education. For if we are not all professional teachers, we have all, at some time or other, been taught. Even if we learnt nothing—perhaps in particular if we learnt nothing—our contribution to the discussion may have a potential value.

I propose to deal with the subject of teaching, properly so-called. It is in the highest degree improbable that the reforms I propose will ever be carried into effect. Neither the parents, nor the training colleges, nor the examination boards, nor the boards of governors, nor the ministers of education would countenance them for a moment. For they amount to this: that if we are to produce a society of educated people, fitted to preserve their intellectual freedom amid the complex pressures of our modern society, we must turn back the wheel of progress some four or five hundred years, to the point at which education began to lose sight of its true object, towards the end of the Middle Ages.

Before you dismiss me with the appropriate phrase—reactionary, romantic, mediaevalist, *laudator temporis acti*, or whatever tag comes

first to hand—I will ask you to consider one or two miscellaneous questions that hang about at the back, perhaps, of all our minds, and occasionally pop out to worry us.

Disquieting Questions

When we think about the remarkably early age at which the young men went up to the university in, let us say, Tudor times, and thereafter were {11} held fit to assume responsibility for the conduct of their own affairs, are we altogether comfortable about that artificial prolongation of intellectual childhood and adolescence into the years of physical maturity which is so marked in our own day? To postpone the acceptance of responsibility to a late date brings with it a number of psychological complications which, while they may interest the psychiatrist, are scarcely beneficial either to the individual or to society. The stock argument in favor of postponing the school leaving-age and prolonging the period of education generally is that there is now so much more to learn than there was in the Middle Ages. This is partly true, but not wholly. The modern boy and girl are certainly taught more subjects—but does that always mean that they actually know more?

Has it ever struck you as odd, or unfortunate, that today, when the proportion of literacy throughout western Europe is higher than it has ever been, people should have become susceptible to the influence of advertisement and mass-propaganda to an extent hitherto unheard-of and unimagined? Do you put this down to the mere mechanical fact that the press and the radio and so on have made propaganda much easier to distribute over a wide area? Or do you sometimes have an uneasy suspicion that the product of modern educational methods is less good than he or she might be at disentangling fact from opinion and the proven from the plausible?

Have you ever, in listening to a debate among adult and presumably responsible people, been fretted by the extraordinary inability of the average debater to speak to the question, or to meet and refute the arguments of speakers on the other side? Or have you ever pondered upon the extremely high incidence of irrelevant matter which crops up at committee-meetings, and upon the very great rarity of persons capable of acting as chairmen of committees? And when you think of this,

and think that most of our public affairs are settled by debates and committees, have you ever felt a certain sinking of the heart?

Have you ever followed a discussion in the newspapers or elsewhere and noticed how frequently writers fail to define the terms they use? Or how often, if one man does define his terms, another will assume in his reply that he was using the terms in precisely the opposite sense to that in which he has already defined them?

Have you ever been faintly troubled by the amount of slipshod syntax going about? And if so, are you troubled because it is inelegant or because it may lead to dangerous misunderstanding?

Do you ever find that young people, when they have left school, not only forget most of what they have learnt (that is only to be expected) but forget also, or betray that they have never really known, how to tackle a {12} new subject for themselves? Are you often bothered by coming across grown-up men and women who seem unable to distinguish between a book that is sound, scholarly, and properly documented, and one that is to any trained eye, very conspicuously none of these things? Or who cannot handle a library catalogue? Or who, when faced with a book of reference, betray a curious inability to extract from it the passages relevant to the particular question which interests them?

Do you often come across people for whom, all their lives, a “subject” remains a “subject,” divided by watertight bulkheads from all other “subjects,” so that they experience very great difficulty in making an immediate mental connection between, let us say, algebra and detective fiction, sewage disposal and the price of salmon—or, more generally, between such spheres of knowledge as philosophy and economics, or chemistry and art?

Are you occasionally perturbed by the things written by adult men and women for adult men and women to read?

We find a well-known biologist writing in a weekly paper to the effect that: “It is an argument against the existence of a Creator” (I think he put it more strongly; but since I have, most unfortunately, mislaid the reference, I will put his claim at its lowest)—“an argument against the existence of a Creator that the same kind of variations which are produced by natural selection can be produced at will by stock-breeders.” One might feel tempted to say that it is rather an argu-

ment for the existence of a Creator. Actually, of course, it is neither: all it proves is that the same material causes (recombination of the chromosomes by cross-breeding and so forth) are sufficient to account for all observed variations—just as the various combinations of the same thirteen semitones are materially sufficient to account for Beethoven's Moonlight Sonata and the noise the cat makes by walking on the keys. But the cat's performance neither proves nor disproves the existence of Beethoven; and all that is proved by the biologist's argument is that he was unable to distinguish between a material and a final cause.

Here is a sentence from no less academic a source than a front-page article in the [London] *Times Literary Supplement*:

The Frenchman, Alfred Epinas, pointed out that certain species (e.g., ants and wasps) can only face the horrors of life and death in association.

I do not know what the Frenchman actually did say: what the Englishman says he said is patently meaningless. We cannot know whether life holds any horror for the ant, nor in what sense the isolated wasp which you kill upon the windowpane can be said to “face” or not to “face” the horrors of death. The subject of the article is mass-behavior in *man*; and the human motives have been unobtrusively transferred from the main proposition to the supporting instance. Thus the argument, in effect, assumes what it {13} sets out to prove—a fact which would become immediately apparent if it were presented in a formal syllogism. This is only a small and haphazard example of a vice which pervades whole books—particularly books written by men of science on metaphysical subjects.

Another quotation from the same issue of T.L.S. comes in fittingly here to wind up this random collection of disquieting thoughts—this time from a review of Sir Richard Livingstone's *Some Tasks for Education*:

More than once the reader is reminded of the value of an intensive study of at least one subject, so as to learn “the meaning of knowledge” and what precision and persistence is needed to attain it. Yet there is elsewhere full recognition of the distressing fact that a man may be master in one field and show no better judgment than his neighbor anywhere else; he remembers what he has learnt, but forgets altogether how he learned it.

I would draw your attention particularly to that last sentence, which offers an explanation of what the writer rightly calls the “distressing fact” that the intellectual skills bestowed upon us by our education are not readily transferable to subjects other than those in which we acquired them: “he remembers what he has learnt, but forgets altogether how he learned it.”

The Art of Learning

Is not the great defect of our education today—a defect traceable through all the disquieting symptoms of trouble that I have mentioned—that although we often succeed in teaching our pupils “subjects,” we fail lamentably on the whole in teaching them how to think: they learn everything, except the art of learning. It is as though we had taught a child mechanically and by rule of thumb, to play “The Harmonious Blacksmith” upon the piano, but had never taught him the scale or how to read music; so that, having memorized “The Harmonious Blacksmith,” he still had not the faintest notion how to proceed from that to tackle “The Last Rose of Summer.” Why do I say, “As though”? In certain of the arts and crafts we sometimes do precisely this—requiring a child to “express himself” in paint before we teach him how to handle the colors and the brush. There is a school of thought which believes this to be the right way to set about the job. But observe—it is not the way in which a trained craftsman will go about to teach himself a new medium. He, having learned by experience the best way to economize labor and take the thing by the right end, will start off by doodling about on an odd piece of material, in order to “give himself the feel of the tool.”

The Mediaeval Syllabus

Let us now look at the mediaeval scheme of education—the syllabus of the schools. It does not matter, for the moment, whether it was devised for small children or for older students; or how long people were supposed to {14} take over it. What matters is the light it throws upon what the men of the Middle Ages supposed to be the object and the right order of the educative process.

The syllabus was divided into two parts; the Trivium and Quadrivium. The second part—the Quadrivium—consisted of “subjects,” and need not for the moment concern us. The interesting thing for us is the composition of the Trivium, which preceded the Quadrivium and was the preliminary discipline for it. It consisted of three parts: grammar, dialectic, and rhetoric, in that order.

Now the first thing we notice is that two at any rate of these “subjects” are not what we should call “subjects” at all: they are only methods of dealing with subjects. Grammar, indeed, is a “subject” in the sense that it does mean definitely learning a language—at that period it meant learning Latin. But language itself is simply the medium in which thought is expressed. The whole of the Trivium was, in fact, intended to teach the pupil the proper use of the tools of learning, before he began to apply them to “subjects” at all. First, he learned a language; not just how to order a meal in a foreign language, but the structure of language—a language, and hence of language itself—what it was, how it was put together and how it worked. Secondly, he learned how to use language: how to define his terms and make accurate statements; how to construct an argument and how to detect fallacies in argument (his own arguments and other people’s). Dialectic, that is to say, embraced logic and disputation. Thirdly, he learned to express himself in language; how to say what he had to say elegantly and persuasively.

At the end of his course, he was required to compose a thesis upon some theme set by his masters or chosen by himself, and afterwards to defend his thesis against the criticism of the faculty. By this time he would have learned—or woe betide him—not merely to write an essay on paper, but to speak audibly and intelligibly from a platform, and to use his wits quickly when heckled. There would be questions, cogent and shrewd, from those who had already run the gauntlet of debate.

It is, of course, quite true that bits and pieces of the mediaeval tradition still linger, or have been revived, in the ordinary school syllabus of today. Some knowledge of grammar is still required when learning a foreign language—perhaps I should say, “is again required”; for during my own lifetime we passed through a phase when the teaching of declensions and conjugations was considered rather reprehensible, and it was considered better to pick these things up as we went along.

School debating societies flourish; essays are written; the necessity for “self-expression” is stressed, and perhaps even overstressed. But these activities are cultivated more or less in detachment, as belonging to the special subjects in which they are pigeonholed rather than as forming one coherent scheme of mental training {15} to which all “subjects” stand in a subordinate relation. “Grammar” belongs especially to the “subject” of foreign languages, and essay-writing to the “subject” called “English”; while dialectic has become almost entirely divorced from the rest of the curriculum, and is frequently practiced unsystematically and out of school-hours as a separate exercise, only very loosely related to the main business of learning. Taken by and large, the great difference of emphasis between the two conceptions holds good: modern education concentrates on *teaching subjects*, leaving the method of thinking, arguing, and expressing one’s conclusions to be picked up by the scholar as he goes along; mediaeval education concentrated on first *forging and learning to handle the tools of learning*, using whatever subject came handy as a piece of material on which to doodle until the use of the tool became second nature.

“Subjects” of some kind there must be, of course. One cannot learn the theory of grammar without learning an actual language, or learn to argue and orate without speaking about something in particular. The debating subjects of the Middle Ages were drawn largely from theology, or from the ethics and history of antiquity. Often, indeed, they became stereotyped, especially towards the end of the period, and the far-fetched and wire-drawn absurdities of scholastic argument fretted Milton and provide food for merriment even to this day. Whether they were in themselves any more hackneyed and trivial than the usual subjects set nowadays for “essay-writing” I should not like to say: we may ourselves grow a little weary of “A Day in My Holidays,” and all the rest of it. But most of the merriment is misplaced, because the aim and object of the debating thesis has by now been lost sight of.

Angels on a Needle

A glib speaker in the Brains Trust once entertained his audience (and reduced the late Charles Williams to helpless rage) by asserting that in the Middle Ages it was a matter of faith to know how many archangels could dance on the point of a needle. I need not say, I hope,

that it never was a “matter of faith”; it was simply a debating exercise, whose set subject was the nature of angelic substance: were angels material, and if so, did they occupy space? The answer usually adjudged correct is, I believe, that angels are pure intelligences; not material, but limited, so that they may have location in space, but not extension. An analogy might be drawn from human thought, which is similarly nonmaterial and similarly limited. Thus, if your thought is concentrated upon one thing—say, the point of a needle—it is located there in the sense that it is not elsewhere; but although it is “there,” it occupies no space there, and there is nothing to prevent an infinite number of different people’s thoughts being concentrated upon the same needle-point at the same time. The proper *subject* {16} of the argument is thus seen to be the distinction between location and extension in space; the *matter* on which the argument is exercised happens to be the nature of angels (although, as we have seen, it might equally well have been something else); the practical lesson to be drawn from the argument is not to use words like “there” in a loose and unscientific way, without specifying whether you mean “located there” or “occupying space there.”

Scorn in plenty has been poured out upon the mediaeval passion for hairsplitting; but when we look at the shameless abuse made, in print and on the platform, of controversial expressions with shifting and ambiguous connotations, we may feel it in our hearts to wish that every reader and hearer had been so defensively armored by his education as to be able to cry: *Distinguo*.

Unarmed

For we let our young men and women go out unarmed, in a day when armor was never so necessary. By teaching them all to read, we have left them at the mercy of the printed word. By the invention of the film and the radio, we have made certain that no aversion to reading shall secure them from the incessant battery of words, words, words. They do not know what the words mean; they do not know how to ward them off or blunt their edge or fling them back; they are a prey to words in their emotions instead of being the masters of them in their intellects. We who were scandalized in 1940 when men were sent to fight armored tanks with rifles, are not scandalized when young men

and women are sent into the world to fight massed propaganda with a smattering of “subjects”; and when whole classes and whole nations become hypnotized by the arts of the spellbinder, we have the impudence to be astonished. We dole out lip-service to the importance of education—lip-service and, just occasionally, a little grant of money; we postpone the school leaving-age, and plan to build bigger and better schools; the teachers slave conscientiously in and out of school-hours; and yet, as I believe, all this devoted effort is largely frustrated, because we have lost the tools of learning, and in their absence can only make a botched and piecemeal job of it.

What, then, are we to do? We cannot go back to the Middle Ages. That is a cry to which we have become accustomed. We cannot go back—or can we? *Distinguo*. I should like every term in that proposition defined. Does “go back” mean a retrogression in time, or the revision of an error? The first is clearly impossible *per se*; the second is a thing which wise men do every day. Obviously the twentieth century is not and cannot be the fourteenth; but if “the Middle Ages” is, in this context, simply a picturesque phrase denoting a particular educational theory, there seems to be no *a priori* reason why we should not “go back” to it—with modifications—as we have already “gone back” with modifications, to, let us say, the idea {17} of playing Shakespeare’s plays as he wrote them, and not in the “modernized” versions of Cibber and Garrick, which once seemed to be the latest thing in theatrical progress.

Let us amuse ourselves by imagining that such progressive retrogression is possible. Let us make a clean sweep of all educational authorities, and furnish ourselves with a nice little school of boys and girls whom we may experimentally equip for the intellectual conflict along lines chosen by ourselves. We will endow them with exceptionally docile parents; we will staff our school with teachers who are themselves perfectly familiar with the aims and methods of the Trivium; we will have our buildings and staff large enough to allow our classes to be small enough for adequate handling; and we will postulate a Board of Examiners willing and qualified to test the products we turn out. Thus prepared, we will attempt to sketch out a syllabus—a modern Trivium “with modifications”; and we will see where we get to.

But first: what age shall the children be? Well, if one is to educate them on novel lines, it will be better that they should have nothing to unlearn; besides, one cannot begin a good thing too early, and the Trivium is by its nature not learning, but a preparation for learning. We will, therefore, “catch ‘em young,” requiring only of our pupils that they shall be able to read, write, and cipher.

The Three Ages

My views about child psychology are, I admit, neither orthodox nor enlightened. Looking back upon myself (since I am the child I know best and the only child I can pretend to know from inside) I recognize three states of development. These, in a rough-and-ready fashion, I will call the Poll-Parrot, the Pert, and the Poetic—the latter coinciding, approximately, with the onset of puberty. The Poll-Parrot stage is the one in which learning by heart is easy and, on the whole, pleasurable; whereas reasoning is difficult and, on the whole, little relished. At this age, one readily memorizes the shapes and appearances of things; one likes to recite the number-plates of cars; one rejoices in the chanting of rhymes and rumble and thunder of unintelligible polysyllables; one enjoys the mere accumulation of things. The Pert Age, which follows upon this (and, naturally, overlaps it to some extent) is characterized by contradicting, answering-back, liking to “catch people out” (especially one’s elders), and in the propounding of conundrums. Its nuisance-value is extremely high. It usually sets in about the eighth grade. The Poetic Age is popularly known as the “difficult” age. It is self-centered; yet it yearns to express itself; it rather specializes in being misunderstood; it is restless and tries to achieve independence; and, with good luck and good guidance, it should show the beginnings of creativeness, a reaching-out towards a synthesis of what it {18} already knows, and a deliberate eagerness to know and do some one thing in preference to all others. Now it seems to me that the layout of the Trivium adapts itself with a singular appropriateness to these three ages: grammar to the Poll-Parrot, dialectic to the Pert, and rhetoric to the Poetic Age.

Let us begin, then, with grammar. This, in practice, means the grammar of some language in particular; and it must be an inflected language. The grammatical structure of an uninflected language is far too analytical to be tackled by anyone without previous practice in dialectic

tic. Moreover, the inflected languages interpret the uninflected, whereas the uninflected are of little use in interpreting the inflected. I will say at once, quite firmly, that the best grounding for education is the Latin grammar. I say this, not because Latin is traditional and mediaeval, but simply because even a rudimentary knowledge of Latin cuts down the labor and pains of learning almost any other subject by at least fifty percent. It is the key to the vocabulary and structure of all the Romance languages and to the structure of the Teutonic languages, as well as to the technical vocabulary of all the sciences and to the literature of the entire Mediterranean civilization, together with all its historical documents.

Those whose pedantic preference for a living language persuades them to deprive their pupils of all these advantages might substitute Russian, whose grammar is still more primitive. Russian is, of course, helpful with the other Slav dialects. There is something to be said for Classical Greek. But my own choice is Latin. Having thus pleased the Classicists among you, I will proceed to horrify them by adding that I do not think it wise or necessary to cramp the ordinary pupil upon the Procrustean bed of the Augustan Age, with its highly elaborate and artificial verse-forms and oratory.

Latin should be begun as early as possible—at a time when inflected speech seems no more astonishing than any other phenomenon in an astonishing world; and when the chanting of “*amo, amas, amat*” is as ritually agreeable to the feelings as the chanting of “eeny, meeny, miney, mo.”

During this age we must, of course, exercise the mind on other things besides Latin grammar. Observation and memory are the faculties most lively at this period; and if we are to learn a contemporary foreign language we should begin now, before the facial and mental muscles become rebellious to strange intonations. Spoken French or German can be practiced alongside the grammatical discipline of the Latin.

The Use of Memory

In *English*, verse and prose can be learned by heart, and the pupil's memory should be stored with stories of every kind—classical myth, European legend, and so forth. I do not think that the classical stories

and masterpieces of ancient literature should be made the vile bodies on which to practice the technics of grammar—that was a fault of mediaeval education {19} which we need not perpetuate. The stories can be enjoyed and remembered in English, and related to their origin at a subsequent stage. Recitation aloud should be practiced—individually or in chorus; for we must not forget that we are laying the groundwork for disputation and rhetoric.

The grammar of *history* should consist, I think, of dates, events, anecdotes, and personalities. A set of dates to which one can peg all later historical knowledge is of enormous help later on in establishing the perspective of history. It does not matter greatly which dates: those of the kings of England will do very nicely, provided they are accompanied by pictures of costumes, architecture, and other “everyday things,” so that the mere mention of a date calls up a strong visual presentment of the whole period.

Geography will similarly be presented in its factual aspect, with maps, natural features and visual presentment of customs, costumes, flora, fauna, and so on; and I believe myself that the discredited and old-fashioned memorizing of a few capital cities, rivers, mountain ranges, etc., does no harm. Stamp collecting may be encouraged.

Science, in the Poll-Parrot period, arranges itself naturally and easily round collections—the identifying and naming of specimens and, in general, the kind of thing that used to be called “natural history,” or, still more charmingly, “natural philosophy.” To know the names and properties of things is, at this age, a satisfaction in itself; to recognize a devil’s coach-horse at sight, and assure one’s foolish elders that, in spite of its appearance, it does not sting; to be able to pick out Cassiopeia and the Pleiades; to be aware that a whale is not a fish, and a bat not a bird—all these things give a pleasant sensation of superiority; while to know a ring-snake from an adder or a poisonous from an edible toadstool is a kind of knowledge that has also a practical value.

The grammar of *mathematics* begins, of course, with the multiplication table, which, if not learnt now will never be learnt with pleasure; and with the recognition of geometrical shapes and the grouping of numbers. These exercises lead naturally to the doing of simple sums in arithmetic; and if the pupil shows a bent that way, a facility acquired at this stage is all to the good. More complicated mathematical processes

may, and perhaps should, be postponed, for reasons which will presently appear.

So far (except, of course, for the Latin), our curriculum contains nothing that departs very far from common practice. The difference will be felt rather in the attitude of the teachers, who must look upon all these activities less as “subjects” in themselves than as a gathering-together of *material* for use in the next part of the Trivium. What that material actually is, is only of secondary importance; but it is as well that anything and everything which can usefully be committed to memory should be memorized at this period, whether it is immediately intelligible or not. The modern {20} tendency is to try and force rational explanations on a child’s mind at too early an age. Intelligent questions, spontaneously asked, should, of course, receive an immediate and rational answer; but it is a great mistake to suppose that a child cannot readily enjoy and remember things that are beyond its power to analyze—particularly if those things have a strong imaginative appeal, an attractive jingle, or an abundance of rich, resounding polysyllables.

The Mistress Science

This reminds me of the grammar of *theology*. I shall add it to the curriculum, because theology is the mistress-science, without which the whole educational structure will necessarily lack its final synthesis. Those who disagree about this will remain content to leave their pupils’ education still full of loose ends. This will matter rather less than it might, since by the time that the tools of learning have been forged the student will be able to tackle theology for himself, and will probably insist upon doing so and making sense of it. Still, it is as well to have this matter also handy and ready for the reason to work upon. At the grammatical age, therefore, we should become acquainted with the story of God and Man in outline—i.e., the Old and New Testament presented as parts of a single narrative of creation, rebellion, and redemption—and also with “the Creed, the Lord’s Prayer, and the Ten Commandments.” At this stage, it does not matter nearly so much that these things should be fully understood as that they should be known and remembered.

It is difficult to say at what age, precisely, we should pass from the first to the second part of the Trivium. Generally speaking, the answer

is: so soon as the pupil shows himself disposed to pertness and interminable argument. For as, in the first part, the master-facilities are observation and memory, so in the second, the master-faculty is the discursive reason. In the first, the exercise to which the rest of the material was, as it were, keyed, was the Latin grammar; in the second the key exercise will be formal logic. It is here that our curriculum shows its first sharp divergence from modern standards. The disrepute into which formal logic has fallen is entirely unjustified; and its neglect is the root cause of nearly all those disquieting symptoms which we have noted in the modern intellectual constitution.

A secondary cause for the disfavor into which formal logic has fallen is the belief that it is entirely based upon universal assumptions that are either unprovable or tautological. This is not true. Not all universal propositions are of this kind. But even if they were, it would make no difference, since every syllogism whose major premise is in the form “All A is B” can be recast in hypothetical form. Logic is the art of arguing correctly: “If A then B”: the method is not invalidated by the hypothetical {21} character of A. Indeed, the practical utility of formal logic today lies not so much in the establishment of positive conclusion as in the prompt detection and exposure of invalid inference.

Relation to Dialectic

Let us now quickly review our material and see how it is to be related to dialectic. On the *language* side, we shall now have our vocabulary and morphology at our fingertips; henceforward we can concentrate more particularly on syntax and analysis (i.e., the logical construction of speech) and the history of language (i.e., how we come to arrange our speech as we do in order to convey our thoughts).

Our reading will proceed from narrative and lyric to essays, argument and criticism, and the pupil will learn to try his own hand at writing this kind of thing. Many lessons—on whatever subject—will take the form of debates; and the place of individual or choral recitation will be taken by dramatic performances, with special attention to plays in which an argument is stated in dramatic form.

Mathematics—algebra, geometry, and the more advanced kind of arithmetic—will now enter into the syllabus and take its place as what it really is: not a separate “subject” but a subdepartment of logic. It is

neither more nor less than the rule of the syllogism in its particular application to number and measurement, and should be taught as such, instead of being, for some, a dark mystery, and for others, a special revelation, neither illuminating nor illuminated by any other part of knowledge.

History, aided by a simple system of ethics derived from the grammar of theology, will provide much suitable material for discussion: Was the behavior of this statesman justified? What was the effect of such an enactment? What are the arguments for and against this or that form of government? We shall thus get an introduction to constitutional history—a subject meaningless to the young child, but of absorbing interest to those who are prepared to argue and debate. *Theology* itself will furnish material for argument about conduct and morals; and should have its scope extended by a simplified course of dogmatic theology (i.e., the rational structure of Christian thought), clarifying the relations between the dogma and the ethics, and lending itself to that application of ethical principles in particular instances which is properly called casuistry. *Geography* and the *sciences* will all likewise provide material for dialectic.

The World Around Us

But above all, we must not neglect the material which is so abundant in the pupils' own daily life.

There is a delightful passage in Leslie Paul's *The Living Hedge* which tells how a number of small boys enjoyed themselves for days arguing about an extraordinary shower of rain which had fallen in their town—a shower {22} so localized that it left one-half of the main street wet and the other dry. Could one, they argued, properly say that it had rained that day *on* or *over* the town or only *in* the town? How many drops of water were required to constitute rain? and so on. Argument about this led on to a host of similar problems about rest and motion, sleep and waking, *est* and *non est*, and the infinitesimal division of time. The whole passage is an admirable example of the spontaneous development of the ratiocinative faculty and the natural and proper thirst of the awakening reason for definition of terms and exactness of statement. All events are food for such an appetite.

An umpire's decision; the degree to which one may transgress the spirit of a regulation without being trapped by the letter; on such questions as these, children are born casuists, and their natural propensity only needs to be developed and trained—and, especially, brought into an intelligible relationship with events in the grown-up world. The newspapers are full of good material for such exercises: legal decisions, on the one hand, in cases where the cause at issue is not too abstruse; on the other, fallacious reasoning and muddleheaded argument, with which the correspondence columns of certain papers one could name are abundantly stocked.

“Pert Age” Criticism

Wherever the matter for dialectic is found, it is, of course, highly important that attention should be focused upon the beauty and economy of a fine demonstration or a well-turned argument, lest veneration should wholly die. Criticism must not be merely destructive; though at the same time both teacher and pupils must be ready to detect fallacy, slipshod reasoning, ambiguity, irrelevance, and redundancy, and to pounce upon them like rats.

This is the moment when precis-writing may be usefully undertaken; together with such exercises as the writing of an essay, and the reduction of it, when written, by 25 or 50 percent.

It will, doubtless, be objected that to encourage young persons at the Pert Age to browbeat, correct, and argue with their elders will render them perfectly intolerable. My answer is that children of that age are intolerable anyhow; and that their natural argumentativeness may just as well be canalised to good purpose as allowed to run away into the sands. It may, indeed, be rather less obtrusive at home if it is disciplined in school; and, anyhow, elders who have abandoned the wholesome principle that children should be seen and not heard have no one to blame but themselves.

Once again: the contents of the syllabus at this stage may be anything you like. The “subjects” supply material; but they are all to be regarded as mere grist for the mental mill to work upon. The pupils should be encouraged to go and forage for their own information, and so guided towards the proper use of libraries and books of reference, and shown how to tell which sources are authoritative and which are not. {23}

Imagination

Towards the close of this stage, the pupils will probably be beginning to discover for themselves that their knowledge and experience are insufficient, and that their trained intelligences need a great deal more material to chew upon. The imagination—usually dormant during the Pert Age—will reawaken, and prompt them to suspect the limitations of logic and reason. This means that they are passing into the Poetic Age and are ready to embark on the study of rhetoric. The doors of the storehouse of knowledge should now be thrown open for them to browse about as they will. The things once learned by rote will be seen in new contexts; the things once coldly analyzed can now be brought together to form a new synthesis; here and there a sudden insight will bring about that most exciting of all discoveries: the realization that a truism is true.

The Study of Rhetoric

It is difficult to map out any general syllabus for the study of rhetoric: a certain freedom is demanded. In literature, appreciation should be again allowed to take the lead over destructive criticism; and the self-expression in writing can go forward, with its tools now sharpened to cut clean and observe proportion. Any child that already shows a disposition to specialize should be given his head: for, when the use of the tools has been well and truly learned, it is available for any study whatever. It would be well, I think, that each pupil should learn to do one, or two, subjects really well, while taking a few classes in subsidiary subjects so as to keep his mind open to the inter-relations of all knowledge. Indeed, at this stage, our difficulty will be to keep “subjects” apart; for a dialectic will have shown all branches of learning to be interrelated, so rhetoric will tend to show that all knowledge is one. To show this, and show why it is so, is preeminently the task of the Mistress-science. But whether theology is studied or not, we should at least insist that children who seem inclined to specialize on the mathematical and scientific side should be obliged to attend some lessons in the humanities and vice versa. At this stage also, the Latin grammar, having done its work, may be dropped for those who prefer to carry on their language studies on the modern side; while those who are likely

never to have any great use or aptitude for mathematics might also be allowed to rest, more or less, upon their oars. Generally speaking: whatsoever is *mere* apparatus may now be allowed to fall into the background, while the trained mind is gradually prepared for specialization in the “subjects” which, when the Trivium is completed, it should be perfectly well equipped to tackle on its own. The final synthesis of the Trivium—the presentation and public defense of the thesis—should be restored in some form; perhaps as a kind of “leaving examination” during the last term at school. {24}

The scope of rhetoric depends also on whether the pupil is to be turned out into the world at the age of 16 or whether he is to proceed to the university. Since, really, rhetoric should be taken at about 14, the first category of pupil should study grammar from about 9 to 11, and dialectic from 12 to 14; his last two school years would then be devoted to rhetoric, which, in his case, would be of a fairly specialized and vocational kind, suiting him to enter immediately upon some practical career. A pupil of the second category would finish his dialectical course in his preparatory school, and take rhetoric during his first two years at his public school. At 16, he would be ready to start upon those “subjects” which are proposed for his later study at the university: and part of his education will correspond to the mediaeval Quadrivium. What this amounts to is that the ordinary pupil, whose formal education ends at 16, will take the Trivium only; whereas scholars will take both Trivium and Quadrivium.

The University at Sixteen?

Is the Trivium, then, a sufficient education for life? Properly taught, I believe that it should be. At the end of the dialectic, the children will probably seem to be far behind their coevals brought up on old-fashioned “modern” methods, so far as detailed knowledge of specific subjects is concerned. But after the age of 14 they should be able to overhaul the others hand over fist. Indeed, I am not at all sure that a pupil thoroughly proficient in the Trivium would not be fit to proceed immediately to the university at the age of 16, thus proving himself the equal of his mediaeval counterpart, whose precocity astonished us at the beginning of this discussion. This, to be sure, would make hay of the English public school system, and disconcert the universities very

much. It would, for example, make quite a different thing of the Oxford and Cambridge boat race.

But I am not here to consider the feelings of academic bodies: I am concerned only with the proper training of the mind to encounter and deal with the formidable mass of undigested problems presented to it by the modern world. For the tools of learning are the same, in any and every subject; and the person who knows how to use them will, at any age, get the mastery of a new subject in half the time and with a quarter of the effort expended by the person who has not the tools at his command. To learn six subjects without remembering how they were learnt does nothing to ease the approach to a seventh; to have learnt and remembered the art of learning makes the approach to every subject an open door.

Educational Capital Depleted

Before concluding these necessarily very sketchy suggestions, I ought to say why I think it necessary, in these days, to go back to a discipline which we had discarded. The truth is that for the last 300 years or so we have {25} been living upon our educational capital. The post-Renaissance world, bewildered by the profusion of new “subjects” offered to it, broke away from the old discipline (which had, indeed, become sadly dull and stereotyped in its practical application) and imagined that henceforward it could, as it were, disport itself happily in its new and extended Quadrivium without passing through the Trivium. But the scholastic tradition, though broken and maimed, still lingered in the public schools and universities: Milton, however much he protested against it, was formed by it—the debate of the Fallen Angels, and the disputation of Abdiel with Satan have the tool-marks of the schools upon them, and might, incidentally, profitably figure as set passages for our dialectical studies. Right down to the nineteenth century, our public affairs were mostly managed, and our books and journals were for the most part written, by people brought up in homes, and trained in places, where that tradition was still alive in the memory and almost in the blood. Just so, many people today who are atheist or agnostic in religion, are governed in their conduct by a code of Christian ethics which is so rooted in their unconscious assumptions that it never occurs to them to question it.

Forgotten Roots

But one cannot live on capital forever. A tradition, however firmly rooted, if it is never watered, though it dies hard, yet in the end it dies. And today a great number—perhaps the majority—of the men and women who handle our affairs, write our books and our newspapers, carry out research, present our plays and our films, speak from our platforms and pulpits—yes, and who educate our young people, have never, even in a lingering traditional memory, undergone the scholastic discipline. Less and less do the children who come to be educated bring any of that tradition with them. We have lost the tools of learning—the axe and the wedge, the hammer and the saw, the chisel and the plane—that were so adaptable to all tasks. Instead of them, we have merely a set of complicated jigs, each of which will do but one task and no more, and in using which eye and hand receive no training, so that no man ever sees the work as a whole or “looks to the end of the work.”

What use is it to pile task on task and prolong the days of labor, if at the close the chief object is left unattained? It is not the fault of the teachers—they work only too hard already. The combined folly of a civilization that has forgotten its own roots is forcing them to shore up the tottering weight of an educational structure that is built upon sand. They are doing for their pupils the work which the pupils themselves ought to do. For the sole true end of education is simply this: to teach men how to learn for themselves; and whatever instruction fails to do this is effort spent in vain.

A CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY OF METHOD IN EDUCATION

William N. Blake

Education today, whether Christian or secular, lacks a workable philosophy of method. During the early part of this century, John Dewey made a conscious effort to perfect a philosophy of method for teaching which he saw as the missing link to realize social good. Should there be such a universal method, he thought, the teaching profession could then lead mankind steadily upward in its evolutionary ascent. Dewey's prodigious efforts resulted in the progressive education movement, which failed to achieve its goals. Dewey thought he had provided a workable philosophy of method and often bitterly complained that failures in the movement were due to educators' ineptness and politicians' unwillingness to follow closely his prescriptions. Was the problem with Dewey or with the profession and society? After reflecting on the matter, some educators have concluded that Dewey failed because of his idealism. Dewey vehemently opposed idealism in his writings but ended up with an idealism which men were unable to put into effect to transform and rebuild the world in terms of the social democracy he envisioned for the good of man.

Dewey nonetheless performed a needed service to the teaching profession by stressing again the importance of method. Method became so supreme in his thinking, however, that truth was banished from his system. Truth or metaphysics cannot be abandoned without disastrous effects, for it is the foundation upon which one must erect a method or practice. We must practice a vocation, but it must be a vocation with an ultimate goal in view. Truth provides the goals, the purposes of life. Method furnishes the potential practice, the way to achieve those goals. Truth and method or theory and practice must be happily wed if solid achievements are to be realized.

Christian Education

Our Western Christian civilization has realized the greatest advance in education known to mankind. Two ingredients combined to bring this about. *First*, Christians gave to the world the hope of redemption in Christ Jesus: the hope of fulfilling the original divine cultural mandate here and {27} now with the ultimate hope of dwelling in a city whose builder and maker is God. An achievable task or goal was broadcast. Mankind could now move ahead and away from the darkness of paganism. The shackles of sin which kept men from entering into their freedom were broken. All men could now enjoy the blessings that came from obedience to the divine Creator and Redeemer. *Second* in importance is the philosophy of method in education which Christians invented during the fifth and sixth centuries. This pattern of teaching has been practiced and sustained throughout the succeeding centuries up to the present to some degree. The practice has not always been consistent with the original philosophy, but those bright eras in education have been marked by a return to these basic principles. Just what are these basic principles?

These principles are the foundation for the long-tested curriculum called the Seven Liberal Arts as advanced by Boethius and Cassiodorus in the fifth and sixth centuries. Dorothy Sayers's essay, "The Lost Tools of Learning" (1947), brings to our attention once again these roots of our Western Christian education.² Her analysis of the underlying philosophy governing this curriculum deserves renewed vigorous consideration and application by Christian educators if our civilization is to be rebuilt and restored to its original intention of building the kingdom of God on earth.

When Christians invented and applied their philosophy of education, they operated on the premise that God is the sovereign Creator and Determiner of all things. God gave man a beautiful and productive world in which to live, but it was a world which had to be subdued

2. Dorothy L. Sayers, "The Lost Tools of Learning" (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1948). This is the reprint of a paper read at a vacation course in Education, Oxford, 1947, and which later appeared as an article in the *Hibbert Journal*. See the American reprint of this essay in this issue of this journal. Dorothy Sayers, in the opinion of this writer, has here written the most significant essay on education during this century.

through man's creative efforts. Work, then, is basic to man's being and happiness. Man was created to do something constructive to the glory of his Creator. These early Christians viewed man as a workman equipped by God with creative intelligence and energies to devise tools and skills and to manage his time in such a manner that the "diamond-in-the-rough" earth could be transformed into a sparkling demonstration of the glory of God.

Man in this perspective is basically an *active* being, but a being whose every action is governed by *purpose*. Theory and practice are thus happily combined. Man never learns just for the sake of learning, but he always learns in order that he may fulfill the terms of the divine covenant incumbent upon him. He learns and contemplates that he may serve and worship his God more perfectly. He learns that he may fulfill all the duties that God requires of him. Learning, then, always has an end outside {28} itself. The Platonic model of learning for the sake of release from the world of practicality and of ultimate absorption into the realm of pure thought is squarely rejected by the Christian. The Christian values whatever God has taught him to value. The *body* is just as much a part of man's being as is the soul and mind. Both parts merge together in perfect harmony. Scripture teaches that God made the body of man first and then breathed into him the breath of life. The body was not an afterthought or accident in creation, but a prominent aspect of man. Christian thinking attempts to ascribe to the body, to the practical, every bit of importance which Scripture attaches to it.

Not only do Christians hold that man has particular tasks to perform, but they also contend that man can know the purpose for life. This certainty of knowledge ignites human potential into solid and satisfying achievements. We know the truth through the illumination of the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit illumines the truths already deposited in divine revelation. Divine revelation is found in the whole created cosmos and in the Holy Bible. The Bible is the starting point in knowledge, for through it man learns that he is in rebellion against God and that he can be changed by God's grace into a loving child of God through the cross of Christ. This restored union with God opens up new vistas of understanding regarding God, the Bible, and life in general. Everything comes into focus. Nothing makes sense apart from the

new birth wrought by the Holy Spirit and the Scriptures. Purpose suddenly comes. Incentive to make something out of life propels man to labor with his hands and his intellect to fulfill his newly found destiny on earth. The Christian sees himself as a co-laborer with his God and with his fellow believers in this challenging enterprise. He is part of a great family, a collective of free men. He is not a rugged individualist who must bat, swat, and plot his course alone. For example, he submits to the government of Christ in the home, in the church, and in civil government. He welcomes the admonition of his brothers in Christ, for he realizes the power of indwelling sin to blind him to the true riches of faithful service in Christ's kingdom. This sure knowledge of what he is to do and how he is to believe maximizes productive labor and minimizes the opportunities for stumbling into blind alleys.

Trivium and Quadrivium

This Christian philosophy of method in learning stems from the Seven Liberal Arts. The Seven Liberal Arts were divided into the Trivium and the Quadrivium. The *Trivium* contains the heart of this philosophy of method. It alone remains unchanged to the present. The Trivium is what Dorothy Sayers calls "the lost tools of learning." The Trivium contains three parts: grammar, dialectic, and rhetoric. The *Quadrivium* had four subjects: music, arithmetic, geometry, and astronomy. The Trivium or {29} tools of learning remain unchanged, but the Quadrivium or the subjects change with the expansion of knowledge. The Quadrivium represents the various academic disciplines and can accordingly expand and contract with the current status of these studies. There is one important feature of each subject on the original catalog which requires attention. Each part has a mathematical structure to it. The same guideline persists today. Have you ever seen an academic discipline which has gained respectability which did not have a system to it? Logic, mathematics, and system are closely related. Our thinking today, then, is quite Medieval in that we insist upon order in a given discipline.

The interest during this century in the *structure of knowledge*, in academic models, and in the logic of language, has reinforced the wisdom of the Quadrivium. It is by seeing these skeletons of learning that one is enabled to flesh out the whole with useful data and workable facts. The

whole body of learning hereby takes on meaning and promotes increasing growth in research. Without such a structural model in a discipline, there would be little direction to data gathering; it would be impossible to handle and use the information which issues forth from research. In fact, research itself would be thwarted without a system to direct and to stimulate it. A concerted return to the mathematical, categorical, or structural underpinnings of a given body of knowledge promises efficiency and effectiveness in learning. To do this also implies that God is a God of order and that this attribute is reflected in what He has made. However, the commitment to an *evolutionary model* implies a world of change where the God of Scripture has no place. Men stand by evolution because of their adherence to Satan's covenant and lie that man can determine truth for himself. Truth is not seen as a revelation deposited in creation and the Scripture, but rather as a phenomenon of human determination and the mutability of all things. The final result, if these principles are consistently applied, is the disappearance of anything one might call truth and the concomitant dissipation of the academic disciplines. The Christian philosophy of learning therefore guarantees truth and opens the horizon for the expansion of useful knowledge.

The prime question before us is not knowledge itself, but *how to attain* that knowledge. This question, however, cannot be pursued until one is certain that there *is* such a thing as knowledge or truth. At this point, the certainty of knowledge is assumed; however, many significant writings can be referred to which argue for cognitive truth.³ To many people, the Christian {30} appears trite and simplistic because he seemingly glides right over those epistemological problems which have filled volume upon volume of philosophical treatises and which in the end have not resolved the question, "What is truth?" Why can a thoughtful, educated Christian do this? The answer is that he has been born again. He has found truth. His faith is firmly anchored in reality. The unbelieving scholar will never find an anchor for his thinking

3. Cornelius Van Til, *A Christian Theory of Knowledge* (Nutley, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1969). Reference is made to Van Til's perspective because it agrees most with the viewpoint of the author. Van Til holds a consistently biblical outlook. Van Til analyzes other Christian epistemologies which will provide an opening to those desiring to inquire into this field of study.

because his faith is misplaced, misguided. No man by his will alone can find this correct starting point. Only a man called by God, regenerated by the Holy Spirit, and imbued with true faith in the triune God can launch forth into reality itself and accomplish externally useful things for his fellow man and for the glory of his Creator-Redeemer. The starting point is all-important; therefore, the Christian calls all men to repentance and true faith that they may equally enjoy the same prospect of acquiring real and useful knowledge.

This Christian philosophy of method in learning derives its inspiration from the Trivium of the Seven Liberal Arts. The basic ideas of the Trivium remain unchanged, even though the complexion of schooling has altered considerably. The goal of these tools of learning, the Trivium, according to Dorothy Sayers, is “to teach men how to learn for themselves; and whatever instruction fails to do this is effort spent in vain.” One prominent notion in this goal is *methodology*. In taking prospective scholars into our care as teachers, we see our task as that of developing *skills* in the individuals. Our duty is not to cram as much subject matter into the cranium as possible. The substance of learning is delayed until the Quadrivium, which will begin sometime in the high school years for most students. To begin with the idea of *imparting knowledge* is to assume that the teacher’s role is to indoctrinate the young. To begin with the goal of *developing skills*, academic or otherwise, is to believe that the teacher’s duty is to develop in the student the ability to learn for himself. In one case the student is by and large passive; in the other he is active, for he is gaining self-sufficiency in the learning process. In one case, the teacher is the prime interpreter of life; in the other, the student is learning the principles of interpretation so that he can arrive at his own views intelligently. Attention to proper method opens the way to teach men how to learn for themselves.

Christianity prompts and rewards men to think for themselves. For example, the new Christians at Berea who came to know Christ through the preaching of the Apostle Paul were commended by the Holy Spirit because they did not accept what Paul had taught them until they had checked out the truth of the matter (Acts 17:10–11). This they did by comparing what the apostle said with Scripture. They had a method. This method gave them self-sufficiency in gaining knowledge. The student was active in this case, checking out all that

the apostle said with the supreme standard {31} of truth. To the extent that Paul's teaching conformed to Scripture would these Bereans believe. As great and as learned a man as was the Apostle Paul, this gave him no warrant in and of himself to require his listeners to accept his teachings unchallenged by Scripture. Christians are a people of the Book of books and can preserve their religion only by giving to its adherents this method of self-inquiry.

Doesn't this position appear to weaken Christianity? One may hereby get the uneasy feeling that Christianity is up for grabs, open to any private interpretation. How can you have a collective way of thinking when each "does his own thing"? However, behind all this inquiry on the part of Christians is the divine Teacher Himself. The sovereign God is responsible for the initial interest and commitment that Christians have in the Bible as the standard of truth. This same sovereign Christ is mankind's only teacher and interpreter of the truths deposited in revelation, whether in the general revelation of creation and providence or in the special revelation of Scripture. This goal of self-inquiry, then, must be understood in the light of man's total dependence upon Christ to lead him in the direction of truth and to give sure understandings of that truth. Having said this, the whole matter of the goal of education fits well into the notion of a *unified system of truth*, for its source of unity is Christ and not man. To the extent that Christ is calling a people to Himself, to that degree will there be those who have a common set of presuppositions to search for truth. The living, eternal Christ working among men is the only guarantee that men will accept revelation and understand it and that there will exist a Christian way of life in this world. The intellectual vibrancy of Christianity depends not upon a set of well-arranged propositions, but upon a real living Person who is truth itself and who excites His followers to search for truth.

The Trivium Applied

The Christian, then, holds that *self-sufficiency in learning is the outgrowth of training in skills*, in the tools of learning. The model for this philosophy of method is that of a workman using skills and tools to build the kingdom of God on earth. It could be any workman with tools and skills necessary to carry out his vocation. Take a carpenter, for instance. He has a plumb and a line as one tool among many. He

must possess skill to use this tool properly, so that the house he erects will be plumb and straight according to its design. An apprentice will be instructed in this skill and practice it on any convenient model or real structure under the supervision of a master carpenter. Once this skill has been perfected, the apprentice is now ready to be self-sufficient in this aspect of his vocation. There are many other skills and tools to master. Each has its own {32} particular application to the trade. All of these particular skills and tools must, then, be seen as means to erect a structure. The end is not for the sake of the skills and tools but to build something useful to man in his efforts to subdue the earth, in his efforts to be more efficient and productive in fulfilling his divine mandate. Men advance from the standpoint of a vision about their role in life. Skills and tools are garnered with a view to fulfill this vision. We then see that in this model the apprentice begins learning the particulars of a given tool and its associated skills. He must then see the total use and application of this tool. The same procedure is followed for all the other tools in the trade, but he is not a carpenter until he can take all these tools and bring them into a harmonious union to construct something out of the raw materials of the earth.

A further analysis of this model shows that there are *three distinct steps* involved in finally becoming an able carpenter. The *first* part of the method is to take each tool and study each particular feature and use of that tool. The *second* thing is to bring all the divergent aspects of a particular tool into focus. All the particulars of the first step merge together so that the apprentice now has in view a full range of the potential uses of that tool. Step one and step two are followed closely in regard to each of the tools of carpentry. At this point, the apprentice is a master of each particular tool in that vocation, but that in itself is not sufficient to become a carpenter. The *final stage* is learning to take all these particular tools and see how they work together to do the work of carpentry. His vocation is no longer viewed as the mastery of discrete tools unrelated, but now all these unique tools blend their individual differences into a harmonious whole. Working together, they will be used to build a house or something useful. When this harmony is achieved, the apprentice then becomes a carpenter: he has mastered the tools of carpentry. The goal is not mere mastery of the tool, but

dominion over some part of the earth through his effective use of the tool.

These three steps are an analysis of what happens in learning carpentry. They are not intended to limit the instructor from utilizing in some way all three steps simultaneously in the instruction process. For example, when a carpenter's level is studied, it would be natural to point out that this tool along with the plumb and line assists in the proper alignment of a house before students learn how it indeed will do that. One may also show how the level and the plumb both have related functions before all is known about either. Here the third step is introduced before the first step is mastered. Although there may be apparent overlapping in the instruction process, yet the order of these steps remains unchanged in bringing one to the mastery of carpentry.

The *model*, then, is that of a workman building the kingdom of God through thought and labor. This model encompasses every human vocation, {33} for all men are called to labor under the lordship of Christ Jesus. Not all will repent and submit to Christ, but the call is universal for all to repent. This, however, is the Christian's goal of *dominion* in this life. Every culture has its concept of dominion and the means to fulfill it. A people and a culture cannot be thoroughly understood without identifying their dominion concept. Studies of anthropology and history in particular are greatly enhanced when the dominion concept of a people is clearly illuminated.

It may seem to some that using the model of a common laborer is unbecoming to the academic world. The early Christians gave due honor and respect to those who labored in the academics, but they viewed the scholar's labor in the same way as that of the carpenter. They both had tools to master; they both had hard work ahead of them in using these tools to subdue the earth. All labor and professions were reduced to a common denominator, namely, that of productive workmen in the kingdom of God. In this perspective, one would conclude that all education is *vocational* at heart. The idea that some education is designed to make thinkers, and that the remainder is vocational and designed for the laboring man, is a dichotomy unacceptable in this Christian perspective. Christians today still largely think in terms of this dualism, which is obviously more reminiscent of Greek Platonism than it is of pristine Christianity. The tools of the scholar are more aca-

demic in nature, but they are nonetheless tools to accomplish real day-to-day tasks in building God's kingdom. The task may be to refute heresy that erodes away the foundations of a Christian way of life. It may be to communicate effectively the everlasting gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ to the contemporary world. One may be challenged to develop a Christian view of government so that our profession in Christ's atoning love will be consistent with Christ's demands upon civil government. These and numerous other practical tasks require the tools of learning to assist in carrying out these vital projects. One may labor in more practical endeavors, but both are laborers in God's kingdom whose preparation for service requires the acquisition of certain basic tools.

The model for the academician is thus that of a workman trained skillfully to use tools to perform practical tasks that assist men to advance God's kingdom. Can the tools of learning be identified, or are they not so numerous as the tools of the so-called common laborer? All are common laborers in Christ's kingdom in a general sense, but the tools of a mechanic, of a carpenter, of an electrician, and so on are much more obvious than those of a scholar; for this reason we do not think of the scholar as a workman with tools. The Trivium of the Seven Liberal Arts identifies these tools and limits the number to three: grammar, dialectic, and rhetoric. {34}

Dorothy Sayers highlights the significance of these tools of learning. She attempts to restore a vision that persisted for centuries but is lost today. Now, in this century, the very thought that something invented fourteen or fifteen centuries ago can have any bearing on contemporary education seems too much to accept. For those sincerely searching to restore learning to our land, Sayers's essay, "The Lost Tools of Learning," deserves at least a reading, and this analysis of the underlying philosophy may open the door to make Christian principles of learning the harbinger of much good in education.

The first tool of learning is *grammar*. What happens at the grammar level is an introduction to a given body of knowledge through looking at various established *facts* associated with it. General principles are not mastered here, but particular facts receive concentrated attention. This is the time for mastery of detail. How these details fit together into a system of knowledge follows this first step. Here the memorization of facts and details characterizes educational efforts. It is like walking

through a maze of trees in the woods and becoming acquainted with all the different trees. Moving into the second level is like emerging from these trees and turning around to see that you have been in a forest.

The second tool of learning is *dialectic* or *logic*. Here all the particular facts are put into a *system* in the sense that one emerges from a woods and looks back to see that he has been in a forest. A generalization is made about all the particulars. Things are viewed in a system. They are pulled together into a whole, so that each detail is seen as a part of the whole. The consequence of seeing how things fit together promotes questioning and a wholesome spirit of contradiction. This is the process of seeing through the logic of a matter for oneself. This cannot be done without some kind of dispute as to how all the details fit into the system. The amount and depth of disputation depends upon what is being learned and the open atmosphere of inquiry engendered by a given teacher.

Rhetoric completes the tools of learning. Dialectic zeros in on the logic of things, of particular systems of thought or subjects. Rhetoric takes the next grand step and brings all these subjects together into one *whole*. As dialectic sees the system within a particular subject, rhetoric attempts to see the interrelatedness of all these subjects. The world must not be seen, for example, as something reduced to a scientific explanation, a sociological explanation, an economic explanation, an historical explanation, a psychological explanation, a political explanation, and so on. All these particular systems of thought must some way merge together and be seen as part of a whole. The logic that was pressed so zealously at the dialectic stage must now to some extent be distrusted, for the student comes to sense that the logic of any particular subject will not answer all the compelling problems of life. Furthermore, one comes to see that a given {35} solution for life offered by one subject is not really a solution at all until it can fit into an overall view of life. In other words, life is more than mathematics, more than science, more than sociology, more than economics, more than history, more than psychology, more than politics, more than religion, and so on.

The Christian is able to make the three lost tools of learning effective in the hands of students because he can provide the necessary means to integrate the various components of life. He can do this without elevat-

ing any aspect of life at the expense of other worthy components. Each part receives its respected place in the scheme. What logic, then, does the Christian have that will pull these divergent interests into a workable whole? He has no logic to achieve this. He has only a Personality who is the very Creator of all these parts. God as manifested in the Person of our Lord Jesus Christ is that central personality, that unifying force. All things were made by Him and all things were made for His glory. "For His glory" means in this discussion that all things come into focus in Christ. All things gain meaning and significance in and through Him. A little child clearly sees, if taught by loving Christian parents, that all things are here to bring glory to God. Life makes sense for a child when Jesus Christ stands as the shepherd of his life. The arrogance of the scholar must give way to this childlike vision of Christ being central in all things.

One can trace the course of humanism in our Western Christian culture and observe that the humanists could successfully use only two of the tools of learning, grammar and dialectic. The rhetoric tool was attempted but failed due to bad faith. Humanists attempt to reduce all the rest of life to some particular aspect of life which they believe can give meaning to all the rest. We have witnessed in this century, for example, the reduction of life to scientific explanations. Science is important but not all-important. When all of life is reduced to science, or any other particular aspect of reality, then life becomes distorted and monstrous. Men cannot and do not long live under a single distortion. This accounts for the changing nature of the humanist's view of life. When I took my first philosophy course at college, my professor readily acknowledged that his beliefs had changed at least four times during his teaching career and would likely change again if a more plausible explanation was set forth. His ultimate faith was in human reason. Humanism can never find that integrating principle of life, due to its commitment to human autonomy. Until men become as little children and bow themselves before the Lord Jesus, every effort they make to see the interrelatedness of life will be futile. Children can begin to put all things together into a meaningful whole. The exercise of putting divergent things together into a whole does not always involve seeing things in a direct and ultimate relationship to Christ. Some examples

will assist to see this point as well as show how these three tools of learning {36} contribute to equipping a man to be an apt scholar.

These tools of learning function at all levels of learning and accordingly give form to educational methods. One of the first steps in formal education is to learn to read. Learning the sounds of particular letters or associating sound with symbol can be likened unto the “grammar” tool of learning. Putting these disparate symbols together into a single word brings a learner to the dialectic level. Here all the particulars fit into a system, namely, a word. The student will learn how to manipulate more and more symbols and to put them together to produce a multitude of words, but his learning is not complete until these words can be put together and express a whole thought, namely, a sentence. Seeing the interrelatedness of words in a sentence brings a student to the “rhetoric” tool of learning. The three tools in this instance are the symbol (the particular), the word (the system), and the sentence (the interrelatedness of the many systems).

To demonstrate the breadth of application involved in the three tools of learning, it can be shown that, from another perspective, the sentence is at the grammar stage. From the standpoint of learning to write well, or what is called composition, the sentence may be viewed as the world of particulars. A student at this grammar level learns how to write a good sentence. He masters all the different kinds of sentences and the various orders permissible within each kind of sentence. When the matter of sentences is mastered, then he is prepared to go the next step and put sentences into a paragraph. He puts them together into a system such that they will work together to communicate a larger message. There is much effort involved in mastering the many alternatives available to say something with telling effect in paragraph form. Finally, one must put paragraphs together to make a story or an essay. The end is the creation of writing that carries a meaningful and effective account to real people in actual life situations. The mastery of sentences alone would not achieve this goal. Neither would competence in forming paragraphs. Until all the parts can be put together into a whole, nothing very useful emerges. Rhetoric brings the matter to the forefront, where communication really counts.

The pattern of the three tools of learning can be seen and illustrated in the study of many subjects. In *history*, for example, one begins learn-

ing about people, then how people affect each other to produce an event. Finally, historians study how these events all demonstrate the history of an individual, group, or nation.

In studying *geography*, the initial particular might be the sun, the wind, the ocean, the lakes, the rivers, the plains, or the mountains. The dialectic phase would put these elements together. The sun, the ocean, and the cloud would be linked in one system. The wind, the cloud, the mountain, {37} and the rain might be linked in another. The rain, the creeks, the lakes, the rivers, and the ocean might be linked in still another. Finally, all these systems are pulled together in an example of a weather pattern.

Extending the study of geography into *ecology*, one can begin with the study of all that physically comprises a given area: land, mountains, lakes, roads, farms, towns, cities, railroads, airports, a given population with its various vocations, and so on. These can then be put together by maps and other means to obtain a thorough geographical understanding of that area. Then, at the rhetorical level, take an ecological account of the area by developing an understanding of the overall relationship of these parts to each in order to form what is called a community of people and their environment. The introduction of a proposed interstate highway may add impetus to discovering this interrelationship. Assessing the impact of this new highway on the community will bring to the people pro and con arguments to determine whether such a highway should be constructed with or without their approval.

In *biology* the starting-point may be the identification of various animals. The dialectic stage involves placing these animals into similar groups. Once animals of a kind have been classified, then the ecology or inter-relationship of these animals to one another can be studied.

A parallel seems to exist between the three *academic degrees* offered at the university level and the three tools of learning. The baccalaureate degree corresponds to the grammar level. Here the university student is given a broad background of many facts through taking a wide variety of subjects. When a student prepares for a master's degree, he studies one subject in depth. The current doctorate tends to be an extension of the master's degree—in-depth study—which may suggest its limitations. In the early university, the doctorate degree required a vigorous defense of a thesis. This involved being able to see this thesis in relation

to other existing truths. In other words, the one subject of specialization had to be placed as a viable contribution of knowledge within the total spectrum of life. A man holding a PhD in biology was not supposed to be ignorant of theology of ethics, of geography, of politics, and so on, insofar as his thesis might have some bearing upon these other facets of life. This final rhetoric level not only examined the candidate for thoroughness of understanding of a particular subject, but more particularly for his understanding of *how this knowledge fit into the total scheme of life*. Doctors were not just specialists unable to do anything with the rest of life; they were trained craftsmen able to do something to effect changes for the better in the human situation. They were not dreamers, but agents of change in a real world to which they addressed themselves. Is it possible that the apparent lack of communication among scholars today is due to a deficiency in training at this rhetoric level? Have our scholars only progressed to the {38} dialectic level? If so, this locks them into the logic of their own specialty and limits their breadth of vision and usefulness.

A Christian Trivium vs. Secular Trivia

Dorothy Sayers sees a pedagogical application to the three tools of learning. Roughly speaking, the *primary school* is likened unto the grammar level of development. At this level children delight in detail, unattached to a system. Memorization of otherwise boring details to older children is at this age a challenge and is readily absorbed. With maturity children develop a questioning attitude, a healthy sense of contradiction. These are the *middle years* of school, possibly extending into grades nine and ten. Here students are more interested in making sense out of the details. The logic of facts gains importance. These are the dialectic years of learning. When one reaches the maturity of the upper years of *high school*, he can begin to cope with the task of putting all these systems into a whole. He is mature enough to see the limitations of logic. He senses the need for an overall view of life to assist in pulling together all that he has learned into a body of thinking that will do something in the real world about him.

The end of elementary and secondary training is to give students skills, not mastery of subject matter. Undue emphasis on subject matter brings a heavy burden of words, thoughts, ideas, propositions, descrip-

tions, speculations, and probabilities upon the youngster, which is more than he can bear. He thus becomes a victim of his culture rather than a master and creator of it. He increasingly sees himself as a cog in an enormous wheel, unable to be creative in his world. He is powerless in the face of all this knowledge and verbiage to control and constructively improve his environment. The intent of the Trivium is to emphasize *skills* at this early stage of learning and to wait until the student is efficient in these tools of learning before he is turned out into the big world about him. Just as an apprentice carpenter does not undertake the responsibilities of building a house until he is skilled in his trade, so the student does not tackle the world of ideas until he has the skills to do it on his own.

Most everyone senses the futility of much of contemporary education. Do we really want our children to be equipped to be creative? Or do we mostly want them to fit into the present system? Many fear the dangers which will follow in the wake of producing a generation capable of thinking for itself. There is legitimate ground for these fears when you reflect on the revolutionary activities of many young people in our recent past. How does one cope with this problem of freedom and responsibility? The answer is an easy one for the Christian, but for the humanist, meaning the contemporary secularist, there is no solution. Christian training opens the door to the only freedom there is to men in this world. It is a freedom {39} under God our Creator and Redeemer. This freedom comes when men have full release from the burden and guilt of their sins. They enter the gates of freedom through the cross of Christ. They are released from the bondage of their sins and of Satan's kingdom, and they can freely serve their God and their fellows. Man is free under God's law. He no longer seeks to break the law that gives him existence and gives meaning to life, but he loves it, for he sees in it the very essence of life as his God has designed it. He is not his own master, but has the governing principle of God's Word and God's Holy Spirit in his innermost being. He is not a revolutionary, but an obedient servant of the Great God of Heaven. His whole aim in life is to do the will of his God. This God requires him to subdue, to control his environment so that the labor of his hands will build and advance the kingdom of God on earth. The tools of learning are designed to assist aspiring youth to take this kind of role in life, to work

consciously at subduing his environment for the glory of God. His aim is not to subdue men but his environment. Nowhere in Scripture are Christians called upon to rule autonomously over men. Their project is to subdue their environment with all the might, intelligence, gifts, and skills which God has given them.

The political scene may appear to be a “hands off” area of life for the Christian in the light of the above discussion. To the contrary, the Christian works politically to place men under the law of Christ. Our forefathers in America made a conscious effort to situate Christ as the head of this nation. They did not envision a democracy of men to rule over the people. This is man ruling man. They saw God as the only legitimate ruler of men. The Word of God was the final arbiter in human affairs, not the ballot box.

The tools of learning place heavy emphasis on mastery of *language*. Mastery of language not only includes the study of one’s mother tongue and foreign languages, but it includes to a large extent the language of subjects. It matters little in this scheme which subject is the object of instruction. The point being that this philosophy of method gives priority to skills, not to any particular subject. The student has to develop his skills on some kind of subject matter in the sense that an apprentice carpenter must practice building some kind of structure. The chief concern is developing skills, not absorbing subject matter.

In developing these skills in learning, it is advantageous to *limit the number of subjects* on which the student practices. The end is mastery of skills, and when solid achievement is realized in fewer subjects, the student gains self-confidence in what he is doing. He feels he has control over the situation. Handling words and ideas becomes as routine as sawing boards square and hammering nails straight for the apprentice carpenter. With his skills highly developed in a fewer subjects, the scholar can then {40} turn to the larger world of learning and feel confident that he can in time master what is before him.

The Tempo School in Edmonton, Alberta, Canada, has made a conscious effort under the leadership of Dr. George Cormack to apply the principles suggested by Dorothy Sayers. One example of how Dr. Cormack has reduced the number of subjects is in his approach to science. The formal study of science begins with physics in grade seven. In grades eight through ten both physics and chemistry are studied each

year. In grade eleven, chemistry alone is taken, and physics in grade twelve. As I observe this pattern, it seems that the intent is to provide students with the tools of science or skills in being a scientist. The selection of physics and chemistry suggests that the school was looking for two subjects to develop skills in science which are highly organized with a clear set of principles. These two subjects no doubt are fundamental to all other sciences. In other words, a person who is trained in the skills of becoming a physicist or chemist will have the basic scientific stance to tackle any further scientific problems. The method and skills of science in general should be fairly clear to such a student after six years of practice and instruction in physics and chemistry. The object in such a curricular choice is not to impart a great mass of scientific knowledge, but rather to equip students with the skills of scientific investigation.

Every curriculum is devised in terms of *philosophy of method* in education. Many who devise curriculums today may not be conscious of the underlying presuppositions involved in their choices. The fact remains that the end result reflects a definite point of view. Why do we teach so many scientific subjects in the lower schools today? Are these curriculum choices producing a population capable of coping with scientific problems, or are they producing a people committed to what certain specialists in science can do for us? The same question may be worded to ask whether science is in the hands of the people or in the hands of the experts. It seems evident that real interest in science is at a low ebb today except for what some expert can do to make a better automobile or some other convenience. This is certainly a detached interest in science with very limited ability to control the use and growth of the discipline. Men who are free through the regenerating act of the Holy Spirit seek to exercise that freedom by controlling what God has committed to their charge. A slavish mentality contents itself with the crumbs handed down by its masters. This Christian philosophy of method intends to equip the Christian to fulfill his God-given responsibilities and not blindly follow the current trend of enslavement of the human spirit.

The curriculum below is suggested for Christian schools who seek to produce competent workmen in learning. The emphasis is not on an abundance of subjects but on developing solid competence in the tools

of {41} learning. This curriculum outline does not answer the question of how to teach the Trivium; it only shows how to limit the subjects so that the Trivium can most effectively be taught and students gain the greatest sense of achievement in the tools of learning.

Curriculum for Christian Schools

[See accompanying chart below]

It will be noted that with each history course there is a geography course. Teaching these together locates history in the context of real places with real people involved in their vocations. *Geography* gains significance because people, lands, and vocations are not studied to satisfy curiosity or stimulate interests in world travel, but rather as a skill necessary to understand the ebb and flow of events that affect a people. Historical understanding requires a thorough acquaintance with the geographical factors associated with these events. *Mathematics* receives attention throughout the school experience. This logic of numbers is a discipline basic to all other studies. The Scriptures give significance to numbers. Our God is a Trinitarian God. Three Persons in one divine Godhead. Repeated patterns and uses of numbers in Scripture suggest the order and design of the Creator. Students desiring to see clearly God's order and redemption must be proficient in mathematics. *Language study* begins with learning to read and continues throughout the grades. The study of a foreign language begins with Latin in grade five and is dropped in favor of Greek in grade ten. Why emphasize the dead languages? Dorothy Sayers answers well this objection. Her basic concern is that the language chosen should be highly reflective. This means that it has a fairly consistent system of constructing words through word endings and so on to denote changes in person, number, tense, case, and so on. English is not highly reflective, but Greek and Latin are. Russian, for example, is one of the least reflective languages today. The point is not to return to the past for the sake of the past, but to take that language which will best provide a student with a sense of what language is all about. Sayers argues that highly reflective languages best serve that end. One must remember that the goal is to provide *skills* in dealing with languages, not the mastery of a particular

language. Tools and skills have priority in this decision process. Contemporary language can be pursued when these language skills become *automatic responses* for the student.

The study of the Bible receives much attention throughout. The plan to begin biblical history and geography in grade four and biblical theology in grade ten is only a suggestion. The end is to produce students skilled in the tools of biblical interpretation so that they will be prepared to search the Scriptures to find truth and to measure all other teachings against this absolute standard. No study requires more attention than that of the {42} Bible, for Christians live in terms of it. Christians are a people of the Book of books. Their very survival and continued success depends on a thorough grasp of its message. No one can ever know all that is needed from Scripture to solve all future problems. What is critical is to be able to handle Scripture and to be equipped to search for those answers when problems arise. In this way, Christians can meaningfully testify with the psalmist, “Thy Word is a lamp unto my feet and a light unto my path” (Ps. 119:105). Skill in using the Bible has priority over indoctrination. After all, we believe the Holy Spirit alone teaches, imparts truth, or indoctrinates. The school has a formal task to perform in regard to the Scripture, namely, that of providing skills in searching for the truth. The family and the church have responsibilities for the more intimate relations between a child and his God. This is not to minimize the importance of a personal relationship with our Lord Jesus Christ, but it is an effort to set spheres of prime responsibility. The school may lead many children to know Christ as their only Saviour, but that should not be its first objective as a school. If the school settles for a strictly evangelistic goal in its approach, then it has failed to produce Christians who can wrestle with the critical personal and social problems in terms of Scripture. It has produced people aligned with Christ but who are ill equipped to fulfill the demands of Christ in home, church, school, state, and society in general. Look at the politicians today who profess to be born again. This sounds great for the nation, but the nagging question always comes to mind concerning why they appear so incompetent to apply Scripture to the political scene and to restore Christian principles to matters of government. This philosophy of method in education holds that *the school has a limited role, formal schooling*, and that if this

responsibility is lived up to, the body of Christ will best be served by such a restricted outlook. The school cannot play the role of the home and church as well; it must primarily be a school.

The return and restoration of this early Christian practice in education promises much for the rebuilding of a Christian society and state. It will release new energies into our youth, for they will stand in the face of the ruins of our present civilization with the realization that God has ably equipped them to rebuild America and the world for the glory of God. {43}

Proposed Curriculum for Christian Schools

Grade	Subjects								
1	Bible Stories	Reading	Spelling	Phonics	Writing	Math			
2	"	"	"	"	"	"			
3	"	"	"	Composition	Geography	"			
4	History and Geograpy of O.T. & N.T.	English Literature	"	"	"	"	Grammar		
5	"	"	"	"	"	"	Latin		
6	"	"	"	History	"	"	"		
7	"	"	Physics	"	"	"	"		
8	"	"	Physics-Chemistry	"	"	"	"		
9	Biblical Theology	"	"	"	"	"	"		
10	"	"	"	"	"	"	Greek	German	
11	"	"	Chemistry	"	"	"	"	"	Logic
12	"	"	Physics	"	"	"	"	"	"

TASKS OF THE CHRISTIAN EDUCATOR

T. Robert Ingram

Undoubtedly one of the most pressing demands upon what we loosely call Christian education is to get clear of the whole complex of modern instruction both as to subject matter and methods, and then to keep clear.

There are two main difficulties. The *first* has to do with the basic assumption, generally agreed upon even by the Christian community, that there is a natural law accessible to the human intellect, whether or not there is a personal God. The *second* is the lack of availability of instructional material, or even an outline guide for what is to be taught.

The first difficulty is the controlling one. It is the cause of the second, and unless it is rooted out thoroughly from the minds of those engaged in teaching (almost complete sanctification), there seems to be no way to lay down a course of study and provide suitable teaching material and guidance that is not badly tainted.

It may be said that the false basic assumption was found acceptable and has been the guiding one for well nigh onto 150 years, certainly from the 1830s. In that length of time, whatever instructional material may have been available from the preceding regime has been lost. Proportionately, it was meager to begin with, and time takes a voracious toll on textbooks. Since that date, nothing of importance has been produced that did not have one eye on the false assumption. Worse still, at least five teaching generations have passed away, leaving us hopelessly cut off from a wiser and sounder past.

It would be hard to exaggerate the deadliness of the stroke dealt to wisdom and understanding among us by the very first compulsory school legislation. The point of departure is clear. From the moment all the children in any given community were required by law to attend school, the school had to be one that was acceptable to parents of varying religious opinions, even of denominational groupings that were at loggerheads on some point or other of doctrine. The only possible solution was to restrict teaching in the common school to what were

considered “essentials,” while conflicting views were relegated to silence.

The generally accepted notion was that what was clearly religious doctrinal instruction would be reduced to the *lowest common denominator*. An even more significant notion was tacitly agreed upon along with this, {45} however, namely that there is a vast body of learning which, as stated above, is accessible to the human intellect whether or not there is a personal God. As more popularly expressed, it was agreed that there is such a thing as “secular” learning, meaning learning that does not involve God in subject matter or method.

Put another way, reading, writing, and arithmetic, it was agreed, had no connection with religion. These things could be taught whether or not there is a personal God. (It is not without reason at this point that for the first time among Christians, *music*, the fourth basic subject, was quietly dropped. The most likely reason is that the only music worth working at is religious.)

Viewed from an analysis of the actual textbook material that began to be used, it may be said that it took nearly 100 years for all recognizably Christian material to disappear, once Massachusetts adopted Horace Mann’s secular vision of government education. It was not until after World War I that even the simplest moral teachings were deliberately excised. The gradual but steady reduction in Christian content in textbooks has been carefully studied and reported on elsewhere and need not be reviewed here. Thus, it might be said that it was that long before the full effects of the action of the Massachusetts legislature were felt.

Considered from the basic assumption that underlay the whole teaching effort in this country, however, what might properly be called Christian education died with the acceptance of the common school. For acceptance of the common school, with its lowest common denominator religiously and its main body of secular or neutral learning, was an overt repudiation of a sovereign living and ruling Lord Jesus Christ “in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge.”

The Christian concept of teaching had found its voice in the fourth century when Augustine of Hippo wrote his little treatise, “On Christian Teaching.” It is pretty well agreed that what Augustine wrote here

set the pattern and course of education in the Latin world from that time on. Strangely enough to modern minds, Augustine had no need to argue for placing the Lord Jesus Christ at the center of all learning and Scripture as the unquestioned subject matter to be taught. He had rather to reach out and take into the body of instructional material such non-Christian writings as could be used to contribute to growth in understanding Christ. Truth, he said, wherever it is found, is in the service of its master. He wrote, "For Moses knew that, from whatever mind true counsel might proceed, it should not be attributed to that mind but to him who is the truth, the immutable God."

It cannot be denied that much that is good and true is found in non-biblical thinkers and writers. The Apostle Paul roundly declared that God had implanted a basic knowledge of Himself in all mankind, and also a {46} general moral sense. It has been pointed out that apart from this assumption much of the Old Testament does not make sense. To accommodate to this, however, is radically different from the proposition that truth exists whether or not the God of the Bible does. Quite the contrary, it asserts the dependence of all truth upon God and brings all in submission to Him. That Plato, for example, did not know the full truth does not imply that what he did see he saw, or would have seen, whether or not Jesus Christ is Lord. Plato has to be read in the light of the gospel.

The New England school settlement, however, postulated that the truth can be seen without the light of the gospel. And that amounted to a denial of the lordship of Jesus Christ, if not downright atheism. From that point on, there was only one way for education to go. And go it has, unswervingly and unchecked, despite the hand-wringing of a few Christian stalwarts here and there.

It is no surprise that, granted the possibility of religious neutrality, moral instruction is ruled out, for the very idea of morality rests upon the active presence of the living God in judging the deeds of all men. If there is such a thing as an eternal moral law (and who would deny it?), then it must follow that a man is expected to suffer death rather than to violate that law, knowing that he will be accountable after death. Apart from this truth, there can be no moral system—only expediency. Situational ethics, therefore, is inevitably the end of the road for all who

agree that there is a body of teaching accessible to the human intellect whether or not there is a personal God.

Neither is it surprising that school children today, after being abused with such enormities as “new math,” “new English,” etc., should be found to be doing worse and worse on the standard scholastic achievement tests, year after year. Graduate students, we hear, cannot write; and that, says a Stanford University study, because they cannot think. But who can make sense out of anything apart from God who made and redeemed all things? Yet that such a body of learning exists is a necessary premise of the whole educational establishment today.

What this means for the Christian educator is simply that he has to grind away continuously at his own mental equipment, refining and cleansing it of falsehoods that come from the false proposition, but are so intricately intertwined in all that he has learned that he needs almost to go through an extended period of consciously unlearning much of what he has himself taken for granted.

Nowhere is this more glaring than in the so-called scientific disciplines. These may quite well be defined as disciplines organized around the very false proposition that has caused all the mischief—namely, that the secrets of “nature” may be discovered and incorporated into the human intellect whether or not there is a personal God. The evolutionists are quite right {47} in their opposition to the doctrine of creation as suitable to a science class, simply because what they mean by science is that which can be understood whether or not one presupposes God. Progress generally means learning more and more that can be understood without reference to God—getting along in more and more ways without religion.

And this brings us face to face with the second difficulty facing the Christian teacher. Where can he turn for material to teach about the created order, or nature, which makes any other assumption than that no one need mention God in the study of it? How can he sift out the good and solid inquiry into nature from the endless repetition of propaganda about evolution? Even the leading creationists among us today, the heroic pioneers, speak of “primitive” man when they mean “savage,” betraying that they still assume at least social evolution to be true.

Yet more to the point, where can he find suitable material to use in teaching little children how to read? For it must be admitted that what a child reads, even as a beginner, has some meaning for him. Normally, beginning readers can read selected Scripture with understanding. But in the determination to escape from the sovereignty of God in wisdom and knowledge, and in the dedication to the removal of all that smacks of religion from the eyes of school children, the textbook people have come up with the dullest imaginable sort of trash about nothing. Worse still, they are reduced to talking animals, since everybody “knows” animals are not moral or immoral creatures.

Teaching arithmetic seems to be affected more subtly, but no less effectively. What usually happens, for some reason, is simply that the teacher finds herself unable to get it across; and the textbooks are of little help. It is just possible that where the idea of God is lost, the charm and mystery of numbers, even on a beginning level, is also lost. New math aside, the Christian teaching of elementary arithmetic is pretty much dependent on the teacher as to the order of presentation of material, the drill required, and the rate of advancement.

Now it is true that in the elementary grades a Christian teacher who has grasped the fundamental principle of all wisdom and knowledge being contained in Christ, and who has started out on simple ground rules of phonics in reading and “facts” of arithmetic, can after a few years, and usually will, manage without any textbook at all. The difficulty is finding enough of such teachers to begin to do the job.

In the meantime, many a Christian school has to limp along, letting the elementary teachers “follow the track” laid down by the atheistic system, simply because they are incapable of striking out on their own. This can be tolerable, provided they are never allowed to lose sight of the grand goal and pressure is kept on to grow out of the humanistic straitjacket. All too often, however, what happens is that the Christian school people {48} throw in the towel and simply settle back into the groove provided for them by the education machine.

It may well be that the critical point is this very elementary period. If a child can be rooted and grounded in the ways of truth—in learning and applying the logic of the phonetic alphabet, for example, and the facts of arithmetic—his mind is sufficiently attuned to recognize truth, so that in the upper grades, where the subject matter is more valuable,

the teacher can get through with much truth while the error simply eludes the child and does not enter into his understanding.

If we can rest confidently in Augustine's dictum, that there is no such thing as learning that does not lead to understanding, then we may trust that the Christian teacher who is unable to lead his students to understanding simply does not teach at all and does no irreparable harm. But there is much time wasted, time that can be ill spared.

It would seem, then, that in the more advanced grades, the only way to go for the present is for such teachers as are willing to try to devote themselves to the diligent pursuit of understanding of God and His Truth, for only so can they teach their charges. Furthermore, whatever understanding they may impart, whether it falls within the curriculum or the planned course of study or no, is a positive and glorious gain.

For those who are bold enough to pursue such a kind of teaching, there must be one sure guiding rule, namely as spoken by Saint Paul, "Not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect: but I follow after, if that I may apprehend that for which also I am apprehended: but this one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things that are before, I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Jesus Christ" (Phil. 3:12-14).

DISTINCTIVE FEATURES OF THE CHRISTIAN SCHOOL

T. Van Der Kooy

Extracts from Van Der Kooy, *The Distinctive Features of the Christian School* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1925), chaps. 6–7. Reprinted by permission.

Method

The question next in order is: What shall be the method employed in teaching?

Method, proper technique, is not at all an indifferent matter. Because of the great significance of teaching, we teachers have not fulfilled our task until we accomplish all that can be accomplished. This maximum accomplishment is not to be understood in a narrow sense as referring to the child's progress in the subject-matter (arithmetic, language, and the like), but rather as referring to the development of the child himself, and its attainment is largely a question of method.

The question then is in what way, by what method is this result attained, and in my opinion the answer must be: by adapting oneself to the nature of the soul of the child. And, since the peculiarity of the child's soul is not a work of man but of the Creator Himself, fundamentally we here face the law of creation. The laws according to which the development and unfolding of the child take place and must be promoted, are innate in the child. There are here laws of God which we must discover in order that, following them, we may attain the highest result. The task of methodology is nothing but the discovery of the divine laws that control the development of the soul of the child. These laws are present in the soul of the child himself. The result is that a specific method for any one subdivision as well as also method in general must rest upon a psychological basis, more particularly on the basis of child psychology. All study of method aims at the discovery of these divine ordinances, which together constitute what we call methodol-

ogy. Scripture itself points in this direction when it says, “Rear the child the way he should go.” In order to be able to do that, the “way” of the child must first be known. Such is the Reformed conception of methodology.

Nevertheless, he who does not share this Calvinistic view can assist in the discovery of these laws of method. Is not such assistance available in other domains and human endeavors? Can we not apply also here what Isaiah says concerning the work of the husbandman, “And his God does {50} teach him”? God teaches man through experience in the realm of practical labors, but by investigation, reflection and study as soon as man attempts a theoretical account of things.

Consequently, the Christian school is not narrow and exclusive in its attitude toward methodology. It does not hold itself aloof from the methodology which is being developed outside of Christian education. The fruits of universal culture were at all times utilized by the Church of God. Of course, she will test that which she receives from foreign sources. I most urgently warn against blind appropriation. And especially would I do so because in foreign quarters, inasmuch as an all-inclusive fundamental principle and an organic unity in pedagogy are lacking, the emphasis is frequently placed upon subordinate elements. That which is in reality secondary is often made fundamental principle and point of departure. In such cases of misplaced emphasis, the first task of the Christian methodologist is to criticize and evaluate the view presented, and so to arrive at the truth.

Thus, about twenty years ago, it became clear after serious and thorough discussion that eye-knowledge is not and cannot be, as had long been maintained, the point of departure for all education. For it has been proved that though the child in the early period of his life receives many impressions of the world through vision, nevertheless a much larger portion of knowledge comes through the ear; it has been proved that the subject-matter presented may and must be clarified through presentation to the eye, but that this must be merely for the sake of illustration; it has been proved that eye-knowledge must be accompanied from the very start by thinking, and that our mind by means of reflection penetrates more deeply into the essence of things than through sheer perception, since subject and object, man and the world have been created by one and the same Logos.

Although the original antithesis between education by ear-knowledge and education by eye-knowledge is no longer generally held to be an absolute one, without doubt the less presumptuous position assigned to “eye-knowledge” may be regarded as one of the distinctive features of the Christian school.

At that time, too, great stress was laid upon the fact that the teacher should by all means descend to the level of the child, and that the teacher’s aim should be to have the child comprehend that which is learned.

But it was soon understood that in practice one readily becomes one-sided in this matter. If the teacher descends too far his method of teaching acquires a forced and artificial form which misses the mark in that it does not satisfy the child, with the inevitable result that the latter considers the teacher childish. The same objection was voiced some time ago in the periodical *Pharus*: “Do not always be descending; let us rather raise the child to our own higher level.” {51}

Personally, I would express the contrast between the two views less sharply and less absolutely. It is a matter of course that the teacher will attempt to adapt his instruction as much as possible to the acquired knowledge of the child. But it is not necessary for the child to comprehend everything, for this could only be demanded in an age of superficial rationalism. Who understands everything? What adult does not find himself in the midst of many mysteries which it is impossible for him to solve? And must a child then comprehend everything and be reared with the thought that the incomprehensible does not exist? It is preferable that the child be impressed with the reality of a wonderful and invisible world beyond the visible. Then reverence for the mysterious will fill his soul. Especially in two instances does the world of the incomprehensible enter into consideration; namely, in religious instruction and in memorizing. Many dogmas transcend the mind of the child, it is said. Granted; but they transcend the mind even of adults. The opposition to dogma in pedagogy is fundamentally an opposition to dogma itself. There are, however, certain truths that must be accepted without comprehension. And thus, too, the objection against memorizing selections that are not understood falls away, for what he memorizes will equip the child for the future when he will evaluate and appreciate these selections. We owe our thanks to the Rev.

Sikkel for nobly defending this truth. In consequence, I also include as one of the chief distinctive features of the Christian school that in agreement with what Scripture teaches in regard to the limitations of human understanding and the darkening of the intellect, this school does not hesitate to impart incomprehensible material to the child. Prof. Bavinck puts this beautifully, "The truth is not in need of our approval, rather we are in need of the truth."

Even in arithmetic reaction has recently set in against the mania for explaining every step. The custom has lately arisen of not losing too much time in explanation of the four fundamental operations in arithmetic, but of learning the trick of solution, although the process may not be understood. The tacit theory is that explanation may conveniently be deferred.

The soul of the child lays hold by intuition on many things which cannot be made clear to his intelligence. Especially must it be remembered that high and ideal thoughts facilitate and hasten the acquisition and the assimilation of subject matter that in many instances might be considered as lying beyond the comprehension of the child.

The requisite of good method is, naturally, that the child be spurred on to self-activity. The child must not be listless; his soul must be in action and in this way completely engaged in the learning process.

In order to reach this ideal of making the child himself active, the Christian school must make use of the discovery, made outside its own circles, {52} that the best means of bringing about the activity of the pupils is by arousing their interest. Experience has proved that this is the right way. If the pupil has no interest in the material that is presented, either one of two things takes place: he is indolent, listless, and passive, or his activity expresses itself in other directions. If, however, one succeeds in arousing his interests (and the teacher must discover the means of doing so) one can be assured of the pupil's participation, and the teacher need then only exercise care that the interest be sustained.

The pupil is just as much an active being as a receptive being. Naturally, method must adapt itself to this fact. Even the very concept of receptivity presupposes self-activity. But reproduction, assimilation, approval, and application must follow reception. In this way the subject-matter becomes the child's permanent possession. And especially

in the formal subjects the need of activity is very pronounced. How could these subjects be taught otherwise than by the child's careful observation and imitation of the teacher's examples immediately followed by drill and application?

The Christian school cannot possibly ignore the need of self-activity. Exactly in this way it counteracts the dislike of work which is a characteristic of the rising generation. Is it not striking that in the period immediately preceding ours one finds the teacher who was always teaching, always speaking, always convincing and persuading, and who often gave the class little time for self-activity?

And so, too, we must carefully watch the course of development of ideas in another, closely related, field—to wit, that of classroom technique. In this field it is, for example, already an established principle that the monologue of a teacher who does all the talking must be supplanted by the conversational method, in which the teacher must give guidance, but in which he seeks in Socratic fashion to stimulate the pupils' thoughts and to cause them to proceed in the direction he desires. The conversational method increases the interest of the pupils, and though in this respect we can easily pursue Utopias, we must not forget that children in general eagerly ask questions, and that this expression of their inquisitiveness is often wrongly checked at school, so that a period of indifference frequently follows former enthusiasm.

The attempt to promote self-activity by carrying to unwarranted extremes the self-initiative type of learning has in every instance proved an illusion. And it proved such in the first place because people were charmed by the idea that "seeking knowledge" is more important than "finding knowledge"—a contention which the Reformed people cannot grant. But in the second place, it resulted in a method which developed only the appearance of self-initiative, whereas in reality it endangered self-activity. Every teacher will understand me. It was the period when all the questioning and all the talking was done by the teacher and the pupils {53} did not learn to discover problems for themselves, although that was the intention.

The Reformed view can serve as a wholesome corrective of such extremes. It can do so because it maintains that the laws of God with regard to the development of the child are present in his characteristics, and a proper method must be deduced from these.



For a time, too, extreme gradation in the presentation of subject matter was regarded as the highest law. Everything, so ran the contention, should be articulated very gradually and without any serious gap between any of the steps. Sentimentalism this was; a sentimentalism which was anxiously concerned about too strenuous effort and too great difficulty. We may rejoice because a change is taking place. Exertion is an excellent thing for the child, for it strengthens his powers. Things were far too easy under the system of extreme gradation. The child is not so ignorant, delicate, and helpless as was held. In recent years methods are based upon sounder views. Although such sounder methods are not restricted to the Christian school, they are nevertheless welcomed as a reaction against previous lack of balance.

The situation is the same with regard to memory work. Aside from all formal procedure and routine factors in teaching, one would naturally demand much of the memory of the child and would not be afraid of a considerable amount of memorizing. There was, however, a time when the value of memorizing was not appreciated and its use even neglected, because of the view that bare memorization does hindrance to thinking. But better views now prevail. The Christian school makes abundant use of this rich gift of memory. Memory is indispensable to retention. If the matter can be explained to the child, retention through memory becomes easier, but even if complete explanation is not possible we shall not fear the hobgoblin of “noncomprehended” material, for we know that in his later life with a fuller mental development the child digests what was formerly memorized.

These, it seems to me, are the characteristics of method in the Christian school. To be sure, we must with regard to method not look for an absolute difference between our schools and others. Just because the indications for method are inherent in the nature and composition of the child’s soul, this phase of pedagogy is of a general character. Nevertheless, what we said previously is of particular application; namely, that the pedagogy which is not built upon the solid basis of God’s Word is in danger of being carried along by every new pedagogical current and as a result emphasizes now one nonessential, and then another.

The Christian school rejoices in the reactions which result from such {54} extremes, for its position is often justified by the reactions, and, in addition, these very reactions can teach it much.

Discipline

By discipline I shall mean the guidance we give the child in the fashioning of his desires. This definition, it is true, has no specifically Reformed content, but will suffice as a provisional formulation. May I at once, too, point out that in it lies the contention that discipline is applied for the purpose both of strengthening and directing the will; no sound pedagogy neglects the importance of will power. So much is, indeed, universally granted and were we to proceed no further we would still be left with nothing but abstractions. A pedagogy of the will begins to acquire real content only when we consider the question of good and evil; then, too, diversity of opinion becomes evident.

It will be well to begin the discussion by making certain distinctions. There is, first of all, natural and civic good, as to the content of which there is little difference of opinion. But there is, in the second place, moral and spiritual good, and as soon as we relate the problem of discipline to it and investigate the essence of evil and the norm of good and evil, the difference of life-views becomes especially evident. In other words, as soon as we leave the sphere of common grace and civic righteousness, the conflict of opinions arises.

What is evil? Is it merely imperfection, an inferior stage of being, from which the higher stages will develop according to the laws of evolution? Is the difference between good and evil, ultimately, only a relative one? Or is evil a disease which requires only skilful treatment and care in order to be eliminated?

According to the Reformed view it is neither the one nor the other. The difference between good and evil is not merely relative, nor is evil only a disease. For there is also present in evil the element of guilt. Evil inherently implies guilt on our part.

The Reformed view recognizes the fact of sin which came over creation like a destructive tempest, and which would have disjointed all of created life, had its increasing momentum not been checked. Evil is deviation from the will of God, and hence is rebellion against the highest Sovereign. It is exactly this which makes evil guilt.

On this point, fortunately, the Calvinist will permit no yielding. He will not tolerate any whitewashing or disguising of evil. He wants evil to be known as evil. It must of necessity follow that by virtue of this standpoint Christian education acquires a measure of absoluteness, of severity; a severity, however, which is anything but uncharitableness. On the contrary, in the opinion of the Christian educator, uncharitableness would manifest itself precisely in developing in the child the opinion {55} that the difference between good and evil is of subordinate importance, or is, indeed, merely relative.

It will at once be evident in the light of this consideration that morality is according to our view not an independent something, but is intimately related to religion. Morality is not autonomous, but has its roots in religion.

This close relation between morality and religion becomes all the more evident when the question is raised of the norm or standard which determines what is good and what is evil. How are we to attain certainty with respect to the norm? It cannot be obtained from history. Man's sense of justice is often errant. Conscience is frequently seared and robbed of its sensitiveness. It is true that, as St. Paul tells us, the Gentiles have "the work of the law written in their hearts ... and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another" (Rom. 2:15), but "the law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul" (Ps. 19:7). For us the norm lies in Holy Scripture which reveals the will of God. Once more, morality is not autonomous, but rooted in religion.

Furthermore, that the good may be truly spiritual, it is not only requisite that it be in conformity with the norm of Scripture, but it must also proceed from true faith and be directed to the glory of God. To put it otherwise, mere external conformity as such is not the only factor that determines the morality of a deed. Both principle and aim are likewise involved, and when put this way the intimate relation between religion and morality is especially evident.

It is profoundly typical of the Reformed view as also of Christian education in general, and of the Christian School in particular, that this relationship between morality and religion is fully recognized.

Though it is true that in the application of this view to discipline the family is primary, one must not underestimate the importance of school-discipline. For it is undeniably true that the school is a minia-

ture society and as such contributes much to making the child fit for his later social life. The school furnishes the child with growth situations for engrafting him into moral relationships as divinely appointed and historically developed (“*zij doet ingroeien in de zedelijke rechts-orde*”). The school “habituates the child to definite forms of order and discipline better than does the family” (*Ons Program*). And the school can likewise be of great value for the child’s more general development and serviceable for the unfolding of all that is latent in him, so that grown to full stature, he may function effectively.

But the profound tragical element is that true faith is not by nature present. The natural inclination is to transgress God’s law in thought, word, and deed; and the glory of God is in no wise the goal which corrupt man sets himself, for he is incapable of any good and prone to all evil. {56} No education is powerful enough, no pedagogy sufficiently perfect, no love for children passionate enough to alter in the least this sinful condition. The substitution of a heart of flesh for one of stone is the work of the God of Life. The teacher can plant and water, but God must give the increase.

Fortunately, such transformation is no mere speculative possibility but actuality. God Himself counteracts the consequences of sin by His grace. In the first place He checks the activity of sin in its pernicious effect in the sphere of human life in general by His common grace. But in addition to that He has revealed His covenant of particular grace, beginning in Paradise, and established with Abraham and his seed. Through the channel of this covenant of grace He imparts the blessings of salvation to the believers and their children, bestows on them the free gift of regeneration, and as they grow up, inclines their will to the fear of His Name. It is thus that He creates true faith in the soul, arouses the desire to live not only according to some, but to all God’s laws, and directs their lives to the glory of God.

In this dispensation, however, this new life does not attain maturity. It remains, as the Heidelberg Catechism says, “only a small beginning of this obedience” (Lord’s Day 44, Question 114). Nevertheless, there is present the desire for and, at the same time, the daily increase in grace which we call sanctification—the aspiring to the ideal of perfection of which the Apostle Paul speaks, and which consists in daily conversion.

Such imperfection is present in the children of the believers, who are included in the covenant of God and His Church as well as in the adults; with the children, too, there is a daily lapse into sin; the transgressions of childhood, too, are sins; most properly David prayed, "Remember not the sins of my youth, nor my transgressions" (Ps. 25:7).

Viewed in this light, the discipline both at home and at school is the guidance which we give the daily conversion of the child. Now in this matter men have attempted to penetrate beyond the veil; emphasis has been laid upon the fact that all are not Israel who are of Israel; on the part of some there is a demand for definite assurance regarding the status of each particular child, and they presume to have this assurance. All in vain, for the secret things are for the Lord, our God. An analogous situation obtains in the case of teaching for citizenship. Children are educated in this study; we have no assurance that none of them will turn traitor in the future, yet we do not take this lack of assurance into account. In like manner, the distinctive feature of Christian education, and particularly of Christian discipline, is that the child is not reared in the atmosphere of a choice that is still to be made, but rather of a choice that has already been made; he is already included in the ranks of King Jesus, whose insignia he bears. The child is taught to accept the proffered offer of salvation {57} and to conform to the revealed will of God, and so to walk in the way of the divine ordinances. The Christian teacher is guided by these considerations, and in prayerful expectation looks for the results of his labors from above. For his continual prayer will be that his hope may be realized, and that the child may enter into mystical communion with God. Who can know to what degree the new life has already developed or that it is not in principle present? In this respect the Christian teacher finds himself in a world of mysteries, but, looking to the promise, he perseveres, faithfully hoping that after sowing in tears the reaping with joy will, in good time, follow.

For the proper direction of the will from day to day, the prescribed means, the so-called disciplinary measures, must be applied. These are suggested in the Holy Writ, but are especially discovered in the natural course of experience. Scripture gives us particularly in Proverbs, and in certain of the Apostolic epistles, rich pedagogical counsel. It speaks of instruction, correction, exhortation, threat, punishment, and even of the rod. But, in addition, experience, both of human nature in general

and of scientific pedagogy, enables us to determine the proper measures, so that we arrive at a complete system of disciplinary measures, which, if applied with wisdom and discriminating judgment, can be a blessing for the child.

* * * * *

In the first place, care must be exercised that a spirit of cheerfulness dominate the mutual relationship. This deserves to be emphasized in our Reformed circles particularly. There are instances in which the seriousness of the teacher was so rigid that it created an atmosphere of frigidity. Did not Dr. Kuyper regard it a meritorious feature of the poet Cats that he caused a healthy smile to play about the mouth of the Calvinist—a mouth too often set in lines of austerity? Also in education a healthy laugh is invaluable. Happiness, joking, and play are indispensable for the child. And he will develop best in cheerful surroundings.

The importance of a pleasant atmosphere is not sufficiently appreciated in many homes and schools; frequently, the element of compulsion is overemphasized. In such an environment the child cannot in the long run thrive, although parents and teachers may be inspired with the noblest intentions. The Christian school will take these things into consideration and will take care not to be shipwrecked upon the rocky cliff of one-sided severity.

A second requisite follows: that the educator, be he parent or teacher, remain natural in his dealings with children. “If you want your children to be good, be no hypocrite” (Nicolaas Beets). All intentional and forced unnaturalness must be absent. With reference to the quality of the voice, the child hates especially the unctuous holy whine and the {58} haughty tone of the schoolmaster. The child wants naturalness. We must avoid Anabaptism; we must not attempt to make greybeards of children. Childhood has its intrinsic value but also its own advantages. The Lord said, “Become as the children.”

Naturalness and cheerfulness are of great importance in the classroom, but in addition all those means which experience has proved to be sound measures in moral education are indispensable. Not to accept these means would cause a degeneration of the Christian school. For a distinctive feature of this institution is an open and unbiased view of the field of pedagogy. Among the means which will affect the will, love

occupies the first place. It expresses itself also at school as sympathy in joy and sorrow. It tries to win the heart of the child by friendliness; it is longsuffering and kind toward childhood's defects and shortcomings. "Love is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil; ... hopeth all things, endureth all things" (1 Cor. 13:5 and 7). Without love the Christian school would become "sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal."

Furthermore, our schools, as is the case with all education, face the problems of moral fashioning, of character development. Here we seem to encounter a contradiction. The will presupposes personal freedom, and all training of the will aims at acquiring and practicing freedom. But exactly at this juncture the conflict arises, for a child cannot immediately be put in possession of full freedom; he is, as the Scripture says, under tutors and governors (Gal. 4:2). The way to obtain freedom is by obedience and subjection. It is difficult for the educator to strike the proper balance. If he emphasizes obedience, he is in danger of neglecting to arouse and to bring into action the child's own will. This is the mistake of the Jesuits, who aimed at slavish subjection, but suppressed the child's opportunity for developing a free personality. It is likely that at times this was lost sight of in our circles also. But this is not to be ascribed to the Reformed principle. In the more recent views regarding a freer discipline, a wholesome reaction to and a sound correction of the former one-sidedness is observed. The characteristic feature of the Reformed method is certainly subjection and obedience, but in such a way that the reins are not held tighter than is necessary, in order that the child may also have the opportunity of developing unto freedom, till eventually the restraints of external authority fall away and childish things can be put aside. The Reformed type of discipline does not regard as ideal such children as, because of shyness, timidity, and bashfulness, do not dare express themselves; rather by permitting the child to develop in self-activity does it seek to inculcate the proper self-confidence. It aims at guidance which does not destroy but respects the individuality of the child. For personality, all the more when understood in its essence, is the divine idea which is implicit in the being of man, and which in life must be unfolded {59} and developed. And the teacher in the Christian school cannot better serve this purpose than by avoiding as much as possible the appearance of arbitrariness and the show of acting according to momentary whims and caprices. On the contrary,

it is in accord with the Reformed view that the teacher himself set the example of subjection to higher laws and faithfully follow the rules that have been established, mindful of the fact that God is a God of order and wills that all things take place in an orderly manner.

In addition, the injunction, "Speak sparingly," has been proved an invaluable means in controlling the class. The teacher must not always be disapproving, censuring, and rebuking. The speech that is infrequent has all the greater effect. But when the teacher feels he is compelled to take notice of childish naughtiness and defects, he should do so with a firmness which at the same time is gentle. Patience is an indispensable requisite. Let no nervous impatience or passionate wrath or childish vengefulness sweep him along; here, too, the divine injunction is pertinent, "Provoke not your children to wrath" (Eph. 6:4).

Again, the Christian teacher should be mindful of the fact that he will accomplish more by encouragement and appreciation of honest effort than by constant criticism. Especially, let him not resort to crude sarcasm and cruel, unfeeling ridicule; amongst Christians in the sphere of the covenant, and when dealing with the lambs of Christ's flock, these qualities are altogether out of place.

This does not mean that strength and firmness, both in command and prohibition, are necessarily absent. The Decalogue, which has educational significance exactly because it is a "pedagogue," says, "Thou shalt not...." Likewise, the teacher should not, if necessary, hesitate to inflict punishment. "Objective authority and subjective respect for authority," says Prof. Bavinck, "are the two pillars upon which for centuries all education and instruction have rested." The Christian school aims at keeping them intact. By doing so it is consciously and intentionally in conflict both with Rousseau, whose educational system, by allowing the child absolute license, ended in sentimentalism, and with such modern educational reformers as thought that the child must express himself with perfect lack of restraint, and that he thus would achieve the proper development. In maintaining its position the Christian school is supported alike by Scripture and experience, both of which teach that the child is in need of firm and unwavering guidance, and that license does not bring about true happiness.



And when the question arises who is fit for the task that has just been outlined, our answer is, “Our efficiency is from God.”

Prayer, which according to the Heidelberg Catechism is the most important element of the Christian’s gratitude, is therefore indispensable to {60} education. Just as the body without the soul is dead, so, too, education without prayer is barren, dead, and mechanical.

The Christian school values prayer highly. In accord with its philosophy it is unthinkable that prayer should ever be discarded. Prayer must be offered with and for the pupils; prayer for the school in its entirety, for the individual needs of children, for the needs of the teachers, for the parents and the families, for the needs of the Kingdom of God at large, and for the government and for the nation. We must invoke the blessing and the help of God without which all work would be in vain. In this way there will again arise a nation given to prayer, and it will once more be experienced that “the prayer of a righteous man availeth much.”

ACCELERATED CHRISTIAN EDUCATION: AN ALTERNATIVE TO STATE SCHOOLS

Edward C. Facey

“Christian Education: The Hope of Our Republic”

The above quote appears as the Pitney-Bowes mailing message for a remarkable new system of education for grammar and high school students, called Accelerated Christian Education. ACE, as it is familiarly called, started in 1970 with one pilot school, but today there are 1500 schools using the ACE system. This is enterprise in a hurry, and, for this writer, it represents an encouraging development.

Readers of this journal are not unaware of the problems of public education: how it is necessary to water down the academic curriculum for the slow learners; how it is necessary to eschew religion for reasons of state—and with religion goes God-centered morality, to be replaced by no permanent standard of conduct to which the public school student may repair; how it is necessary to patrol many schools with guards because of drug taking or alcoholic drinking, sexual activity, or vandalism.

ACE represents a solution to these problems. First of all, it has *individualized instruction*. This means that the student proceeds at a pace which has been assigned to him after consultation with a superior. From this consultation daily goals are set up for the student, and he aims to meet them. Stars begin to be placed on his achievement card as he moves through the academic material.

The students work at their “offices.” Each boy or girl has a chair and a desk divided off from other students by partitions at the sides of his or her office. The achievement card and other appropriate designs or pictures are placed on a board at the rear of the desk in front of the student, and the student is to be a businesslike person as he or she attends to the academic matters at hand.

The academic materials are divided into PACES, called Packets of Accelerated Christian Education. These PACES are provided by the

ACE headquarters in Garland, Texas. They are paper textbooklets of twenty-five to thirty-five or so pages, with subject content in the basic disciplines of English, mathematics, science, social studies, and spelling.⁴ Tests are sprinkled throughout these books, and the student must test himself on {62} comprehension as he goes along. If he has any questions about the material, he puts up a small flag or other indicator, and one of the teacher-directors will come to his aid. The student checks his answers to the test questions at a scoring table, but at the end of the book he takes a test which a teacher administers, and the student must score at least 80 percent to be allowed to go on to the next PACE learning booklet.

Students are cautioned to maintain academic balance. A student may be a whirlwind in mathematics and proceed ahead of the other students of his age category. But he is still warned not to give all his attention to math. He should be making appreciable progress in the other areas as well.

Since the ACE school is a private school, it can go in the direction its supporters want it to go, and its supporters are usually unabashedly pro-Bible and pro-Christian. The Bible undergirds all teaching, be it mathematics, science, social studies, or English. A problem in math, for example, might be to add up all the numbers given for the membership of the twelve tribes of Israel and find the average membership in a tribe. Another problem might be to analyze the grammar of a sentence relating information about characters from the Bible.

Every month students are assigned quotations from Scripture and asked to memorize them. This can be quite consoling and inspiring for the students, as the Bible abounds with useful sayings for daily living. Tim LaHaye writes in *How to Study the Bible for Yourself*,

Worry, anxiety and fear are as natural to a human being as building dams are [*sic*] to beavers. That's why the Word of God has so much to say about "fear not," "let not your heart be troubled," and "take no anxious thought for tomorrow." But such injunctions are of little value if you don't have them cemented in your mind when you need them.⁵

4. There are also special classes, as in art, as well as other training which is introduced at specific times as the children move along.

5. (Irvine, CA: Harvest House Publishers, 1976), 129.

The ACE student will leave his school with a rich supply of wisdom as he or she goes forth to meet the tempestuous challenges of later life. This is education forever.

ACE students begin each day with pledges to the flag of the country and to the Christian flag and to the Bible. Then they sing the song of the month, such as, “For God So Loved the World.” Then they all read the Scripture passage of the month, thus helping in their memorization of it. Following this, the principal or pastor will give a spiritual message, and then the students are ready for their assignments of the day.

It is a pleasure to enter one of these schools and see the children at work. Talking is not allowed during their study sessions, to enable the students to concentrate on the particular subject matter at their desks. {63} A system of demerit and merit is used to encourage them not to disturb their neighbors *and* to go on to the completion of their work.

It is pleasant to look at students who are pleasantly groomed. The girls are in dress “to the middle of the knee,” and they are without “wigs, extreme hair styles, bleached or dyed hair.” The boys’ hair does not touch “the ears or hang on (their) collar(s) or eyebrows”; nor do they have beards or mustaches. The Handbook of the New Hope School (Camden, Michigan) further advises that “girls below the tenth grade are not permitted to wear makeup. Girls 10th to 12th grades will be given a Christian Charm Course.”

The Handbook, in its philosophy underlying the rules, asserts:

Appropriate clothing encourages responsible behavior. One’s personal appearance is a manifestation of self esteem and each reinforces the other.... We seek to use every means at our disposal, including clothing regulations, to encourage students to think and act like ladies and gentlemen.

Our grooming standards for boys as well as girls are designed to minimize the unattractive spirit of clothes competition (sidenote—in our day students have been moving toward quite slovenly dress in their “competition”) which seeks to draw attention to self or sex. We encourage each student to gain recognition through personal charm and conscientious work.

Among the General Comments it is written that “marked on or defaced property is to be replaced at offending student’s expense. Guns, matches, lighters, knives, weapons, radios and gum are not permitted on campus.” Further the Handbook says:

High School Dept.: “hands off elementary students” and students of opposite sex.

Elementary Dept.: “no backtalk to high school student.”

There is to be no smoking, drug taking, or alcoholic drinking: “Students may not be accepted who have smoked habitually ... [or] used narcotics....”

Along with the Bible at the center of the stage is a patriotic emphasis to be expressed in love of country. American ACE students wear the colors of this country. As an ACE example, New Hope girl students wear red shirts with blue jumpers, red socks almost to the knee, and red, blue, or black shoes. The elementary boy students wear blue pants with belts, red shirts, blue ties with a red cross on them, dark blue socks, and black shoes.

In ACE studies, the patriotism is reflected in an emphasis on the ideas of the Founding Fathers. Like students of other schools, ACE students learn about the operation of the various institutions of government such as Congress and the Judiciary. But ACE students also do memorizations {64} from the Constitution (the Preamble), the liberty speech of Patrick Henry, and the Declaration of Independence.

What really helped win this writer’s lasting favor with regard to ACE and made him a more sincere advocate was the discovery that that wondrous and exciting book, from which so much may be learned, *The Law*, by Frederic Bastiat, is required for ACE high schoolers. Let me repeat that: in 1,500 ACE schools across the land, *The Law* is required reading in the upper levels of learning. As ACE-ers would say, “Praise the Lord”—for promoting limitation on the powers of the state and for upholding the rights and dignity of the individual person.

As an economics teacher, I was particularly interested in PACE 59 on economics. I was surprised at the depth to which the PACE went for a student of ten years who might be reading it. This particular PACE described demand and supply, using a diagram to illustrate. It related how an increase in income to people can cause the demand schedule for a good to increase (shift to the right) for every price.

PACE 59 described inflation as “a time when the money supply and prices are increasing,” and deflation as a time when “the money supply and prices are decreasing.” The booklet even goes into a discussion of

the 1929 Depression (parentheses other than the brackets are from the text):

If the supply of money were decreased, its value would increase. Demand for it will increase [?]. It will take less money to buy more things. When money is more expensive in terms of things (has a greater purchasing power), right after the money supply has been too [?] rapidly expanding (increasing), some people cannot afford to stay in business and other people lose their jobs (because their companies do not have enough to pay them). Prices go way down. This situation is called a *depression*. A depression occurred in 1929—the Great Depression.

Now there is truth in this in that the money supply did expand and then contract in the boom-bust period around 1929. But *why* did this happen? And can the Christian find moral grounds to oppose the expansion of the money supply as organized by the Federal Reserve and the commercial banks in this country? I think he can and should. ACE would do a wonderful service if it would plumb the depths of the definition of money, as the Austrian school has, and show that money is a commodity—gold and silver have served as money—and that issuances of paper money substitutes unbacked by the commodity they stand for can lead to serious trouble.

In my dealings with ACE personnel, I have found them quite cooperative. For example, my son found in PACE 76 the following: “Proper Zoning and Annexation are keys to good city growth.”

Being an opponent of zoning, I wrote to the ACE center, expressing {65} my concern over the support given. I enclosed a copy of my *Zoning: Protection or Dictatorship?* (available at FEE),⁶ which followed a speech I gave on the subject. I referred to ACE’s use of *The Law* in its curriculum and noted that “Bastiat would not have the politicians telling persons how they may or may not use their land.” I closed with,

I hope you can find your way clear to strike out advocacy of zoning (if you cannot oppose it). Hew to voluntarism which is in keeping with the teachings of Christ.

The response from ACE was most encouraging—

6. FEE: Foundation for Economic Education, Irvington, NY 10533.

Thank you for the letter which you wrote July 5 calling our attention to government zoning. It certainly is not our intention to support government control of the people or their rights. Sometimes things such as this slip through even though we are looking for them. I appreciate the spirit with which you wrote and be assured this is not the position of ACE As the third edition is completed all of these teachings will be removed.

Can you beat that? Try writing to your State Board of Education and see if you can get a response like that!

Let me conclude by urging all conservative or libertarian Christian readers of this journal, along with those looking for a principled alternative to the present public educational morass, to give ACE consideration. ACE schools cost, but they cost less to operate than the traditional private schools and they certainly cost less than the public schools.

The leaders of ACE are determined to lead this country away from, in President Donald R. Howard's words, "the influence of utopian world planners who are following a trend that is leading America into financial bankruptcy, militant passivism, philosophical humanism, moral permissiveness, and eventual political slavery."⁷ With God's help the ACE leaders just might be able to do it.

ACE, onward and upward!

7. *Facts about Accelerated Christian Education* (Garland, TX: Accelerated Education Inc., 1976), 2.

AN EVALUATION OF ACE FROM A REFORMED PERSPECTIVE

Charles D. Grant and Kirk W. House

1. WHAT IS ACE?

History

ACE are the initials which stand for Accelerated Christian Education. From a small beginning in Garland, Texas, in 1970, it has grown to over 1,500 schools, some of which have an enrollment of close to 1,000 students. Drawing the best from traditional American education as found in the one-room country school, and combining this with the very latest in learning technology that is consistent with the biblical precepts which emphasize the individuality of each child, ACE has developed a packaged school program that can be implemented in both large and small Bible-believing churches.

Philosophy and Objectives

The principles of ACE are not new. ACE is, in reality, a modified, updated, one-room school. It has combined the ideal of a dedicated Christian teacher who provides individual attention, Christian inspiration, and motivation to pupils working at their individual level of ability with a curriculum that is truly and fully Christo-centric.

One of the stated objectives of ACE is to provide churches with a “place to start.” ACE seeks to supply sufficient training via a procedural, step-by-step manual for the successful implementation of its program. It limits its help to local churches, placing strong emphasis upon the autonomy of each church. It considers itself to be a ministry of the church in fulfilling its God-given function to aid parents of each assembly in bringing their children up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.

Statement of Faith and Practice

The following is excerpted from the back of the contract that is required to be signed by each church upon its affiliation with ACE.

Doctrinal Position

We believe in:

1. The inspiration of the Bible, equally in all parts and without error in its origin; {67}
2. The one God, eternally existent Father, Son and Holy Spirit, Who created man by a direct immediate act;
3. The preexistence, incarnation, virgin birth, sinless life, miracles, substitutionary death, bodily resurrection, ascension to Heaven, and the second coming of the Lord Jesus Christ;
4. The fall of man, the need of regeneration by the operation of the Holy Spirit on the basis of grace alone, and the resurrection of all: to life or damnation;
5. The spiritual relationship of all believers in the Lord Jesus Christ, living a life of righteous works, separated from the world, witnessing of His saving grace through the ministry of the Holy Spirit.

Relationships

1. *Staff*: All personnel who are involved in the development of the program, materials, curriculum, etc., whether employed full or part time must sign the ACE Statement of Faith and Practice.
2. *Contracts*: ACE will not knowingly enter into contract for the establishment of new schools nor become identified with a church or organization that holds a doctrinal position inconsistent with the basic principles as set forth in the Scriptures. Furthermore, ACE will not contract with any church that is a member of the National Council of Churches or the World Council of Churches (2 Corinthians 6:14, 17; 2 John 9-11; 1 John 4:1-3). Also, ACE will not enter into contract with any organization or parent group other than a local incorporated Bible-believing New Testament church under an ordained pastor.
3. *Affiliation*: ACE is not affiliated with any denomination but encourages membership by ACE schools in local, state, and national school organizations which share a similar doctrinal position.

Individualized Instruction

The ACE program places a large emphasis upon the individual child. The program meets the child “where he is,” i.e., it does not place him in a learning situation based solely upon his chronological age. Through a diagnostic testing procedure the child’s abilities are determined and a prescribed program for filling in gaps in his previous learning experience are taken care of first. Each student works in his own private “office” in a Learning Center. He works at his own pace, which means that fast students are not held back by those who are slower, nor are slower students overwhelmed and left behind while the class moves on. Strong emphasis is placed on one-to-one help of each student by trained staff members. The ACE program is not a form of open education.

Description of Controls

Each student is required to set daily goals on a card which is kept before him in his office. These are monitored by the staff each day to make sure that the student is fulfilling his objectives and is maintaining academic {68} balance in all subjects. Students are not free to roam at will—they must earn privileges such as: extra play time, freedom to read library books, freedom to listen to tapes, right to go on field trips, etc. Students are disciplined by a system of demerits and detention and the use of the “rod of correction.”

Basic Instructional Unit: PACE

Each PACE is a “Packet of Accelerated Christian Education” material, i.e., a bite-sized portion of a year’s work in a given subject. There are usually twelve PACEs per level, of which the first nine are new material, the tenth is a review, and the eleventh and twelfth are enrichment PACEs. Each skill subject is numbered from 1 to 144. Theoretically, a student who spends his entire school life in this program would cover all 144 PACEs in English, math, social studies, and science, with additional work in spelling and various electives. A student may seek to obtain one of three kinds of diplomas: vocational, general, or college prep. College level work is also available to qualified high school students. In fact, ACE is seeking to make it possible for students to take at

least two years or more of accredited college work in the local Learning Center.

The student works through each PACE checking his own work at a Scoring Table under the watchful supervision of staff members. When a student demonstrates mastery of the PACE material by scoring at least 90 percent on a Self Test, he is then given the final PACE test after handing in his PACE and waiting twenty-four hours. This taking of a final test a day after turning in the PACE eliminates cramming for tests and determines whether or not the student has truly mastered the material. A score of 80 percent is required for passing and going on to the next PACE in the series. Those failing to achieve a passing score are required to redo the PACE and/or do additional work to overcome an area of weakness.

Grades and Teachers

There are no “grades” as such in the ACE program. However, Learning Centers may be developed according to age or peer groups (primary, junior high, or high school or even by individual grade levels such as would be used in conventional schools depending upon its facilities or enrollment). A school may use the ACE program for its entire student body or for only the elementary or only the high school level, depending on what the individual church school thinks will best meet its needs. ACE does not intend its program to be thought of as seeking to replace the conventional Christian school. Many conventionally established schools are finding that ACE materials can be used to supplement their programs by providing “remedial education” needs at a minimum cost.

ACE does not replace the teacher. It is true that its program requires less staff, but it requires the very best kind of teacher—one who has a sincere {69} love for students, the ability to understand and adapt to their individual needs, and is willing to invest a lot of hard work into each busy school day.

The program is valuable for small churches as well as large. Volunteer help serving as trained monitors assist the professional staff. The professional staff does not have to be large, which helps keep down the cost of the operation of the program. One professional and two monitors are recommended per twenty-five students.

Generally speaking, there are no “classes” where a teacher lectures to students; however, mini classes may be used for special purposes, e.g., teaching of foreign languages, remedial work, and vocational courses. Students get to interact socially in chapel, gym classes, recess time, lunch periods, and field trips.

2. SOME OBJECTIONS COMMONLY VOICED AGAINST THE ACE PROGRAM

Objection No. 1: There is only limited use of the “biblical method” of direct learning from a teacher’s lecturing. The principle of Romans 10:17, that “faith comes by hearing,” is usually voiced in support of this contention.

Answer: It may be said that although the lecture method is much used in Scripture, it is not used exclusively. For instance, in John 13 our Lord used three different methods: expository lecture, direct command, and example, to communicate a needed lesson to His disciples. Also, the prophets were often directed by God to use “dramatics” as a means of teaching (e.g., Ezekiel, chapters 4, 6, and 12; Jeremiah, chapters 3 and 18; Agabus in Acts, chapter 21, etc.). Thus we see that the “lecture method” is not the only biblical method of teaching. Indeed, the Bible itself is God’s word written.

Objection No. 2: There is too much individualism. In support of this objection, many claim that the program is too “permissive,” that the student is given too much “freedom of choice,” that he is allowed to act too much as a free agent and is therefore not learning to fulfill a proper role in a given society. It is felt that this approach contributes to the “atomization” of society.

Answer: It may be stated that one of the most pronounced weaknesses in many churches today is the concept which reduces individual responsibility and initiative and transfers both to the pastor. The controls of the ACE program help prevent a chaotic or “atomistic” situation while helping to train the student to exercise self-control and individual creativeness within a given society. It must be remembered that God made each of us as unique individuals rather than as a “group.” There is a definite need for a program which helps each individual develop his God-given gifts {70} to their fullest potential and

encourages each person to see himself as an individual who has an important role to play within the body of the local church.

Objection No. 3: The PACEs are academically superficial.

Answer: It is true that in some elementary level PACEs, especially math and phonics, much more repetition and drill are needed. In our school we have found it necessary to establish some mini classes to work with those students who do not manifest enough initiative to memorize their math tables. ACE recommends the usage of the Self-Pronouncing Alphabet prior to the student's beginning the use of its curriculum. It is highly desirable that a student be given instructions in phonics in a kindergarten situation before entering an ACE Learning Center.

We have found that students entering the ACE program from junior and senior high school grades in public school almost always test below their expected levels in the ACE curriculum. ACE standards in English and math are far higher than those to which most students are accustomed. Some ACE science courses on the high school level require math beyond the capability of most contemporary high school students. We have attempted to resolve the problem by making up our own basic English material (which we are requiring to be completed before allowing the students to begin working in the PACEs), and by holding students back from some science courses until they have completed Algebra 1. Students almost always need more practice, especially in basic skills. This need must be recognized and provided for by school personnel and with the cooperation and help of the parents.

It should be remembered that ACE is a developing system less than ten years old. The "lab" process for ACE material is therefore limited.

Objection No. 4: The PACE material has "bugs" in it. Many have heard negative reports regarding the fact that there are vocabulary and concept levels that are out of place, that tests do not coincide with PACE materials, that there are ambiguous questions, misspelled words, incorrect answers on Score Keys, etc.

Answer: This objection was especially valid regarding the first edition of the ACE curriculum. ACE did not have the time or the money to put its materials through a laboratory process such as most school curriculums enjoy before their wide distribution and use. However, the problems noted above have been and are being dealt with by ACE. In

the December 1976 *ACE Report and Manual Supplement*, it was stated that priority in the development of the upcoming third edition of PACEs is being given to Math 1-96. Dr. Donald Howard, ACE president, emphasized that he is taking personal responsibility to see that math PACEs 25-75 will build “mastery of computation skills and move towards theory in the last few PACEs.” {71}

Objection No. 5: The PACE material is biblically superficial.

Answer: The charge that PACEs are shallow in their biblical content is largely invalid. Elementary PACEs are those most open to this charge. We have found that the lower level PACEs constantly draw the attention of the students to some Christian virtue or characteristic while teaching them basic skills. Also, it should be pointed out that PACEs in the primary and high school levels are resplendent with biblical concepts of behavior patterns or Christian virtues (some fifty-two are dealt with). In addition, it should be remembered that PACEs are not the exclusive means of teaching spiritual truth. Chapel, devotions, personal interaction, and required readings all supplement the home and church training.

Objection No. 6: ACE is not accredited.

Answer: Usually when someone brings up the question of accreditation, that person is indicating a concern about students being able to get into institutions of higher learning. The July 1976 ACE manual supplement included a list of sixty-seven colleges and universities which have accepted graduates of ACE schools. Included in this list are state, private, and Christian institutions of higher education. The last report we have is that the list has grown to 108.

Accreditation of individual ACE schools is a matter left to the discretion of each local church. Many, if not a majority of Christians schools, do not want or seek accreditation from state agencies. Yet these schools probably have both higher academic standards and behavioral policies than so-called “accredited” schools.

Objection No. 7: As Calvinists we should not be in association with non-Calvinists, such as are the majority of ACE designers, leaders, and participating churches.

Answer: Affiliation with the ACE program is on the basis of its Statement of Faith. As given above, this Statement is evangelical and accept-

able to all Bible-believing Christians, including Calvinists; it contradicts none of our beliefs.

In Reformed circles, a loving attitude towards our “non-Reformed” brothers and sisters is often lacking. This ought not to be. While we have important differences with them, we have even more important unity. We have no desire to compromise God’s truth in any manner, but self-righteous exclusivism only reproaches our Lord. No compromise of God’s truth is necessary. Association with ACE is limited to the following: (1) a one-week training course for new pastors, principals, supervisors, and monitors; (2) two workshops during the year; (3) the use of the basic system of materials, forms, and procedures, which are very practical. There is no “joining” of the ACE organization. Each school’s control is under the supervision of the local church which directs the policies and doctrinal emphasis of the school. {72}

Objection No. 8: While association is theoretically acceptable, the PACE materials are still unacceptable. (This objection usually carries with it the connotation that the ACE materials are so thoroughly Arminian and dispensational that they are of no intrinsic value to Calvinists.)

Answer 1: Reformed people, positions, and institutions are generally very well treated in the PACE materials, as can be seen from the following:

Luther: In Social Studies PACE 45 and others following, Luther is presented as the great and courageous reformer that he was. His teaching on justification by faith and his view of salvation as God’s gift through faith are briefly described.

Calvin: The same PACEs present Calvin as the man who, through his *Institutes* and commentaries, did more than any other to spread the Reformation and the Protestant faith. PACE 57 examines the relationship of the English Puritans to Calvin and includes a very fine summary of Calvin’s soteriology, describing both divine sovereignty and human responsibility. In addition, Puritan influence during the American colonial period is acknowledged and described.

Edwards: While not named as a Calvinist in PACE 57, Edwards is described as America’s leading thinker of the period and a pastor much concerned for God’s truth and human souls.

Whitefield: Described as a Calvinist in PACE 57, Whitefield is praised in this and other PACEs as a preacher greatly used of God in saving

people and thereby exerting great influence on American history during the years preceding the American War for Independence.

Westminster and Reformed Episcopal Seminaries: Social Studies PACE 31 is a case study in the history of cities and their growth. One such city examined is Philadelphia, where both Westminster and Reformed Seminaries are located. They are noted “for their belief in the Bible and their strong stands for Jesus Christ.”

Machen: In Social Studies PACE 119, the Old School/New School controversy is presented as a conflict between historic Calvinism and the New England Theology. Machen, Warfield, and Hodge all come in for high praise.

Please note that the above are selected samples and by no means are exhaustive of what could be offered in proof of this point.

Answer 2: A very good biblical concept of holiness is taught in the Life of Christ PACEs. For example:

A. In its treatment of Matthew 1:21, PACE 134 emphasizes that Jesus has come to save His people, not primarily from Hell, but from their sins. “Any intelligent man who believes there is a Hell would like to be saved from it. But many do not want to be weaned away from their sins. Only Christians are taught by God to repent and to hate {73} sin against God which takes men to Hell. (Ask yourself: ‘Do I hate sin?’ The answer will give you a fair idea about whether or not God is saving you.)”

B. PACE 136 of the same subject, which includes a study of the Sermon on the Mount, emphasizes very strongly that Jesus Christ is laying down regulations for the children of God in this age. It is perfectly clear that these are to be taken as applicable to us in our present situation. “We have a Father’s love exhibiting the kind of character He is producing in His children.” This emphasis is not restricted to the Life of Christ PACEs. In the New Testament Survey series PACE 105, covering the epistles of Peter, John, and Jude, there is the statement on page 18, “a holy life (one lived by God’s grace) is the greatest assurance of a heavenly one.”

Again, let us emphasize that these are only selected examples which clearly tend to support our point.

Negatively, we must admit that the “invitation system” is presented in an objectionable manner in English PACE 28, where a three-paragraph story is used as an exercise in vowel sounds. While mention is made of

trusting in Christ for the forgiveness of sins, the impression one is left with is that forgiveness is attained by walking to the front of the building. Also, dispensationalism in a moderate form is presented in some PACEs. For example: (1) Social Studies PACE 73, which is the beginning of a series of studies on government, describes what are essentially the dispensations of conscience and of human government, but does not name them as such. (2) Later, in Social Studies PACE 118, much praise is given to many early dispensationalists as leaders of fundamentalism and a description of their dispensational views is taught. In all candor, we Calvinists say we believe in “academic freedom.” Should not our students be allowed to know what others believe and where they have come from? (3) New Testament Survey PACE 106 (a study of the Book of Revelation) appears to have a dispensational bias, even though it does not press the point. Most of the other viewpoints are also described. The over-all attitude in this PACE is good. Unity in spirit is encouraged despite divergence in opinion over the interpretation of the book. In fact, seven rules of interpretation are laid down which should govern any honest Bible scholar. And since it calls for one to make Christ the center of his system, it should, by God’s grace, exert a very healthy influence on all high school students studying it. To the best of our knowledge, this PACE is the only one containing a reference to the pre-tribulational rapture. It is described as part of the dispensational system and therefore it is only natural that it be commented upon in such a context. We have allowed the students in our school to express their different viewpoints {74} regarding matters such as these in extra work for which they were given credit. It has been satisfying to us to find students who know what the Bible teaches on these subjects and who are able to demonstrate from the Scriptures why they believe such viewpoints are in error. It has been no less gratifying to us also to find that our students, by and large, have expressed a very gracious attitude towards those who hold such differing opinions.

Objection No. 9: Literature PACEs—Starting with English PACE 36, every even-numbered PACE requires the reading of an appropriate book. The student is expected to pass a test covering the content of the book or to give a written or oral report on it. We have found nothing objectionable in the literature list required by ACE, but we did feel that there are some better titles that could be used. As an example of how

this sort of thing can be dealt with, we have devised our own literature list (see appendix A). We are also writing our own literature guides for these alternate selections. (Guides for the book, *The Mark of the Christian*, by Francis Schaeffer; *Isaac Newton*, by John Tiner; and *The Triumph of Pastor Son*, by Yong Choon Ahn; as well as our basic English material, are available from Grace Abounding Ministries Inc., P.O. Box 25, Sterling, VA 22170.)

Objection No. 10: Right-Wing Attitude—It is true that there is a conservative emphasis in some PACEs. In fact, a strong nationalistic patriotism is encouraged throughout much of the program, even to the recommended wearing of red, white, and blue uniforms. However, schools are at liberty to use other uniforms or even none at all. Personally, we do not believe that there should be an equating of Christianity with Americanism, and have sought to caution our students to realize that one should be a good Christian citizen in whatever country that God places him on this earth.

3. SOME CONCLUSIONS REGARDING THE ACE PROGRAM FROM A REFORMED VIEW

A. The ACE program is not “out” for Calvinists. On the basis of what we have stated above, it can be seen that a Calvinistic church can use this program to help Christian parents to carry out their God-given mandate to bring their children up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, instead of trying to undo the damage done by a non-Christian education (since many state-controlled schools are “bastions of atheistic humanism”). The ACE program is adaptable to our Reformed churches.

B. Neither is ACE a panacea. It gives the student opportunity to learn, individually, in a controlled situation, and makes a low budget, low enrollment school feasible for grades kindergarten through 12. Like all {75} other things, it will work only if you make it work. ACE should not be used as an excuse to see how low you can budget or how much you can get away with yourself. It is certainly not to be used for separation of teachers from students. ACE requires as much competence from school staff as any conventional school.

C. Educational Research Association (ERA) is a viable alternative for those who want to use the basic program of ACE curriculum without

direct association or affiliation with ACE. ERA markets the same PACEs under its own cover. These are more expensive than those supplied by ACE to its affiliated schools. However, ERA is less restrictive in its requirements on its customers. Also, no training or support is available to the user. Non-church-controlled schools, such as those operated by boards of parents or private individuals, may not use the ACE materials, but are allowed to purchase and use the ERA supplies.

D. We have added an appendix B to this article to show that the ACE program is highly usable.

Appendix A. Pace Materials—Books

PACE No.	Required by ACE PACE	Suggested Replacement
35	Charlotte's Web	
36	Child's Garden of Verses	
38	Sugar Creek Gang	
40	Little Green Frog	
42	The Witch's Lamp	
44	A Reward for Jerry	
46	The Tanglewoods Secret	
48	Mystery of the Smudged Postmark	The Lion, the Witch, and the Wardrobe
50	Heidi	
52	Star of Light	Any "Little House" Book
54	The Exiled Prince	Boys— Any Danny Orlis Book Girls— Any Joy Sparton Book
56	Night Preacher	
58	Lassie Come Home	
60	Treasures of the Snow	
62	Little Pilgrim's Progress	The Little Pilgrim
64	Martyr of the Catacombs	
66	Beggars Bible	

Appendix A. Pace Materials—Books

68	Kids from Proverbsville	Johnny Tremain
70	The Bible Smuggler	
72	Pilot Series in Literature: (Book 1)	
74	Young Rebel in Bristol	
76	D. L. Moody	Isaac Newton
78	Through Gates of Splendor	
80	God's Smuggler	
82	By Searching	
84	Swiss Family Robinson	
86	Green Leaf in Drought Time	I Loved a Girl
88	Gobi	The Triumph of Pastor Son
90	Deepening Stream	The Mark of the Christian
94	Robinson Crusoe	Student Power in World Evangelism
96	In His Steps	
98	Up from Slavery	Uncle Tom's Cabin
100	Passport to Life City	Know What You Believe <i>or</i> Basic Christianity
102	Pilgrim's Progress	
104	Scottish Chiefs	
106	Robinson Crusoe	
142	Ben-Hur	

Appendix B: Christian Vocational Education

1. NEED FOR CHRISTIAN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Theological

The chief end of man is to glorify God in all things, including his vocation. We have the biblical example of Christ working as a carpenter.

ter (Mark 6:3) and Paul as a leather-crafter (Acts 18:3). We need to develop more “full-time Christians” in various vocations in our present generation.

Practical

How often one hears the complaint of how they have been “ripped off” for a repair job, whether it involves their car, TV, or some other home appliance. We would like to believe that if there were more Christians in such trades, there would be less problems of this nature.

Although we believe that it is good to provide a liberal arts education as much as possible for each student, it is even more important to fit each student for “life.” This includes equipping him or her to fulfill the biblical commands to be self-supporting and not burdensome to others—the Christian work ethic. (In times of economic difficulty, such as we are experiencing in the 1970s, a large percentage of those on the unemployment dole consists of college graduates who have no marketable skills.) It must also be admitted that many students are not college material.

2. OUR APPROACH TO CHRISTIAN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Basic Reading and Math Skills

We seek to develop functional literacy so that each student is able to {77} read directions, contracts, and similar materials. We also teach “life-line math skills” so that each is able to keep proper records, balance checkbooks, etc.

Science and Liberal Arts

We require, encourage, and help each student to go as far as possible in science and liberal arts courses.

Bible Courses

We require at least two Bible courses for graduation. We consider this very needful and especially encourage students to take at least both Old and New Testament Survey and Life of Christ.

Vocational Courses

Printing: We are presently using a professional printer who is a Christian man to teach our students various phases of the printing trade, such as camera work, platemaking, operation of various printing

presses, collating, binding and trim operations, and packaging. We use the products for our own school and sell at a discount to others as well as providing printing services to the body of Christ at much lower prices.

Auto Mechanics: We have a man who is very gifted in this area who lost both his right arm and leg in an electrical mishap and has helped our students in many practical projects, such as working on our church bus, and doing tune-ups and minor repairs on various staff members' cars. We use the ACE elective Auto Mechanics PACEs as an introductory course.

Distributive Education: Several students have gained much valuable training through employment in local businesses such as a Christian bookstore and a hardware store. Besides learning to take care of stock and wait on customers, they have been able to learn much about management, bookkeeping, and handling cash.

Beauty Culture: We have plans underway to set up a beauty salon in our school with a Christian licensed professional to oversee its operation and to teach the students.

3. SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF CHRISTIAN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Use Existing Facilities

We have mentioned above how we are utilizing our present building for three vocational programs without any additional cost for housing. We have integrated our vocational program into our already existing bookstore and printing ministries. Other possibilities would include maintenance {78} of church or school plant and grounds; office and secretarial work; school cafeteria; etc.

Use of Skilled Christians

Retired or disabled persons can be especially helpful in this area and many times are only too glad to be of help at little or no cost.

“Farm Out” Students to Area Christian-Run Businesses

4. SOME NEGATIVE ASPECTS

State Standards

These are almost unavoidable since safety requirements must be met as well as certain licensing code requirements. Try to avoid problems where food preparation may affect your entire plant.

Professional Standards

These may be restrictive in some areas but are not insurmountable. Some professional unions may even be glad to send representatives to help develop a qualified program.

Qualified Personnel

Such people are often difficult to obtain. Development of programs ought to be weighed in light of available talent.

Expenses

This is the reason why most public and private schools offer only general or college prep courses: they require little more than basic classroom facilities and texts. Equipment and special facilities for vocational courses can become expensive. This is aggravated in Christian schools by low enrollment and marginal funding. (Why couldn't a number of Christian churches operating schools in a limited geographic area cooperate to form regional vocational Christian schools?)

Public Relations

Any that are "farmed out," or go out with your name, represent your church and school (rightly or wrongly, this is so). More broadly, they represent all Christian schools—indeed, Christ Himself. Their academics and skills, as well as their personal character, should be good. Be careful who you "go to bat" for. Diplomas should be marked as vocational diplomas.

EDUCATIONAL VOUCHERS: THE DOUBLE TAX

Gary North

Reprinted from *The Freeman*.

“All State education is a sort of dynamo machine for polarizing the popular mind; for turning and holding its lines of force in the direction supposed to be most effective for State purposes.”

—Henry Adams, *The Education of Henry Adams* (1907).

We are continually bombarded by newspaper and magazine headlines informing us of the continuing “crisis in education,” which actually is a crisis in government-operated education. Virtually all the available data reveal that the crisis is accelerating. Inner-city schools have become literal battlefields between rival gangs, between teachers and students, between administrators and increasingly vociferous faculty unions, and most important, between outraged parents and the whole system. Yet the crisis is in no way confined to inner-city schools. The suburban schools of the white middle class are burdened with the multiple plagues of student boredom, drug addiction, and rapidly increasing alcoholism. A dozen years of falling scores on the college entrance examination reveal the steady nature of the erosion, despite the acceleration of costs associated with the public schools.

Educators cannot bring themselves to admit that the crisis is anything more than a temporary aberration—an aberration from the “normal” which itself was dead long before today’s administrators were born. The theories multiply, the explanations proliferate, and the crisis gets worse. What the last decade has brought is an understanding on the part of the public and a minority of government school employees (untenured, generally) that there is no answer.

Like the sinking ship which finally takes on too much water, the government education system is irretrievable. It will be useful in the future only as scrap. But what about those millions of students who will go

through the system before it finally sinks? Will they too become useful only as scrap?

Parents are becoming aware of the discussion syndrome. The endless discussions in half-empty halls between a few parents and local administrators have not altered anything. The teacher conferences, the PTA conferences, and all the other conferences have proved useful only for the {80} cataloguing of the unsolved and increasingly unsolvable problems connected with government education. Solutions have not emerged from conferences—or at least no solutions acceptable to parents, administrators, school boards, students, state legislators, and an angry group of levy-rejecting voters. If there are no solutions, why pay higher taxes? This is the reasoning of the voters. The reasoning of the school administrators is different. They only want to discover a new source of tax money that will be acceptable to the voters, or better yet, that will not be subject to public elections at all.

The Root of the Crisis

The problems of American public education are the problems associated with any system of government-enforced, tax-supported coercive wealth redistribution: the system of financing conflicts with the expressly stated goals of the planning agencies. This conflict between the method of financing and the stated goals of education has been with us since the days of the Puritans of New England who set up schools for the poor which were to be financed, in part, by the local property tax assessor.

There is no education apart from conformity of thought. One thing is true and another is not. Education requires indoctrination. But the conformity of thought which is basic to all education creates conflicts when parents of differing first principles are required either to finance a hostile educational system or to send their children to it. The Puritans' solution was to enforce conformity by expelling hostile families from the community. The modern bureaucrat's solution is to force parents to finance an alternative school system as well as the government system, and then to take control of the private system later on.

Sidney E. Mead, in his important book, *The Lively Experiment: The Shaping of Christianity in America* (1963), has argued perceptively that the public school system is America's only established church. His

point is well taken. Like all systems of established worship, some people are forced to finance doctrines and principles that they do not agree with. They resent this fact, but instead of seeking for the separation of “church” and state, modern parents only seek to “recapture” the public education system. So deeply rooted is the idea of the necessity of publicly financed education that those who are being destroyed by the system—who are losing their children to the system—cannot bring themselves to abandon it on principle. If the moral answer of the free man to the socialist’s policies of coercive wealth redistribution is “not yours to give,” then the moral answer to those who would somehow take over the public system is “not yours to recapture.”

The religious nature of the conflict has been noted by R. J. Rushdoony: “The state is [seen as] the order of liberty, and the school is the means {81} whereby citizens are prepared for the good life. The state has become the saving institution, and the function of the school has been to proclaim a new gospel of salvation. Education in this era is a messianic and utopian movement, a facet of the Enlightenment hope of regenerating man in terms of the promises of science and that new social order to be achieved in the state.”⁸ Yet precisely because the new state religious establishment has become messianic, it has also become the center of man’s criticism.

Education today occupies an equivocal position in contemporary life, functioning both as a scapegoat for every failure and as a catch-all for every hope and expectation of society. The schools and colleges are berated for extending their authority beyond the fundamentals of learning into a program which envelops the whole child or the whole man, and, at the same time, are given additional responsibilities which can only extend their scope even further. Fundamental to this unhappy and contradictory approach is a messianic expectation of education coupled with a messianic attitude on the part of educators. The attitude of people towards education is that it is a god that has failed and yet a god who can perhaps still be whipped into fulfilling his mission.⁹

8. Rousas J. Rushdoony, *The Messianic Character of American Education* (Nutley, NJ: Craig Press, 1963), 4.

9. *Ibid.*, 6.

The decade which has just passed—one which began only a few months after these words were published—has brought a massive disillusionment concerning education. Nevertheless, the public's faith in government-financed and administered education still persists, at least to the extent that people think the system can still be reformed, transformed, or recaptured, despite the academic crises of 1964-74.

The pluralism of American life is now, and always has been, in direct opposition to a philosophy of public education. Yet the irreconcilable conflict between these two principles has never been faced by the vast bulk of our citizens and virtually any of its educational theorists. The financing of a pluralistic culture must be voluntary, springing from the deeply felt needs of the various religious, intellectual, and cultural groups.

Three centuries of conflict over the control, content, and financing of public education serve as a testimony to the futility of combining a system of tax-financed schools with a pluralistic culture financed by free men. The system of education is elitist, as all professional systems must be, but with taxation as its base, the system is in conflict with democratic principles. It leads to a system of minority rule. Weber was quite correct when he argued that bureaucracy is antidemocratic by nature; control is separated from those who bear the financial burdens.¹⁰ Tenure and civil service protection assure that control and financing are kept separate. {82}

The Assumption of Neutrality

An implicit schizophrenia undermines every system of public education. On the one hand, a primary justification for the existence of government-financed education is that the nation needs citizens who are educated for the responsibilities of democratic participation in the political processes. The schools are to educate men in terms of the "ethics of democracy" or "democratic values" or just plain "patriotism." Schools must inculcate "values," although the more vague these are, the better for the administrators.

10. Max Weber, "Bureaucracy," *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, ed. H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills (New York: Oxford University Press, 1946).

On the other hand, in order to ward off criticism from various religious and ideological groups, public education is simultaneously defended as a system which inculcates no religious or ideological values whatsoever. Public education is simply technical, making possible a better, more productive, and more profitable life for all of its students. *The stated goals of democratic education and strictly vocational or technical training are in absolute opposition to each other.* The first absolutely affirms the value-laden nature of public education, while the second absolutely denies it.

The schizophrenia of public education can be seen in the doctrine of academic freedom. The doctrine was first developed by the professors employed by the Prussian universities that were the products of state financing. (Prussia invented the kindergarten and the graduate seminar, two of the least productive educational developments on record.) The universities were supposed to be extensions of the Prussian state, and they were understood as such by everyone, but professors wanted to be exempted from any form of censorship or control by the agents of the state. Thus, they invented the idea of academic freedom—the freedom of inquiry belonging to any *certified* scholar in his area of expertise. He is to be entirely neutral, however; his instruction must be based only on facts. He must not indulge in propaganda.

Yet, steadily, as the implications of epistemology have been recognized, the idea that “facts” somehow create a neutral world of scholarship has been abandoned. The so-called sociology of knowledge (sociology of prejudice) indicates that men can investigate only a tiny fraction of the infinite number of facts, glean facts and assembling them in terms of a philosophical framework. Presuppositions therefore influence interpretations, and interpretations are now recognized as ultimately religious in nature, i.e., they are accepted as unchallengeable first principles. While few students recognized this fact as recently as the early 1960s, the effects of the Vietnam War and the counterculture have reversed this. The students, and many of their professors, now acknowledge what has always been true: education is not neutral. But if education cannot be neutral, then the public school system’s legal pillar—the assumption of neutrality—is {83} exposed as a false justification for the maintenance of an established church and a tenured priesthood.

The Locus of Sovereignty

The ultimate source of the educational crisis stems from an error in first principles. Once committed to this error, the public education system has floundered repeatedly. To locate the source of the error, men need only ask themselves a single question: who is responsible for the education of a child? The answers, of course, are varied: the parents, the church, the civil government, or a combination of the three.

The conflicts in education are in fact conflicts over a much more fundamental issue: the locus of sovereignty, and hence, the locus of personal responsibility. The person or institution which possesses sovereignty must be the one which takes on the responsibility. By affirming the legitimacy of tax-supported education, voters have attempted to transfer their responsibilities for the education of their children to another agency, the state. Yet at the same time, they affirm their own sovereignty over the content and structure of the educational system. That they have lost almost every battle in their war with tenured, state-supported educational bureaucrats, is the direct result of the public's abdication of personal responsibility, family by family, for the education of their children. The war was lost on the day that parents, as voters, decided to transfer the financial responsibilities of educating their own children to other members of the body politic. While Horace Mann can be regarded as the general who was victorious over private education in Massachusetts, he was only conducting mopping-up operations. The end had been determined two centuries earlier when the Puritans of Massachusetts affirmed the principle of tax-supported education.

Any system of education must ultimately be the reflection of and product of the philosophical principles of those who finance the system. The decision about the financing of any institution inescapably determines the shape and content of that institution. Modern men, being secular, now recognize this fact when applied to the institution of the church. They see that a state-supported church is antithetical to the principle of freedom of conscience. They see, and religious zealots like Roger Williams see, that state-financed churches become the tools of the state which supplies the funds. But modern men do not see that this strict relationship between financing and operations applies equally well to government school systems. Somehow, the relationship

is *ad hoc*; it works when churches are involved, but it is irrelevant in the field of public education. Like the established churchmen of two centuries ago, today's priests and parishioners of the public schools refuse to recognize the nature of their relationship to the state. {84}

Do men finance their children's educations directly, through the personal sacrifice of the family unit? If so, then the family is sovereign over education. The school is then merely an extension of the family. The family makes use of the efficiencies associated with the division of labor. Parents hire professional educators to train their children, but those who are hired are paid to adapt their educational skills to the needs of the families that are financing the education. This can be done directly, through family-controlled school boards, but it can also be accomplished through the indirect means of the market. The family hires the tutor, or the school, in the same way that it hires any other servant. The parents are directly responsible for their children, and the selection of a school is an act of responsible stewardship. The family has not delegated the responsibility of educating the children to anyone else. It controls the purse strings—the ultimate affirmation of earthly sovereignty.

The more distant the source of the school's funds from the family, the less control the family has over the selection of the teachers and equipment. If the church finances the education of its members' children, then a layer of institutional bureaucracy is interposed between parents and teachers. This may be agreeable to many parents, but if church members other than the parents are expected to finance the school (as is the case in most instances), then they too have a legitimate right to determine school policies.

By transferring some of the burdens of financing education to other church members, the family thereby relinquishes a portion of its sovereignty over the educators. The educators then serve someone other than the parents, or at least in addition to the parents: the deacons, the elders, the minister, the school committee, or whatever. By diluting sovereignty, the educational bureaucrats gain more autonomy, since they can play off one church faction against another until everyone gives up and grants more autonomy to the administrators.

This is not to say that a church should never establish a school. The war of the state bureaucrats against private schools may be so intense in

some regions that it would be wise to operate behind the all-important legal barrier of the First Amendment. It is far more difficult for the bureaucrats to get at a school which is protected in this fashion, and it should remain difficult in the future. If it is a question of sending your child to an overregulated private school or a public school, select the private school, but if a third alternative is possible, a church school, then it might be preferable. But if the church school's bureaucracy is to be kept in its place, and if the locus of sovereignty is to stay with the parents, then the tuition fee must cover all costs. No discounts for second, third, or fourth children should be offered, unless there are cost savings involved (such as one-stop bus service). The parents, not the church, are responsible {85} for the education of the children. The locus of sovereignty in education must not be shifted.

The bureaucrats gain their greatest control in tax-supported systems. Sovereignty is so diluted at the level of the individual citizen that the expertise of the professional and tenured bureaucrats is overwhelmingly powerful. But their power is not tied to a personal relationship with the children (as it is with a parent), nor is it linked to a financial dependence on the parents, nor is it even linked to a community of shared values, as in the case of a church school. Their power stems from the unwillingness of legislators to turn off the funds. And the legislators' unwillingness to interfere stems from two primary facts of political life: 1) the experts have an aura of invincibility about them, plus tenure; 2) the voters still believe in the establishment of the public school church. It is easier to give speeches than to take action, so legislators give speeches. Most of them are reelected most of the time, so the policy pays off in the coin of the political realm: votes.

The crisis of education is therefore a crisis in the realm of values, with the values of the parents coming into conflict with the values, philosophies, and incompetence of those in control of the tax-supported educational system. If the parents continue to capitulate to the philosophy of public education, then they will continue to be defeated in their attempts to gain the kind of education they want for their children. There is only one way that all parents can gain such satisfaction: they must pay for the education of their children. They can earn the money or they can convince some third party to give them or their children the necessary funds on a voluntary basis, but the parents must pay. If

they want to get what they pay for, they must pay directly, rather than paying through the coercive means of state taxation.

If outside financing is necessary, then an independent scholarship committee of qualified people should be established. It can be set up as an adjunct to the school. Tax exemption can be applied for from the federal government. This keeps the administration of the school independent of the government. Superior students who can make good use of the education, but whose families are too poor to afford the tuition, can still get the benefits. But the committee must be scrupulously honest in awarding the scholarships on the basis of academic excellence and need, given the *written* religious or educational guidelines in the committee's bylaws. There must be no hint of favoritism, such as the awarding of scholarship money to the children of those who donated the tax-deductible funds. The authorities will examine the awards very carefully to make sure that the committee is fully qualified and fully independent. But at least it is only the committee which is regulated closely, not the school.

Until men are willing to cut off the political funding of the established {86} church of America, they will see the educational crisis escalate. The visible sign of sovereignty is the ability to pay for a service and the willingness to do so. Nothing short of this will suffice to solve the crisis in the schools, for the educational crisis is ultimately a conflict over sovereignty. He who pays with his own funds will win; he who continues to pay by voting cannot possibly win.

Pseudo-market Schemes

Professor Milton Friedman of the University of Chicago is one of the most technically proficient economists in America today. As a defender of the principle of market efficiency, he has been able to gain many adherents within the economics profession. He has been especially successful in challenging the inefficiencies of the federal regulatory commissions. His most popular and widely read book, *Capitalism and Freedom* (1962), was a landmark of the 1960s, for it was popularly written by a professional economist who had long before established his technical proficiency before his peers. Some of the policy recommendations of the book, such as the abolition of occupational licensure by civil governments, have not been taken seriously by most economists

and certainly not by professionals who now hold occupational licenses from civil government. Yet from the point of view of those who are convinced of the technical superiority of the free market over governmental regulation, it is this kind of uncompromising stand taken by Friedman which is most valuable in the defense of freedom, not to mention capitalism.

The problem that many free market advocates have with some of Friedman's policy recommendations is that too often he spends many pages in devising ingenious schemes that would make government programs more efficient and, Friedman fervently hopes, less burdensome to the taxpayers, businessmen, and innocent citizens of the land. These policy recommendations have one feature in common: they are pseudo-market devices. They would create a kind of shadow market—"almost a free market"—that could provide success indicators analogous to those provided by a truly free market. In doing so, he argues, these pseudo-market alterations would make government more responsive to the needs of citizens.

Back in 1920, Professor Ludwig von Mises wrote the most famous essay of his academic career, "Economic Calculation in a Socialist Commonwealth." Mises argued that the inescapable weakness of all systems of central planning is the inability of the planners to assess the actual value of any product or service in the economy. Without freely fluctuating prices that are the product of the private ownership of both consumer and capital goods, there can be no means of imputing value accurately by any of the participants in the economy. What should anything cost? What is it {87} worth? What should be given up to attain any particular goal? Without market prices, meaning without open entry to the market by buyers and sellers, there can be only random guesses by the planning bodies. Randomness is not efficient, except on random occasions. Thus, concluded Mises, the socialist commonwealth is of necessity inefficient. It cannot plan rationally. So long as the monopoly character of the state-controlled markets continues, the planning authorities will remain blind to the true conditions of supply and demand.¹¹

Understandably, Mises had no use for pseudo-market schemes of any kind. In fact, the most important (though ineffectual) reply to Mises from the socialist camp was made by Oskar Lange, and it con-

sisted of a system of hypothetical pseudo-market responses by central planners: artificial and arbitrary prices to be set by the planners, followed by adjustments in the price system in order for planning agencies to stimulate the desired response from buyers and producers.¹² The problem, as always, was the closed nature of the system. The planners could never be sure they were not wasting resources in their attempt to attain any goal. Those who set prices are sovereign, and in the case of the socialist commonwealth, the sovereign is economically blind.

In short, the creation of a pseudo-market cannot guarantee increased government efficiency or increased economic power on the part of consumers. All that will be accomplished is the irrationalization of the central economic plan by mixing it with nonsocialist yet non-market elements. Lange's scheme was never adopted by the Polish planning agency he belonged to, nor have the Soviets adopted it. It is neither socialist nor market; it is only economically irrational.

The Voucher Scheme

Perhaps the most interesting of all of the pseudo-market policy recommendations promoted by Friedman is his educational voucher plan. Under such a school financing system, each family would receive one voucher for each school-age child in the family. The voucher would be redeemable in money upon presentation by a private school to the state or country government. Its value would be equal to the average per student cost of education in the district. (This figure, by the way, is seldom even {88} calculated by school boards, for obvious political and public relations reasons, and when it is calculated, it virtually never includes such crucial items as the interest which the government might have earned had it sold off the school buildings and invested the

11. Ludwig von Mises, "Economic Calculation in a Socialist Commonwealth" (1920), in F. A. Hayek, ed., *Collectivist Economic Planning* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1935).

12. Oskar Lange and Fred M. Taylor, *On the Economic Theory of Socialism* (New York: McGraw-Hill, [1938] 1956). For a reply, see T. J. B. Hoff, *Economic Calculation in the Socialist Society* (London: Hodge, 1949). Hayek's latest statement on the question of central economic planning appeared in *The Morgan Guaranty Survey* (January 1976), and is available on request: 23 Wall St., New York, NY 10015.

money elsewhere, such as in the bank which would lend the purchase money to a local profit-making school.) The parents could then send their students to a public school or to a private school. If the cost of tuition were higher in the private school than the value of the voucher, the parents could make up the difference by paying more money.

The advantages of this scheme, argue the supporters of school vouchers, would be considerable. The parents gain back their lost sovereignty. They decide where the children will attend school. The public schools would be forced to compete for students, thereby increasing their efficiency. Private schools would spring up everywhere in response to the existence of vouchers. The diversity of educational opportunities would be fostered. The costs of administration would be very low. (One advocate back in 1962—a respected libertarian philosopher—announced that it would take only a computer and four secretaries to run the whole system for the state of California. If this were true—and it certainly is not true—it would insure the doom of the program in the eyes of the most potent group of special-interest pleaders in the state, the civil service employees.) The state could establish specialty schools of all kinds to lure back parents and their vouchers. The authority of parents would be reestablished, and this would guarantee a truly progressive educational system.

There is no doubt that the logic of the voucher system is initially impressive. Parents would seem to have more power in selecting educational alternatives under the voucher system. The below-market pricing monopoly of the state would be eliminated. The conformity of bureaucratic education would be challenged by a new diversity. A new educational pluralism would be the creation of vouchers. It would save money and increase freedom. What more could we ask for? In any case, what more can we expect in an age of wealth redistribution? This is always the key argument in favor of the creation of pseudo-market schemes: no way exists to reestablish a truly free market, so this is the best we can hope for.

The Locus of Sovereignty Revisited

It all sounds so plausible. Yet it overlooks the fundamental problem of voucher-financed education. The question must still be asked: where is the locus of sovereignty? And the answer must still be the same: civil

government. The voucher program violates the most important principle of education: parents are responsible for the financing of their children's education. He who is responsible is also legally sovereign, and vice versa. Operationally, the source of the funding determines the locus of sovereignty. {89} The goal of all those who would defend market arrangements must be to determine the *moral* locus of sovereignty in any particular circumstance, and then see to it that the sovereign agent be made legally and economically responsible for the exercise of his power. By failing to demand that parents be the source of funding for their own children's education, the promoters of the voucher scheme have abdicated their responsibility in extending the principle of voluntarism and its concomitant, personal responsibility.

In the voucher system, the source of the funding is still the taxation system. The financing is based on the principle that it is legitimate to use political power in order to grant benefits to one group at the expense of the other. The principle of coercion is still dominant. The dominant principle, over time, will thwart the elements of voluntarism in any pseudo-market scheme. The state is still the operational sovereign over education, simply because the threat of violence, which is the state's legal monopoly, is the source of the funds for education.

There is no doubt that Friedman recognizes this fact, yet he does not emphasize it. He believes that the technical alteration of the way in which coercively collected taxes are redistributed can overcome the sovereignty of the state. He acknowledges that the authority of the parents in a voucher scheme cannot be absolute. The state-financed "educational diversity" under a voucher system is a diversity operating within government-established guidelines. Money spent by the state can never be on a "no strings attached" basis. There is always more demand for government money than there is money available to meet the demand (unless the purchasing power of government money falls to zero). Those legally responsible for the distribution of tax money must have legal guidelines, or else rampant waste and dishonesty will instantly appear, and the treasury will be emptied overnight.¹³ This is why statest education must be bureaucratic education, with guidelines

13. Ludwig von Mises, *Bureaucracy* (New Rochelle, NY: Arlington House, [1944] 1969).

imposed from above, since the money comes from the state. There is no escape from the rules of bureaucracy in a voucher system. Friedman acknowledges this fact:

Governments could require a minimum level of schooling financed by giving parents vouchers redeemable for a specified maximum sum per child per year if spent on “approved” educational services. Parents would then be free to spend this sum and any additional sum they themselves provided on purchasing educational services from an “approved” institution of their own choice.¹⁴

The key word, of course, is “approved.” Why Friedman has chosen to put the word in quotes is not altogether clear. Does he mean “kind of approved”? Certainly, he is wise enough to know that when the {90} state bureaucrats approve or disapprove, they do not hide their actions in quotation marks. They simply decide. They decide in terms of criteria appropriate to the continued functioning of the statist educational bureaucracy. As Friedman writes, “Any subsidy should be granted to individuals to be spent at institutions of their own choosing, provided only that the school is of a kind that it is desired to subsidize.”¹⁵ *Desired by whom* to subsidize? The parents? Hardly; they are the ones to be dictated to, not dictated by. The parents will be told where they can freely spend their vouchers, and they have to that degree lost their sovereignty. The state provides the funds through its monopoly of coercion; the state shall determine, coercively, how and where those funds are to be spent.

Controlling the Alternatives

What the decades-long erosion of the government school systems has provided is a long list of reasons why it would be profitable for each family to remove its children from the subsidized schools. A small but growing minority of parents is doing just that. The state bureaucrats are legally prohibited from providing religious schools, ideologically prohibited from providing free-market education, and apparently unable to provide competent instruction. They see their task as insur-

14. Milton Friedman, *Capitalism and Freedom* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962), 89.

15. *Ibid.*, 99.

ing standards, which means insuring educational conformity. The rise of an independent school system, which is replacing the declining number of Roman Catholic parochial schools, is a threat to public school administrators. They are as hostile to alternative educational programs as the postal system's administrators are to United Parcel Service or anyone else carrying first-class mail.

Private school administrators in Indiana were recently imprisoned temporarily for having cooperated with parents who attempted to remove their son from the public school system against his will. Until their 1976 victory in the Ohio State Supreme Court, parents in Ohio had been threatened with the removal of their children to foster homes if they persisted in sending their children to unaccredited schools. This is warfare, not some simple debate over financing. Technical solutions are insufficient to solve problems of ideological and religious warfare.

What we are witnessing is a conflict over sovereignty. Who is responsible for the training of children, the state or the parents? The lines are being drawn far more sharply today than at any time in this nation's history. Pseudo-market schemes cannot solve questions of ultimate sovereignty, or at least they cannot solve them for the benefit of free market institutions.

State schools rest on a whole series of erroneous assumptions. First, that the state is ultimately sovereign in the field of education—the pseudo-parent of every child. Second, that state schools can teach children totally {91} neutral values—universally acceptable principles that all education must provide. Third, that it is the moral as well as legal obligation of taxpayers to finance the school system. Fourth, that the professional, tenured, and civil-service-protected officials of the educational monopoly are the people best prepared to operate the educational system.

The voucher system directly challenges only the last of these assumptions, and then only superficially. (After all, state schools will still be permitted to operate.) The voucher system necessarily requires the *licensing of schools*. For those who favor bureaucratic licensing of alternative systems by the state bureaucrats whose jobs are threatened by alternative educational systems, I can only recommend chapter 9 of Friedman's *Capitalism and Freedom*—the chapter on occupational licensing.

As private schools continue to replace the disintegrating government schools at the primary and secondary levels, the state's educational bureaucrats will have to take decisive action to protect their monopoly. One way to accomplish this is to refuse to certify any more schools. (I am assuming that outright abolition will not be tolerated politically or in the courts.) This approach may work for a time, since parents are concerned about quality schools. By some peculiar twist of logic, the parents of private school children somehow believe that the state licensing boards are competent to certify educational performance, despite the fact that the schools that they themselves operate are anathema to the parents in question.

Private school administrators, who come to parents in the name of a superior program, are equally hypnotized by the boards of certification. The most intelligent response is that made by Robert Thoburn, principal and owner of the profit-making and highly successful Fairfax Christian School of Fairfax, Virginia: "If the bureaucrats want me to certify their schools, they can come to me and I'll look over their programs. That's my view of certification."

If the certification ploy does not work, then the last hope of state educational bureaucrats is the voucher system. If parents continue to send their children to uncertified schools, then the state must find a way to convince private school administrators that they must register with the state and conform their programs to state educational standards. The voucher system is the most logical means of achieving this goal. Vouchers will create a pseudo-free-market school system, using "free" in both senses: independent and without cost to the users. The state-operated schools will then compete with the state licensed schools. Almost no third alternative will be economically possible.

Those parents who want their children out of the government-operated schools (which their taxes support) will also be paying for the operation of voucher-supported, state-licensed schools. These parents must turn {92} down the first subsidy (free public education in a government school), turn down a second subsidy (vouchers for government-licensed schools), and come up with after-tax income to finance their children's education in a truly independent school.

This is assuming they can find such a school. To do so, they must locate other parents equally committed religiously and ideologically to

the principle of independent education, and also financially able to put their preference into action. How many concerned parents will do this? How many private school administrators will be able to operate a school while denying admittance to those who would pay with vouchers? How many of these schools with total commitment to private education will there be? I can tell you: very, very few.

Not until the blight so obvious in the government-operated schools has spread to the government-licensed voucher schools will parents even consider bearing the second tax (vouchers) and find money to pay for an independent education. In short: *vouchers are the most promising tool for the suppression of independent private education now at the disposal of state bureaucrats.*

What will the price be? What may not have been clear to Friedman back in the early 1960s is clear to us now. We will have HEW guidelines operating in every voucher-using school—equal opportunity policies, quota systems of every kind, teacher hiring and firing policies, racially and religiously mixed student bodies. There will be a whole army of federal bureaucrats, not to mention state bureaucrats, policing every private school. The so-called private educational system will be swallowed up in a mountain of red tape. How much imagination does it take to see what is coming? Isn't it sufficient to look at what our independent private colleges are now going through? Can you imagine the kinds of controls in store for schools that are set up to permit an escape hatch for the crumbling state educational monopoly—the most horrendous visible failure of socialism in America?

There is one final variation of the voucher scheme that must be considered. This is the one which even the most dedicated free-market advocates seem to think could work. I refer to the tuition tax credit scheme. A tax deduction or outright tax credit equal to the cost of tuition would be allowed to parents who send their children to private schools. I have been asked by the man I regard as the nation's outstanding professional free-market economist (who happens to have ten children) to lobby in Congress for this tax benefit. I have heard a speaker at a Christian school administrators conference call upon the listeners to lobby for this program. Yet this approach, economically speaking, is identical to the outright voucher program. The state's educational policy makers will have to certify those schools that are "suitable" for chil-

dren. There is no escape: if the {93} government allows a tax deduction—greater net income after taxes—then it will inevitably be compelled to certify the institutions involved.

The one exception, for the moment, is the church. The federal bureaucrats carefully examine the books and programs of all tax-deductible institutions, but the First Amendment has protected churches from more than minimal scrutiny. This is one reason why there will be continuing efforts of secularists and statistes to abolish tax exemption for charitable gifts to churches. Nevertheless, even today, only Christian schools operated directly by churches as official programs of the church would be likely to avoid policing by educational bureaucrats if the “tax deduction voucher” were legislated. Whenever governments give subsidies or tax breaks to any organization, that organization becomes dependent financially on the continuing favor of the government. Vouchers, direct or indirect, are merely bait used by statistes to reel in their educational rivals.

It is bad enough to operate any organization in terms of its tax-deductible status. The authorities take special care to police tax-exempt organizations. Nonprofit institutions also suffer from institutional lethargy; they do not respond to market demand rapidly, as Professor Manne’s study of universities indicates. The government can always threaten a tax-exempt organization with the removal of its tax-deductible status, another major defect of such organizations.

Bad as tax-exempt operations may be, their efficiency can be improved if they charge fees for service that at least cover costs. To lobby for tax deductions for tuition payments is to guarantee increased controls by the government, making schools that much more vulnerable to the threat of bureaucrats. Being allowed to donate money on a tax-deductible basis is one thing; being allowed to receive a service for a tax-deductible payment is something else again. The education authorities, in league with the tax men, will go to any lengths to police the schools that are allowed the latter tax break. Our schools will lose their full independence.

Ideally, a school should be treated exactly as a tutor might be treated, or a piano instructor, or any other teacher who is hired by parents to instruct their children. The school is simply a system of multiple tutors hired by several families on a cost-effective basis. If we think of the

school as we think of a family tutor, we will make fewer mistakes about the locus of sovereignty and responsibility in education. The tutor should not be discriminated against by special favors granted to schools, such as tax breaks, vouchers, or direct subsidies. However, schools should not be regulated by the government, any more than a part-time tutor should be regulated. To subsidize any one form of instruction is to reduce the diversity of available educational programs, thereby reducing the number of alternatives to the public school system. We reduce our ability to learn new ways to subdue the earth to the glory of God. Remove {94} the subsidies, direct or indirect, and you thereby promote the freedom of choice. You thereby increase consumer sovereignty in the market for education.

Conclusion

The statist educators and politicians of Great Britain are calling for the abolition of all independent schools in Britain, not because they think the government schools will be improved, but because it is intolerable in a society guided by the politics of envy to let any class, any family, any religious group escape the blight of the socialist educational system. If the sons and daughters of the laboring class must suffer the terrors of the government school system, why should the sons and daughters of the rich be permitted to escape? The logic is impeccable. After the Civil War we abolished the right of men to buy their way out of conscription by paying the government a fine sufficient to enlist another man. This practice was thought to be undemocratic. The same will be true, I fear, for those who would escape conscription into the public school system.

The state is not about to adopt pseudo-market schemes unless the bureaucrats believe that the adoption of the scheme will remove competition from consistently independent private competitors. The state is not going to consider the latest pseudo-market proposal to come out of the graduate seminars of the pro-free-market professors unless the scheme can be rewritten to enhance the sovereignty, power, and efficiency of those who would suppress the independence of private men. This should be the lesson of the age: statist ideologues and their tenured hirelings do not commit suicide voluntarily. They do not abandon the ideology of the control economy simply because some new scheme

promises to make the government benign or reduce the tax burden of the public.

Pseudo-market schemes, promoted in the name of the free market, are adopted by the enemies of freedom for very specific purposes: to reduce the zones of freedom. Those who believe in increasing all state sovereignty will adopt pseudo-market schemes only when they are convinced that the free market is too great a threat to pure, uncompromising bureaucratic failure—the same reason why the Soviets allow semi-market pricing in a few restricted areas of the economy.

The state may adopt vouchers for education on an experimental basis, in order to test the scheme. If it does foster independent education, vouchers will be scrapped. But they will not have to be scrapped. Vouchers may well become a permanent fixture of our government education system. If so, it will be for a reason: the school voucher offers vast new powers of control over a vibrant and growing independent school system that threatens to undercut government schools.

The threat to freedom from school vouchers is that they strike at the {95} heart of society: the family. As a pseudo-market device, they promise to be remarkably successful in destroying a tiny but important pure free market development. I am reminded of Lenin's dictum that if the communists announced that all capitalists were to be hanged tomorrow, the capitalists would trip over each other today trying to sell Lenin the rope. The profit system does not regard the origins of profits, at least short-run profits. Men act to improve their positions in life. Private school administrators and most of the private colleges have been eager to receive federal aid; only a minority of a minority has held out against the lure of federal money. (Their schools, it should be remembered, are very small and may grow smaller.) The lure of vouchers almost certainly will prove too great a temptation for thousands of our struggling little private schools. It may take another generation to recover from the defection of these schools, should that defection have an opportunity to manifest itself.

If vouchers are to be stopped, they will have to be stopped by parents who recognize the double taxation nature of the voucher scheme. Those who truly want independent schools and are willing to pay for them must not seek after vouchers, for vouchers are the very seal of doom for the independent school system. Pseudo-market schemes

generally lead to anti-market results. The opposition to vouchers must be made on principle and in opposition to the superficial logic of the pseudo-market. He who is morally responsible must pay. Abandon this principle, and you abandon your sovereignty as a free man. Good results stem from good principles. Vouchers are an intellectual, moral, and educational disaster. They will not work to expand the realm of freedom.

THE FAILURE OF SEMINARY EDUCATION

Rousas John Rushdoony

In the modern era, the church, while numerically strong, has grown less and less influential and more and more peripheral to everyday life, to politics, economics, the arts and sciences, and all else. For most people, the church is irrelevant to the “real world” of human affairs. It provides a limited moral training for children, a social focus for the family, and not much more. Churches have numbers, not strength. Both in membership and in leadership, the churches are radically weak.

Our concern here is with the leadership, and with those who train them, the seminaries. In analyzing the failure of the seminaries, it is necessary to point out, *first*, that the modern seminary is a rootless institution in many respects. At one time, the entire focus of education was theological; all life and education had, more or less, as its function man’s better ability to serve, enjoy, and glorify God. The university was a product of the Christian faith. Only biblical faith, with its affirmation of *one Lord, one faith* (Eph. 4:4), could create a university. For paganism then and now, the universe is really a multiverse, not a single realm of one law under one God, but a multiverse of many possibilities, potentialities, and diverse law systems and lifestyles. Biblical faith made the birth and rise of the university possible. The essential education of man, when school and university were, more or less, Christian, made everything in life relevant to Christian faith. While education has never in the past approximated the ideal or standard of biblically oriented instruction, it has all the same made, in Christian eras, the faith basic to all things, so that a Christian world and life view of sorts dominated the scene.

Now the seminary student comes to his seminary usually with a long background of humanistic education. His seminary training barely scratches the surface of his deeply ingrained humanism. Within ten years, because most pastors do little serious or “heavy” theological,

philosophical, and biblical reading, their underlying humanism has reshaped their ministry. It is commonplace to encounter Arminian and Calvinistic pastors who are zealous contenders for the faith in their churches but whose theology is so interlaced with humanism that their ministry is radically compromised.

At this point, the failure of seminary education rests, not in the seminary, but in the absence of Christian schools and colleges as the necessary {97} prelude to seminary. It is, of course, necessary that these schools and colleges be essentially rather than nominally Christian. Thus, one of the best hopes for seminaries today is the rapid growth of the Christian school.

Second, we must recognize, however, that seminaries too often have a false orientation. They represent a denomination, an ecclesiastical body, rather than the faith. The difference is an important one. If the seminary is created by an institution, its basic loyalty will be to that institution. So many new denominations, rebelling against what apostate seminaries have done to their old church, all the same reproduce the same pattern of control that leads to an institutional rather than a theological seminary.

In an institutional seminary, the financing comes from the denomination, whereas in an independent seminary, it comes directly from those who stand for the faith. The difference is an important one: the wayward denominational seminary is less responsive to popular protests, and more remote from the people it serves. Everything is done through channels.

Third, this does not mean that independent seminaries have the answer. They, together with the denominational schools, are too often oriented more to academic respectability and to scholarship than to the pastorate and the faith. The preferred student is the academically oriented student, not the student whose goal is the pastorate.

Moreover, scholarship, in the modern era, is too often scholarship for the sake of scholarship. Scholars think and write for their peer group, not for the people of God. With the rise of seminaries, scholarship has left the pulpit for the seminary, and, in the process, become less and less mindful of the pastoral responsibilities. Calvin, Luther, Knox, the translators of the King James Version, and others were better scholars than today's seminary professors, and they spoke and wrote

for the people in the pew. Their scholarship had a theological, not academic, orientation, and it was therefore more popular.

On top of that, most seminary scholars write with the modernist scholar in mind. They are endlessly answering learned fools who need no answering, and who never read what the evangelical and reformed scholars write anyway. To waste time and study on such an enterprise is intellectual folly, and is contrary to Scripture (Matt. 7:6). All too much of evangelical and reformed scholarship is an exercise in irrelevance. There is little profit or meaning in it for God's people. It speaks, not to the problems of life, but to the problems of academic scholarship.

The seminary graduate should be a scholar in the Word of God, trained to continue his studies and to apply the Word to every area of life. The academic rather than pastoral scholarship of seminary life does not prepare the student to do this. It is better oriented to graduate studies than to pastoral studies, to academic questions rather than pastoral ones. The {98} result is that much of the student's education has a minimal value.

Fourth, when the seminary seeks to become "practical" in its instruction, the result is a series of "junk courses" for pastoral training. The best and only sound pastoral training should come directly out of theology, Bible studies, and church history. By separating "pastoral psychology and counselling" from theology, both subjects are impoverished. By divorcing church administration, church law, church organization, etc., from church history, both are again made impractical. Luther and Calvin, we should remember, were scholars who derived their churchmanship from theological, biblical, and historical studies.

The so-called "practical" courses, moreover, are taught by the worst possible men—big-city, big-church pastors who are hired as professors. In the past few years, I have encountered this same situation several times, once of a suburban church, newly begun; in other cases, of country churches. The small congregation is scattered over a farming community; the pastor lives next door to the church. The custodial work is parceled out: the minister is to clean the church weekly; the men come in to do painting and repairing on the manse and church; the women take care of kitchen needs, planting shrubs, and the like. But a problem develops: the young minister rebels, saying it is wrong

for him to “wait on tables” (Acts 6:2). The apostles dropped that task only when the church grew beyond their ability to cope with all needs, so that some “widows were neglected in the daily ministration” (Acts 6:1). Paul did not hesitate to work to avoid burdening churches he wanted to feel freer in authority to instruct. The point is that seminary graduates are imbued with a false sense of their own dignity by the academic community. On the foreign mission field, Bible school graduates are more successful very often than are seminary graduates, because they are not as self-important. (One seminary graduate was dropped by his church’s mission board when he said that he and other missionaries were living on too high a level to have any close contact with the people they sought to reach. Although dropped by the board, he continued as a missionary and was rated by a native scholar as the most influential missionary in that country.)

However, a central problem in the inadequacy of seminaries is eschatological. An eschatology of defeat (amillennialism) or rapture (premillennialism) does not need a world and life view, because it has surrendered much of history to the devil. Christianity is, however, inescapably a world and life faith because the God of Scripture is the sovereign God. He is Lord of all things, and biblical faith speaks to every area of life, without exception. An eschatology of retreat and withdrawal will not concern itself with Christ’s lordship over every realm. In American history from its earliest years, it has been very clear that any decline in postmillennial thought in theology has also been marked by a radical decline {99} in the power and relevance of theology in American life.

An eschatology of withdrawal will not concern itself with what Scripture has to teach concerning politics, economics, conservation, marriage and the family, the arts and sciences, and other like subjects. The Bible is reduced to an ecclesiastical manual, whereas the Bible is in fact God’s word for all of life. John Witherspoon’s pupils exercised a determinative influence in the writing of the U. S. Constitution because Witherspoon’s theology, however defective in some of its apologetic approaches, still represented an older and more catholic interpretation of the Reformed faith. Witherspoon saw the relevance of God’s law to economic and political concerns.

Some years ago, I asked a seminary student about his theology courses. He described them as “about as dry as corn flakes.” This is too often the case. Theology, where man should see the relevance of God’s Word to the totality of life, is too often marked by an abstraction from life, and by a barren, rationalistic logic. It views life from the study, and with the logic of the study. Calvin’s *Institutes* smells of the battleground. (I am reminded of the criticism of Dr. Cornelius Van Til by an ostensibly Reformed scholar; he described Van Til’s apologetics as “always too controversial” to be sound apologetics! This is a good illustration of the contemporary love of barrenness.)

This rationalistic sterility manifests itself in the seminary’s neglect of music. At best, music has a minor place in the seminary curriculum. The Bible, however, has a major and central section—the Psalms—which is a song book. Music appears in other parts of the Bible, and its links to theology and faith are strong. Whatever the theological problems of the medieval church, it deserved the name *Catholic*, because its approach to life was catholic, and it gave music a very central position. A living faith is a triumphant, singing faith, and the seminary today gives us nothing to sing about. We are told by some historians that there has never been a popular war without fresh and popular songs. The modern church has no “new song” for the Lord of any vitality, character, or joy. An eschatology of retreat, together with an abstract theology, cannot give birth to music. It is hardly worth a funeral dirge.

TRINITY MINISTERIAL ACADEMY: *PROSPECTUS*

Our Name Expresses Our Purpose

It is a well-known fact that in the Bible the names of persons are frequently more than mere distinctives which set them apart from other individuals; the name of a person indicates something of his character. The same may be said of Trinity Ministerial Academy.¹⁶

Trinity indicates an organic connection with Trinity Baptist Church. The academy is not, in fact, another institution associated *with the church*; rather it is one of the ministries *of the church* and therefore under the church's direct oversight and control.

Ministerial emphasizes that in this school men will be trained for *the ministry*, specifically the gospel ministry. The school is established for this purpose alone. All the courses taught will have direct bearing on "the work of ministering, unto the building up of the body of Christ."

Academy gives further emphasis to the fact that the purpose and function of the school is restrictive. An academy is defined as "any school for special instruction or training." For example, men are sent to the Air Force Academy to be trained for service in the nation's air force. Likewise, Trinity Ministerial Academy exists for the exclusive purpose of training men for the ministry.

But what is the Christian ministry? What are the distinctives of Trinity Ministerial Academy? Who will be accepted as students? What will be the nature of the training they will receive? Who will undertake to provide that training? The answers to these and other questions are given in the following pages. Pastors and other church leaders who contemplate sending young men to the Trinity Ministerial Academy are urged to read and to study the following pages. Likewise, the men who desire to apply (through their spiritual overseers) for acceptance as students in the Academy must give very serious consideration to all that is said in the following pages. In the following material human

16. A ministry of Trinity Baptist Church, Box 277, Essex Fells, NJ.

judgments are combined with biblical principles as an attempt is made to apply these principles to our times and circumstances.

By the grace of God we will not deviate from biblical principles. We recognize, however, that many of the practical applications of the principles can be worked out only in the actual training situation, and experience will be our best teacher in many areas. Refinements, adjustments, and alterations {101} of some of the specific details in the operation of the Academy will no doubt be made as experience reveals the necessity for such changes; but as we anticipate the opening of the school, the following policies appear to us at this time as constituting the best expression and application of the biblical principles involved.

Trinity Ministerial Academy will accept as students only such men as have given the overseer of their respective local church reason to believe that they have been given by the Head of the church certain basic gifts which, if developed, will make them “profitable for the ministry.” Accordingly, the students who come to the Academy and the church leaders who send them should expect that they will pursue the following goals:

1. To be exposed to the broad spectrum of the doctrinal and practical perspectives of the Scriptures which form the basis and substance of a valid biblical ministry.
2. To mature in those specific graces of Christian character which are essential to a valid biblical ministry.
3. To develop the gifts of teaching, preaching, and governing which comprise the major duties of a valid biblical ministry.
4. To get well started in those academic disciplines the pursuit of which is normally necessary for effectively carrying on the work of a valid biblical ministry.

The Nature of the Ministry

One’s understanding of the nature of the Christian ministry, both as to its origin and its function, will pervasively influence his attitude to the matter of training men for that ministry. We find the Bible’s teaching on these points to be very clear. In the first place, a true minister is made only by the sovereign appointment of Jesus Christ, the Head of the church (2 Cor. 3:5-6; Eph. 4:8-11; 1 Tim. 1:12).

Furthermore, we believe that God has designated the essential function of the ministerial office (wherever that office is exercised, whether at home or abroad) as shepherding “the flock of God” (Acts 20:28; 1 Pet. 5:2). This work of shepherding (“feeding,” “tending”) is accomplished by means of the authoritative preaching and teaching of “the whole counsel of God,” together with loving guidance, encouragement, and admonition of the people of God, and wise rule in the house of God. Moreover, these activities must be given credibility and acceptance by the consistent godly example of the minister himself (1 Tim. 4:12; Titus 2:7).

Thus we believe that the only sure indication that a man is being formed by Christ into an able minister of the New Covenant is his growing conformity to the clear standard of graces and gifts set forth in 1 Timothy 3:1-7 and Titus 1:5-9. This truth was excellently set forth by R. L. Dabney more than a century ago in his essay entitled, “What Is a Call to the Ministry?” Dabney wrote: {102}

This leads us to add another important class of texts by which the Holy Spirit will inform the judgment, both of the candidate and his brethren, as to his call. It is that class in which God defines the qualifications of a minister of the Gospel. Let every reader consult, as the fullest specimens, 1 Timothy 3:1-7; Titus 1:6-9. The inquirer is to study these passages, seeking the light of God’s Spirit to purge his mind from all clouds of vanity, self-love, prejudice, in order to see whether he has or can possibly acquire the qualifications here set down. And his brethren, under the influence of the same Spirit, must candidly decide by the same standard whether they shall call him to preach or not.¹⁷

Obviously, our hearty acceptance of this view of the Christian ministry so ably set forth by Dabney means that we have been guided by it in all the planning of Trinity Ministerial Academy, both as to the subject matter and the method of instruction. The following four sections set forth the practical unfolding of these details. Again, we urge that all prospective students and their spiritual overseers give careful and prayerful attention to what is here set forth.

17. R. L. Dabney, “What Is a Call to the Ministry?” *Discussions: Evangelical and Theological*, vol. 1 (London: Banner of Truth Trust, 1967), 2.

The Necessity for an Educated Ministry

“To tend the flock of God” with any degree of proficiency demands the constant exercise of a broad spectrum of God-given and diligently cultivated gifts. A man must “hold the pattern of sound words” (2 Tim. 1:13) and by means of them be able to nourish the people of God with sound doctrine. He must be able to “refute the gainsayers” and to stop the mouths of the propagators of error (Titus 1:9, 11). Along with these tasks he must apply the Word of God in such a manner as to realize its intended profit in the areas of “reproof, correction, and instruction in righteousness” (2 Tim. 3:16). We repeat that the gifts for such a ministry must be God-given; but they must also be diligently cultivated.

Because these gifts must be diligently cultivated, Trinity Ministerial Academy will require strenuous academic discipline of all its students. Each man will be expected to acquire a knowledge of the contents, the message, and the interrelation of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, a working acquaintance with the biblical languages, and a theoretical and practical understanding of systematic theology, biblical theology, and church history.

The student must also apply himself diligently to the experimental and practical aspects of the ministry. Principles of effective preaching and the many aspects of pastoral theology which touch upon the life and work of the church will be emphasized in the teaching. This will include such subjects as governing the church and personal counseling. No man will {103} be admitted to the Academy who does not demonstrate, along with the other requirements for entrance, ability to engage in such studies. Students who have been admitted but who later show a lack of ability or purpose to pursue proficiency in any of these studies will be requested to leave the Academy.¹⁸

We hasten to add, however, that we are convinced that the education essential to the training of useful pastor-preachers does not consist in or require extensive reading in the ever-growing theological systems both past and present. One does not need to delve deeply into error in order to know and appreciate truth. We believe, rather, that the teaching of Trinity Ministerial Academy must have as its goal the cultivation in the student of the ability to think clearly in a biblical and practical

18. “The Necessity for a Thoroughly Educated Ministry,” *ibid.*, 651ff.

manner. C. H. Spurgeon spoke to this very issue in his own generation when he said:

Our churches call for men whose thoughts are worth thinking; whose thoughts follow in the wake of the revealed Word of God, who feel that they are not dishonored by treading in the track of the Infinite. We must have ministers whose education has taught them their own ignorance, whose learning has made them revere the Scriptures; men whose minds are capable of clear reasoning, brilliant imagination, and deep thought; but who, like the Apostle Paul, who was all this, are content to say, and feel themselves honored in saying, "God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ." Such a man is more precious than the gold of Ophir. In him the Lord finds an instrument which He can consistently employ. He is a man among men, a practical working thoughtful preacher.¹⁹

Having, we trust, clearly defined our goal, we must now ask: How may that goal be reached? How may the God-given gifts be diligently cultivated? We believe that the attainment of this goal may best be realized by a method of teaching which involves three factors:

1. *Instructors who themselves are exemplary in accurate exegesis of the Word of God*, i.e., an exegesis continually conditioned by the built-in checks and balances and constant interaction among biblical theology, systematic theology, and sound hermeneutics.

2. *A thorough exposure to the thinking of proven guides in orthodox, experimental, Calvinistic theology*. Among these proven guides none rank higher than the Puritans. Again, we can do no better than to quote C. H. Spurgeon:

When a "thinking man" has reached so sublime a condition of self-conceit that he can sneer at such giants in mind and learning as John Owen, Goodwin, Charnock, and Manton, and talk of them as teaching {104} mere commonplaces, in a heavy manner, not at all adapted to the advanced thought of the 19th century, we may safely leave him and his thinking to the oblivion which assuredly awaits all windy nothings.²⁰

3. *Surrounding the student with the native climate of all revealed truth*. What is this climate but the total life and ministry of the church in its

19. C. H. Spurgeon, "The Ministry Needed by the Churches and Measures for Providing It" (reprinted in *The Banner of Truth*, no. 20, 10).

20. *Ibid.*

visible expression as the people of God—in other words, the local church? The truth of Scripture was not imparted abstractly in the realm of theoretical thought, but rather in the context of the day-by-day life of God's people. We believe that this same truth is best acquired and absorbed in the same context even in our days. Therefore, each student will be expected to involve himself in the life of the local church while pursuing specific theological studies.

The Necessity for Previous Discovery of Gifts and Graces

Since Christ alone confers ministerial gifts upon His church, it should be clear that no man or institution can produce “able ministers of the New Covenant.” The church, however, is responsible to commit the truth of God to “faithful men who shall be able to teach others also” (2 Tim. 2:2). The key words in this text are “faithful” and “able.” The first word points to some measure of developed Christian character in a man and the second to some recognized ability to communicate the Word of God. The church must give herself to the task of training only those men who, in her serious judgment, fit this description. In doing so the church makes no claim of infallibility for herself; she is only acting in obedience to her Lord.

Spurgeon expressed these same sentiments when, speaking of the formation of the Pastors College, he said:

If we would have the right men, again, they should not be *untried*, but should have preached sufficiently long to have tested their aptness to teach. No education can give a man ability if he has none. Amongst the first or ordinary gifts for the ministry is the gift of utterance;—that cannot be produced by training.²¹

It is this conviction which governs the requirements for admission to the Academy and the conditions upon which a student may continue in the program.

Those who desire to hear a detailed exposition of the biblical materials relating to this issue should obtain the two series of cassette tapes from the Trinity Pulpit entitled “The Church Selecting Its Ministers” (TOE-1 and 2) and “Call to the Ministry” (MI-A-1 through 5).²² {105}

21. *Ibid.*, 16.

The Role of the Church in Theological Education

It is our conviction that the church organized after the pattern of the Word of God is ordained by God to be “the pillar and ground of the truth” (1 Tim. 3:15). To the church in her corporate life and official leadership are given the keys of discipline and all the necessary authority for carrying out her manifold duties. Furthermore, the spiritual maturity of each individual believer must be achieved in the context of the corporate life of the church functioning as the body of Christ (Eph. 4:15-16), and the call of God for special service comes to the individual in this same context (Rom. 12:3ff.; 1 Tim. 4:14).

In the light of these perspectives, we believe it is absolutely essential that the specific prerogatives and responsibilities of the church should not be usurped by individual persons or delegated to para-church organizations. Accordingly, in the organization and functioning of Trinity Ministerial Academy we have been governed and must continue to be governed by the following four principles:

1. No man will be accepted for training who has not been recommended to us by the church of which he is a member. This commendation must follow an honest assessment of a man's gifts and character, and it must express the conviction that the student commended to us does show some promise for the work of the ministry.

2. The Academy itself is and must continue to be under the direct oversight of the elders of Trinity Baptist Church, and each man who comes as a student will likewise come under this spiritual oversight. As already stated, he will be expected to take active part in the life of the church while he is in our midst.

3. Each regular instructor will be a member of Trinity Baptist Church, and his life, his doctrine, and his general influence on the students will be a matter of constant concern to the elders of the church.

4. The elders of Trinity Baptist Church will undertake to maintain close communication with the churches who send men to the Academy. When a student has completed his course of study, a letter will be sent to his home church in which an assessment will be made of his

22. Available for \$10.50 (\$1.50 each cassette) from Trinity Pulpit, Box 277, Essex Fells, NJ 07021.

strengths and weaknesses and also of his accomplishments during his stay among us.

Academic Degrees

Present-day practice with reference to ministerial training usually involves the requirement of certain academic degrees for admission and the granting of further degrees upon completion of an institution's program. Although we firmly believe that there is a place for schools of biblical and theological study which require and confer academic degrees, we do not believe that the attainment of our own goals necessitates that practice.

It is our conviction that the office of a minister is essentially that of an {106} elder (bishop, overseer), and it is clear that the biblical requirements for the office of an elder do not necessarily include academic degrees. Some students may come to the Academy holding academic degrees, and some may seek such degrees after completing our course of instruction. In such matters there must be individual liberty.

As for any students who feel that their labors at the Academy should have some compensation, we hope that the favorable commendation of their instructors and the elders of the church will appear to them to be compensation enough.

Classrooms, Housing, and Finance

Trinity Baptist Church has firmly resolved to spend no money for the construction and maintenance of classrooms and dormitories for strictly institutional purposes. Full use is even now being made of the present facilities of the church for theological instruction, and they will continue to be so used until we are able to move to a more commodious building. We are in the midst of a building program which we hope will be completed by the end of 1977, and which will have adequate classroom, study hall, and library facilities.

History demonstrates that great harm has come to the church of Christ by the perpetuation of institutions which have departed from their original vision. In many cases the very existence of institutional buildings has made their perpetuation natural and easy—in some instances almost necessary. Trinity Baptist Church is determined to

avoid this tragic mistake. Accordingly, students who come to the Academy must make their own provisions for meals, housing, and other personal needs. Trinity Ministerial Academy does not make provision for these things, nor does it expect to make provision for them in the future. Although each student must provide for his own needs in this respect, the churches which commend students to the Academy should seriously consider what is their responsibility in regard to the maintenance of the men under their care.

However, *no tuition will be charged for the instruction given in the Academy.* Trinity Baptist Church regards the Academy as one of its ministries and is therefore committed to meeting all its expenses. Frankly, however, we trust that all the churches which send men to us will feel an obligation to obey the biblical injunction: "Let him that is taught in the word communicate to him that teacheth in all good things" (Gal. 6:6).

In addition to those churches which will be specifically served by us, we invite other churches who share our vision and concern to train men for the work of the ministry to share also in shouldering the financial burden. All funds received designated for the Academy will be deposited in a separate Academy account and used exclusively for the operation of the Academy.... {107}

Curriculum

The entire course of Trinity Ministerial Academy will cover *three academic years* of nine months each. Each year will be divided into *two semesters* of approximately four months each: September through December and February through May. A concentrated *intersession* will be held each year during the month of January.

During the first year, classes will be conducted on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. Afternoons and evenings will be free for study and part-time employment.

The basic academic disciplines to be covered during the three year course are :

- Systematic Theology
- Biblical Theology
- Exegesis and Hermeneutics

Church History (including History of Doctrine)

Homiletics

Practical Theology

New Testament Greek

Hebrew

A description of these courses is being prepared and will be available on request.

Special courses will be given by visiting instructors with special competence in particular fields during the *intersession*. Included in the courses being offered at that time will be:

History and Transmission of the Biblical Text

Christian Education

Foreign Missions

Puritan Literature

Biographies of Great Preachers

Science and the Bible

Archaeology

Geography of Bible Lands

Special Exegetical Courses

Students enrolled in the Academy will be required to attend the intersession courses. These courses will also be open to ministers and other men not enrolled in the Academy.

IS PUBLIC EDUCATION NECESSARY?

Samuel L. Blumenfeld

We would not have to ask the above question if public education had not become the great, costly, and tragic failure that it is—a failure that both liberals and conservatives, progressives and traditionalists, acknowledge. A great failure in terms of the expectations it has failed to fulfill. A costly failure in terms of the enormous financial burdens it has added to the taxpayers' shoulders. A tragic failure in terms of the intellectually disabled, semiliterate, disoriented, frustrated, and unhappy youths it is now turning out by the thousands, by the millions. The measure of that failure cannot even be estimated; it may in the end cost us our freedom, our civilization. That indeed is an unacceptable price to pay for a delusive social experiment.

Perhaps Walter Lippman best expressed that great disappointment in expectations when he wrote in 1941, while World War II was raging in Europe:

Universal and compulsory modern education was established by the emancipated democracies during the nineteenth century. "No other sure foundation can be devised," said Thomas Jefferson, "for the preservation of freedom and happiness." Yet as a matter of fact during the twentieth century the generations trained in these schools have either abandoned their liberties or they have not known, until the last desperate moment, how to defend them. The schools were to make men free. They have been in operation for some sixty or seventy years and what was expected of them they have not done. The plain fact is that the graduates of the modern schools are the actors in the catastrophe which has befallen our civilization. Those who are responsible for modern education—for its controlling philosophy—are answerable for the results.

Since those profound observations were made, we have had the Korean War and the Vietnam War, of which the latter is probably the most debilitating, divisive, wasteful, and bloody foreign exercise this nation has ever engaged in. All of our public education did nothing to save us from it, and we shall be paying its price for years to come. In

addition, since 1941, Communist tyranny has spread across the globe, even invading the Western Hemisphere. Our people have not known how to stop this malevolent political cancer from spreading far and wide. As a result, we live in a world of unceasing political tension, threatened by war and nuclear destruction. {109}

There were many seductive arguments for free universal public education at the time of its first promotion in the early years of the last century. Horace Mann saw compulsory free education as the means of perfecting humanity, the “great equalizer,” the “balance wheel of the social machinery,” the “creator of wealth undreamed of.” Poverty, ignorance, prejudice, and every other evil afflicting the human race, it was thought, would disappear. Others argued that free education for all would help us preserve our free way of life. Governor DeWitt Clinton of New York said in 1826, “I consider the system of our common schools as the palladium of our freedom, for no reasonable apprehension can be entertained of its subversion as long as the great body of people are enlightened by education.” Daniel Webster, the eloquent U. S. Senator from Massachusetts, echoed these sentiments in 1837 when he said:

Education, to accomplish the ends of good government, should be universally diffused. Open the doors of the school houses to all the children in the land. Let no man have the excuse of poverty for not educating his offspring. Place the means of education within his reach, and if he remain in ignorance, be it his own reproach.... On the diffusion of education among the people rests the preservation and perpetuation of our free institutions.

Yet, with more compulsory universal education than ever in history, we have seen a steady erosion of our domestic freedom to an ever-growing dependence on government to solve all of our problems. Most Americans, living in a capitalist society, with all their years of compulsory education, cannot understand such basic economic concepts as supply and demand, or the meaning of the word “profit,” or how government can cause inflation and thereby destroy the value of our currency. The result is that our people are unable to solve their problems, and they readily turn them over to those who think they can solve them: the politicians and the bureaucrats.

It is interesting to note that our system of compulsory state-controlled education was not brought about by spontaneous popular demand, for education was already virtually universal in America before it became compulsory. Socialized education was promised by politicians like DeWitt Clinton and Daniel Webster and state administrators like Horace Mann and Henry Barnard, as well as by the professional educators serving the state, because it was in their political and economic interest to do so. According to E. G. West,

The supplier of educational services to the government, the teachers and the administrators, as we have seen, had produced their own organized platforms by the late 1840s; it was they indeed who were the leading instigators of the free school campaign. Whilst conventional history portrays them as distinguished champions in the cause of children's welfare and benevolent participants in a political struggle, it is suggested here that the facts are equally consistent with the {110} hypothesis of self-interest behaviour as described above.

Thus, the *bureaucratic mentality* was an important force in promoting and creating a system that today serves its administrators more than it does its supposed clients, the students. If you understand the bureaucratic mentality, you will understand that the basic inner motivation of the bureaucrat is not to solve problems, but to keep them from being solved, for no bureaucrat wants to work himself out of a secure berth. Nor do politicians solve problems. Their function is to help create them so that our people will turn more and more to them for the answers. Thus, the politician and the bureaucrat, the midwives of legislated force, work in tandem, the former to help create our problems, the latter to keep them from being solved. The purpose of our public educational system in this scheme is to indoctrinate our people into believing that we cannot live without either politicians or bureaucrats, and that they are our very saviors.

The public educational bureaucracy is a force in our society to be reckoned with, and its political power is increasingly being used to preserve and extend its own vested interests. For example, in 1973 the California Teachers Federation (CTF) played a pivotal role in defeating Governor Ronald Reagan's constitutional referendum to limit state taxing authority and, indirectly, state spending. The CTF also spent \$100,000 that same year to help elect 152 local school board members it approved of. In New Jersey, teachers helped force out a state educa-

tion commission who favored teacher accountability and evaluations. In Utah, the teachers' lobby helped kill free textbooks for school children that might divert money from teachers' salary increases. Obviously, the public education lobby will favor all politicians, school board members, and legislation which will further strengthen the hold of the bureaucracy over the country, thus strangling American freedom even more.

It should not be overlooked that all of the totalitarian states of the modern world have used the instrument of public education, with the willing cooperation of public educators, to keep their people enslaved. In fact, our own compulsory system was based on the Prussian model, which was criticized by the wary as being inappropriate for a free country. Even at the time of its adoption, it was suspected that such a system transplanted to our soil would not promote freedom. Horace Mann, who was most instrumental in getting America to adopt the Prussian system, was aware of this and wrote in 1844:

Among the nations of Europe, Prussia has long enjoyed the most distinguished reputation for the excellence of its schools.... Recently, however, grave charges have been preferred against it by high authority.... In 1843 numerous tracts were issued from the English press, not merely calling in question, but strongly denouncing the whole plan of education in Prussia as being not only designed to {111} produce, but as actually producing, a spirit of blind acquiescence to arbitrary power, in things spiritual as well as temporal,—as being, in fact, a system of education, adopted to enslave, and not to enfranchise the human mind. And even in some parts of the United States ... some have been illiberal enough to condemn, in advance, everything that savours of the Prussian system, because that system is sustained by arbitrary power.

If Prussia can pervert the benign influences of education to the supports of arbitrary power, we surely can employ them for the support and perpetuation of republican institutions. A national spirit of liberty can be cultivated more easily than a national spirit of bondage; and if it may be made one of the great prerogatives of education to perform the unnatural and unholy work of making slaves, then surely it must be one of the noblest instrumentalities for rearing a nation of freemen. If a moral power over the understandings and affections may be turned to evil, may it not also be employed for the highest good?

Mann's argument tantalized a lot of wishful thinkers. By naively adopting the dangerous notion that the end justified the means, Mann thought that the Prussian compulsory system could be used to inculcate freedom. Unfortunately, he was the victim of a serious error: that of equating education *per se* with *compulsory* education, as if the element of compulsion would not contaminate the idea of education. The truth is that the very idea of compulsion contradicts the aims and goals of a free society and therefore, by its very nature, cannot be used to promote freedom—no more than hate can be used to promote love.

But we need not put forth moral arguments alone against Horace Mann. We have the performance of public education itself to draw on, which has induced our people to turn more and more of their freedoms over to the tax collectors, the currency debasers, and the price controllers (at least temporarily), simply because our educational system has taught us neither how to solve our problems nor how to maintain our freedoms. At the rate that Americans are currently turning over their freedoms to their government, there may be none left by the time we reach Orwell's prophetic 1984. Our public education system then will serve the very same purposes that public education serves in Soviet Russia, or Red China, or Castro Cuba.

Or if we do have freedoms, they will be the freedoms given to a spoiled child by a confused, perverse, and deranged parent: the freedom to commit suicide, to become a heroin addict, to engage in mindless promiscuity, or to abort ever-increasing numbers of the unborn. But we shall not have the freedom to grow up and become independent of government, to make contracts with our own gold, to control our own wealth, to run our own businesses, and to exchange our products without the meddling and interference of our deranged parent, the state. {112}

So much for how public education is helping us to preserve our freedom. Its purpose has been to turn us into helpless, brainless, spoiled, overindulged children, without self-discipline, without the intellectual means to solve the many difficult problems of an increasingly complex civilization. And because of this, our unhappiness and frustration grow, our rate of drug and alcohol addiction increases and with it the rate of suicide, crime, delinquency, divorce, and other indicators of

profound human unhappiness. Clearly, our “pursuit of happiness” has been seriously sabotaged by our educational system.

Other reasons have been given for the necessity of public education. At the end of the last century, it was seen as a means of Americanizing our immigrants. But today we have few immigrants to Americanize, and the emphasis has been shifted (reversed) to promoting ethnic identity and cultural pluralism. Then, in the first five decades of the twentieth-century, public education, in the hands of social reformers, became an instrument for social indoctrination, for “life adjustment,” so that the little ones when they grew up would eventually want to remake America in the image of a socialist democracy. That utopian plan blew up in America’s face in the 1960s with the spectacle of college students, the flower of public education, rioting on their campuses and turning academia into a nightmare. Today the purpose of public education is harder to determine. No one seems to know exactly what it is supposed to do. Perhaps the best source of information on the present mental state of public education is the Fleischmann Report, a survey of the New York State public school system conducted by a special commission appointed by Governor Rockefeller and published in 1973. Here are some revealing and relevant excerpts:

It came as a surprise to learn how little hard knowledge exists in the field of education—and specifically with respect to the manner in which education of high quality can be produced. As examples, there is no broad agreement among educators as to what method of teaching reading is most effective (though all are agreed that all but a very few children can be taught to read adequately); there is no agreement as to the optimum size of a class in primary or secondary schools; a continuous controversy drags on as to the merits of “open” schools as against their more formal counterparts; last but hardly least, there is not even a consensus as to what the “goals” or “objectives” of education should be.

More than 66 percent of the students sampled indicated that they did not enjoy school. Responses also revealed tensions in student-teacher relations. Students generally felt that teachers did not help them to do their best, did not understand their problems, did not help them to improve their skills and were not concerned with their future. More than simply not enjoying school, many students indicated that their school experience was actually painful.... Student dissatisfaction of this magnitude is a real cause for concern. {113}

It is difficult to pinpoint the causes behind the rapidly increasing problem of drug abuse in New York State. Studies conducted for the Commission reveal that one high school student in four routinely takes some form of psychoactive drug. In New York City the figure is one high school student in two.

Certainly the fact that large numbers of children do not learn to read or write or cipher satisfactorily is evidence that the schools have a long way to go before they can be said to be efficient at their basic job.

But perhaps the best summary of the actual current purpose of public education was given by the Commission in the following statements:

For most children, the first experience with the legal and political framework of their society is in the school. They know that the public maintains the schools, and that they are required by law to attend. And quite apart from the reading, writing and arithmetic they learn in their schools, they also receive an unspoken message—their society's concern, or lack of concern, for them, and the seriousness, or lack of seriousness, of the principles the society professes.

This Commission believes that a school system, maintained by law, governed by public officials, supported by public revenues, cannot, by acts of commission or omission, permit the young who come into its charge to draw the inference that public authority accepts, encourages, or participates in, the division of our society into first- and second-class citizens.

The goal to which the schools must aspire is not merely desegregation but integration.

Integration in the schools should be given the highest priority because it is clear that such cooperation and understanding are more easily instilled in young people than in adults.

Thus, one might conclude from the Fleischmann Report that the latest purpose of our public educational system is the integration of the races, a purpose some light years removed from the original ideas behind public education. Obviously, the reasons why the country adopted compulsory public education are vastly and radically different from the ones—if you can find them—now used to justify its maintenance and continued existence. In fact, what is somewhat astonishing is that even the most loyal supporters of public education cannot seem to come up with any convincing or cogent reasons why public education should continue to exist other than because it already exists. But if

the existence of public education is causing this nation no end of troubles, why should it continue to exist?

Walter W. Straley, chairman of President Nixon's National Reading Council, painted this dismal picture in 1971 when he said, "Across the country, more than half of last year's school bond issues were defeated in confrontation of often angry voters. Taxpayers strike against their schools, teachers strike against school boards. Administrators cut staff {114} and curricula. Many schools must close before normal terms are ended. Probably a million children will strike out this year by simply dropping out, many to drugs and decay."

Add to the above the intense conflicts arising over forced busing and perhaps it is easy to understand why public education has so few supporters today other than those whose livelihoods depend on it.

That public education has also been a *costly* failure is perhaps the greatest understatement one can make about it. We have created a monumental colossus that is now consuming about \$65 billion of the taxpayers' money each year. Education is only second to national defense in its consumption of the tax dollar, and its cost continues to rise while its quality continues to decline. According to the Fleischmann Report, "Substantial increases in costs per pupil in recent years have not been accompanied by comparable improvement in school performance." The report could have added that never has so much been spent to obtain so little. Yet public education is in the midst of a national fiscal crisis, with local property taxes, on which school financing has largely relied, reaching the point of diminishing returns. Also, because poor districts cannot spend as much on education per pupil as rich districts, there is now a new drive to "equalize education." To provide such equalized schooling, the Fleischmann Commission recommended "full state funding of education" by means of any form of taxation—real property tax, income tax, sales tax, or any combination of these. In other words, all taxpayers will be required to bear an even larger tax burden for an educational system which has long since outlived its usefulness and has become a very real menace to our national health.

But the truly heartbreaking tragedy of public education is in what it has done to the minds of the youngsters forced by law to go through its grinding, destructive processes. We are committing something akin to

intellectual genocide when we force millions of bright young minds into the intellectual meat grinder we call public education. We have seen the results in the greatest juvenile drug-taking epidemic in history, in an increased interest among young adults in black magic, the occult, astrology, and primitivism. These young adults are not that way by accident. They are the finished products of an educational system that neither loves them, nor respects their minds, nor understands the learning process. It is, in fact, a system not interested in teaching at all, just merely existing, for through its existence some two million people are fed and clothed and two million careers are seemingly justified.

Obviously the system wasn't always this bad, or else it would have collapsed years ago. Those of us who went to school some forty years ago know that at least some basic learning took place in those days, enough at least to justify public confidence. What happened since then to change {115} things so drastically? What happened is that the *progressives* took over the instrument of public education and decided to use it as the vehicle for remaking America. Their ideas and experiments, adopted throughout the system without much thought or consideration for their long-term effects, destroyed a curriculum based on traditional values, methods, and wisdom and replaced it with the chaos and confusion we have today. Their most destructive experiment took place in the area of teaching children to read, by replacing the alphabetic method with a hieroglyphic whole-word method. The result has been widespread reading disability, functional illiteracy, dyslexia, and what Professor Karl Shapiro calls the "degeneration of the literary intelligence." He told an audience of the California Library Association in 1970, "But what is really distressing is that this generation cannot and does not read. I am speaking of university students in what are supposed to be our best universities. Their illiteracy is staggering.... We are experiencing a literary breakdown which is unlike anything I know of in the history of letters."

Some universities, plagued with functional illiteracy among their incoming freshmen, have been at a loss as to what to do about it. In February 1974, Bowdoin College decided that it would demand a written essay as part of its entrance requirements. The admissions director accused the public high schools, especially the progressive ones, of giv-

ing their students no proper training in writing—of cheating them out of their basic education.

But the reading problem has led to even more tragic consequences. Since a child's reading skill is fundamental to all of his future work, reading failure can destroy a child's school career and lead him to explosive and destructive frustration. The child will take out his frustration against the school and the society it represents. In their recent book, *Schools and Delinquency*, authors Kenneth Polk and Walter Schaffer of the University of Oregon wrote:

Only in recent years has the enormity of educational failure been fully recognized. The rising rate of juvenile delinquency and adolescent alienation are causing increasing alarm.... We propose that educational failure—by schools as well as by students—is directly related to juvenile delinquency.... First, juvenile delinquency in this country is partly heightened by conditions in American public education. Second, these conditions are deeply anchored into prevailing conceptions and organization of the educational system.... Unless basic, radical, and immediate educational changes are made, delinquency will continue to increase—and will be accompanied by the spread of other social ills that stem from the same roots.

The authors conclude their book with recommendations for changing the system within the context of the system. But it is my contention that the nature of public education makes its change for the better impossible. {116} The problem can be stated quite simply. Because public education is controlled by the government, it theoretically belongs to everyone, which means that no one, or no particular group, has the right to impose his philosophy of education on the system as a whole. This has created *a system with no philosophy of education at all*, and you cannot conduct education without one. Since most people do not understand this fundamental fact about public education, various other factions have endeavored to gain control of public education in order to impose their ideas on it. This has led to constant and sometimes ferocious struggles among various factions promoting different philosophies of education. When liberals or progressives dominate a school board, they try to foster their pet ideas. When conservatives dominate a school board, they try to do the same. The end product is chaos, contradiction, and inconsistency. Walter Lippmann saw the situation this way: "Thus there is an enormous vacuum where until a few

decades ago there was the substance of education. And with what is that vacuum filled: it is filled with the elective, eclectic, the specialized, the accidental, and incidental improvisations and spontaneous curiosities of teachers and students.... The graduate of the modern school knows only by accident and by hearsay whatever wisdom mankind has come to in regard to the nature of men and their destiny.” Jules Henry, a noted liberal educator, described the problem in these pessimistic terms: “American education is bleak; so bleak that, on the whole, educators, having long ago abandoned the ideal of enlightenment, concentrate on tooling up. Feeble neo-idealistic gestures in the direction of curriculum revision are merely tinkering with a machine whose basic drive must be—and has been through all history—the maintenance of a steady state.”

Liberals, on the whole, are disgusted with public education because they have not been able to impose all of their ideas on the system. Despite the enormous success the progressives had in influencing the theory and practice of public education, there has always been enough conservative resistance in the community to prevent a complete progressive takeover. This has led to an unworkable, haphazard, *incredibly disjointed compromise*, in which contradictory aims and inconsistent methods have produced chaos, confusion, waste, and rampant demoralization. Today, public education has no consistent philosophy of education because it is torn by two diametrically opposed concepts of the mind—the progressive (collectivist) and the traditional (individualist). As a result, it goes on from year to year, like a grotesque monster, half-blind, half-coherent, stumbling and groping its way from one budgetary crisis to the next. Is it any wonder that its students are taking drugs on an unprecedented scale to render themselves as mindless as the system which is “educating” them?

The basic problem of American public education, a problem which the system can never solve, is its inability to deal with two irreconcilable philosophies {117} of education fighting for dominance within the system. No man can lead a productive, happy life if he is torn by inner conflict to such a degree that he does not know where he is going or what he is doing. The same is true of human organization. The conflict of philosophies raging within the public school system has rendered it impotent as an educator but dangerous as an influence. A child is

bound to be mentally and emotionally affected by the system's contradictions, inconsistencies, and schizophrenia. He comes out of the system far more confused than when he entered it.

We recognize what parental conflict can do to a child within a family. Why can't we recognize what educational conflict can do to him in school? No child should be subjected to such mind destruction in the name of an institution which no longer serves any useful purpose for our country or its people. Dr. F. A. Harper, the late president of the Institute for Humane Studies, once said that if you wanted to solve a problem concerning something, first find out who owned it. In the case of public education, ownership is indeed the key to the problem. Because theoretically everybody owns it, nobody can really impose his ideas on it. The solution? Put American schools back into the hands of private owners.

At the beginning of this essay we asked if public, state-controlled education is necessary. The answer, we are convinced, is no. Education is indeed necessary, but compulsory state-controlled education is not. But what about those parents who would not be able to pay for private schooling? The answer again is quite simple. Let the local community—out of some special voluntary fund—pay for the education of any orphan or child whose parents cannot afford to provide him or her with a basic education. But let the parents choose the school according to the philosophy of education *they themselves* espouse. Thus, liberal parents will be able to send their children to progressive schools, and conservative parents will be able to send theirs to traditional schools, and neither the liberals nor the conservatives will want to impose their ideas on the other.

Above all, the government should own no schools, for the state is not a fitting educator, nor even a fitting administrator of education. *Education is the responsibility and function of parenthood, not statehood.* To have confused statehood with parenthood is another reason why public education has failed. The state cannot provide love, only parents can. And when parents don't, the state can hardly make up for it. In fact, most public school teachers tend to aggravate their students' emotional problems, not alleviate them. Education is part of parental love, not merely responsibility, and a state school is not the fitting instrument of a parent's concern, only a parent's indifference.

It is interesting to note that liberal critics of public education, who want to abolish the entire “system,” are very reluctant to allow parents to assume {118} the responsibility of their children’s schooling. For example, Paul Goodman, author of *Compulsory Mis-Education*, one of the most scathing liberal critiques of public education, writes, “The compulsory system has become a universal trap, and it is no good.” Yet, a few paragraphs later, he adds, “The compulsory law is useful to get the children away from the parents, but it must not result in trapping the children.” The message, of course, is that parents are villains, unfit to either educate or be in charge of their children’s education. But who is this all-knowing, all-understanding educator who knows what’s good for other people’s children? Some super-intellectual from New York whose own kids are on pot?

Ivan Illich, who, in his controversial book, *Deschooling Society*, advocates not only the abolition of public education but of all formal education, shares Goodman’s distrust of parents as the guardians of their own children’s education. For example, he opposes the idea of tuition grants which other liberals favor because “it plays into the hands not only of the professional educators but of racists, promoters of religious schools, and others whose interests are socially divisive.” Thus, in that one sentence Illich dismisses as “socially divisive” and unfit to educate their children all parents who do not share his particular philosophy of education. He does not dismiss forced integration as socially divisive, but only those parents who take action to protect *their* children from its negative social consequences.

After having read a great deal of liberal criticism of public education, I can only conclude that liberals are not interested in educational freedom. They are merely interested in finding a new vehicle, a new instrument, backed by government force and financing, through which they can foster or impose their own educational ideas. Even Illich’s radical system of informal education would, in the end, require government enforcement. He writes, “A good educational system would have three purposes: it should provide all who want to learn with access to available resources at any time in their lives; empower all who want to share what they know to find those who want to learn it from them; and, finally, furnish all who want to present an issue to the public with the

opportunity to make their challenge known. Such a system would require the application of constitutional guarantees to education.”

Is an entirely private school system, free of government interference, feasible for America? Yes, it is. We are a nation with a strong tradition of freedom—of limited government, free choice, and free enterprise. Despite the steady erosion of our freedoms, Americans in general still highly value their freedom. The growth of private education in the South during the past ten years has already proven that parents will take back their responsibilities for their children’s education when they are convinced that it is necessary to do so, despite the added financial burden. {119} That forced racial integration has been the catalyst in the creation of these Southern schools in no way detracts from the fact that these schools have been able to supply better education than their public counterparts at less costs. The Southern experience has proven beyond a shadow of a doubt that private education for the entire community, embracing both rich and poor, is possible.

Perhaps the most important lesson we can learn from the Southern experience—aside from the economic lesson—is that parents, not educators, are the real force behind education in a community. They are the ones who must pay for it all, because it is their children who are to be educated. Educators arise when education is wanted. In the building of their new private schools, whole communities in the South have participated, with parents volunteering their labor as well as their money. The young headmaster of one private school in Alabama told me, “I wouldn’t have dreamed it could be done. I would have never asked them to do what they did. Everyone volunteered to do something.” A trustee of the school told me, “We have had a tremendous amount of volunteer help. All of the painting and carpeting was done by parents. Parents have literally dug ditches. Yes, we’ve done it all ourselves.” When I asked the headmaster of another private school in Jackson, Mississippi, if he had had the help of parents, he replied, “We had doctors and lawyers digging ditches. It was amazing.”

To liberals like Paul Goodman and Ivan Illich such parents either don’t exist, are not qualified to have any say in their children’s education, or are “socially divisive.” It should be noted that black parents in some Northern cities have shown the same initiative and energy in cre-

ating their own private schools for their children. The phenomenon obviously is not limited to white Southern parents.

But another reason why parents should start thinking of private schools, especially in the North, is the enormous rise in costs which the public will have to face. With the bureaucrats and administrators pushing for equal education through “full state funding,” as recommended by the Fleischmann Report, we can expect the tax burden of public education to reach unheard of levels. Ivan Illich writes,

In the United States it would take eighty billion dollars per year to provide what educators regard as equal treatment for all in grammar and high school. This is well over twice the \$36 billion now being spent (1969). Independent cost projectors at HEW and the University of Florida indicate that by 1974 the comparable figures will be \$107 billion as against the \$45 billion now projected.... Rather than calling equal schooling temporarily unfeasible, we must recognize that it is, in principle, economically absurd, and that to attempt it is intellectually emasculating, socially polarizing, and destructive of the credibility of the political system which promotes it. The {120} ideology of obligatory schools admits to no logical limits.

But is there not a limit to public endurance? The advantage of private education, of course, is that its limits are set by the resources of the parents. Parents must provide schooling in much the same manner they provide shoes, food, and other essentials of life to the children. All are limited by the resources of parents. There is no reason why education should not be limited by the same economic realities. But the beauty of education, of course, is that good teaching, good books, good ideas—the pleasure of learning itself—are, like love, not limited merely by economic resources. The amount of money spent has very little to do with the quality of education, just as the size of a diamond ring does not measure the amount of love it represents. One parent, who was instrumental in getting a private school started in her community of Valley Cottage, New York, was quoted in the *Christian Science Monitor* (December 31, 1973) as saying, “It’s amazing how much you can do with so little money. The budgets I see today for various schools are so high they’re ridiculous.”

Illich has some enlightening information to give us on what money can’t do for education. He writes,

Between 1965 and 1968 over three billion dollars were spent in U. S. schools to offset the disadvantages of about six million children. The program is known as Title One. It is the most expensive compensatory program ever attempted anywhere in education, yet no significant improvement can be detected in the learning of these “disadvantaged” children. Compared with their classmates from middle-income homes, they have fallen further behind.

So much for buying education when the will, spirit, and ability to educate are not there—when the very instrument of education does not permit education to take place.

It is becoming increasingly evident that compulsory state-controlled education indeed stands in the way of education in this country, and that we will not really begin to understand what education is all about until we abandon the public educational system. Just as freedom cannot be achieved in Soviet Russia without dismantling the Communist state, true education in America will not be achieved until we dismantle public education. In Russia a full-scale, violent revolution will be required for the people to gain their freedom. In America no such violent revolution is needed to overthrow the “system.” All parents need do is simply withdraw their children from the public system and build their own schools. It has already been done successfully in many parts of the South, without violence, without a massive upheaval in the community, but not without opposition from the vested interests of public education. Surely, America is now ready to give up one of its most costly and harmful delusions. If not, the agony, the financial drain, the intellectual degeneration will continue until it is.

OUR NATION'S SCHOOLS—A REPORT CARD: “A” IN SCHOOL VIOLENCE AND VANDALISM

PRELIMINARY REPORT OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE JUVENILE DELINQUENCY²³

Based on Investigations, 1971-1975

National Trends

There has always been a certain level of violence and vandalism in our nation's public school system. Professor Alan F. Westin of Columbia University in a study of urban school violence in the years between 1870 and 1950 has found a rather steady stream of disruptions occurring throughout that entire period. If, however, the system has never been totally immune from incidents of student misbehavior such problems have historically been viewed as a relatively minor concern seldom involving more than a few sporadic and isolated incidents. As recently as 1964 a survey of the nation's teachers found that only 3 percent of their students could be considered discipline problems. Overall, teachers were able to rate 70-80 percent of their classes as exhibiting good to excellent behavior.

Today, however, the situation has changed and the level of violence and vandalism in our schools is rapidly increasing in both intensity and frequency. Dr. Frank Brown, chairman of the National Commission for Reform of Secondary Education, contends, "The major concern confronting secondary schools today is the climate of fear where the majority of students are afraid for their safety." A Grand Jury in San Francisco issued a report last January which declared: "The most serious problem facing the city is the deterioration of its public school system." In a survey of teacher needs conducted in 1972 fully 54 percent of the teachers found student disruption of their classrooms to be a problem of moderate to critical proportions. Syracuse University Research

23. Printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary, 94th Cong., 1st sess., U.S. Government Printing Office (Washington, DC: 1975).

Corporation conducted a survey of urban secondary schools which found that 85 percent of these institutions had experienced some type of student disruption in the period between 1967 and 1970. The Syracuse report concluded, "The disruption of education in our high schools is no longer novel or rare. It is current, it is widespread and it is serious." {122}

It is alarmingly apparent that student misbehavior and conflict within our school system is no longer limited to a fistfight between individual students or an occasional general disruption resulting from a specific incident. Instead our schools are experiencing serious crimes of a felonious nature including brutal assaults on teachers and students, as well as rapes, extortions, burglaries, thefts and an unprecedented wave of wanton destruction and vandalism. Moreover our preliminary study of the situation has produced compelling evidence that this level of violence and vandalism is reaching crisis proportions which seriously threaten the ability of our educational system to carry out its primary function.

Quite naturally the rising tide of violence in our schools has engendered an increasing awareness and concern among the American people. In a 1974 Gallup poll most adults and high school students surveyed cited the lack of discipline as the chief problem confronting schools today. In fact three of the top four problems cited by most of those polled were directly related to various problems of student behavior.

Our recently completed nationwide survey of over 750 school districts demonstrates that this concern is well founded. The statistics gathered by the Subcommittee indicate that violence in our schools affects every section of the nation and, in fact, continues to escalate to even more serious levels. The preliminary Subcommittee survey found that in the three years between 1970 and 1973:

Homicides increased by 18.5 percent;

Rapes and attempted rapes increased by 40.1 percent;

Robberies increased by 36.7 percent;

Assaults on students increased by 85.3 percent;

Assaults on teachers increased by 77.4 percent;

Burglaries of school buildings increased by 11.8 percent;

Drug and alcohol offenses on school property increased by 37.5 percent; and

Dropouts increased by 11.7 percent.

An even more ominous statistic for the future course of school safety is the fact that by the end of the 1973 school year the number of weapons confiscated by school authorities had risen by 54.4 percent in three years. These weapons include knives, clubs, pistols, and even sawed-off shotguns designed to be easily concealed within a student's locker.

The conclusions to be drawn from the Subcommittee survey are supported by other studies of these problems. Simply put, the trend in school violence over the last decade in America has been, and continues to be, alarmingly and dramatically upward.

In a 1964 survey by the National Educational Association (NEA), 14.7 percent of the teachers surveyed reported that a teacher had been physically assaulted in their schools. By 1973 a similar survey showed {123} that 37 percent of the nation's public school teachers reported an incident of teacher-oriented assault in their schools, and almost 50 percent of the teachers in the larger school systems (over 25,000 students) were aware of specific assaults on other teachers in their schools. Data from an earlier survey of large urban school districts conducted by the Subcommittee showed that assaults on teachers in those systems increased 612 percent between 1964 and 1968. In Chicago alone the number of such assaults went from 135 to 1,065 in that same period.

The returns from the Subcommittee's current nationwide survey show that this problem continues to exist and in fact to worsen. Between 1970 and 1973 assaults on teachers in school systems throughout the country increased again over previous levels by 77.4 percent. The NAE estimates that in the 1972-73 school year alone 69,000 teachers were physically attacked by students and 155,000 teachers had their personal property maliciously damaged. Another study found that 75,000 teachers are injured badly enough each year to require medical attention.

In response to this increase in assaults on teachers, the United Federation of Teachers recently issued to its members a booklet on how to handle violence in a variety of school situations including hallways, lunchrooms and classrooms. The booklet also contains advice to teachers on how best to combat sexual assaults:

This is especially true for female teachers. Most rapes and other sex crimes occur in classrooms, faculty rooms, and workrooms—when the teacher is alone. *The surest means of preventing sexual attacks is never to be alone.*

The teacher who is confronted by a sexual assailant should take account of Police Department recommendations. If a rapist is armed, the police urge that his victim offer no resistance, lest she be maimed or fatally injured. If he is *not* armed, a woman should remember that her knee or almost any instrument can become a weapon: a Bic pen will open a beer can—or a kidney or an eye.

There are indications that student violence and vandalism occur more often in larger urban secondary schools. A survey of newspaper articles between October 1969 and February 1970 revealed that 63 percent of the major school disruptions occurred in urban areas. A Vandalism and Violence study published by the School Public Relations Association estimated that 55 percent of the major incidents of disruption occurred in cities larger than one million people and 26 percent occurred in cities of less than 100,000 population. It should be emphasized, however, that this is not a problem found exclusively in large cities or solely involving older students. A guidance counselor for a school system on the West coast commented:

We get thousands of reports on assaults. It's astonishing to see what {124} happens in the elementary grades, teachers being hit and called filthy names, assaulted by little kids who really can't hurt them much. But the thing is, what are you going to do about these kids so they change their way of thinking about things, their attitude and behavior?

Although the level of violence directed against teachers revealed by these statistics is indeed alarming, the principal victims of the rising tide of crime in our schools are not the teachers, but the students. The Subcommittee's survey found that violent assaults on students increased by 85.3 percent over a three-year period, while reported robberies of students increased by 36.7 percent.

The Subcommittee survey found that incidents involving the use of drugs and alcohol on public school property went up 37.5 percent. A study released this year by the NEA estimates that drug-related crimes in schools had increased by 81 percent since 1970, and that 30 percent of the 18 million students in secondary schools use illegal drugs.

The National Highway Safety Administration estimates that 50 percent of the nation's high schools students go to drinking parties every month and that 61 percent of that group gets drunk once a month. The Highway Safety Administration also found that these students represent a remarkable cross section of our schools:

They are not far out, drop out alienated or under achieving types. On the contrary, they represent all levels of scholastic achievement and aspiration. They report the same range of sport and extracurricular activities as the students who are not involved with drinking.

It is important to stress that the Subcommittee survey findings, as well as those of other surveys on violence within the school system, are only estimates of the nature and extent of the problem. A report on the New York City school system found that the rate of unreported incidents ranged between 30 and 60 percent. Albert Shanker, president of the American Federation of Teachers, explained teachers' reluctance to fully report such incidents as follows:

Teachers find that if they report to the principal an assault, the principal who feels that his own reputation or her reputation or the school's reputation is at stake here, will very frequently turn around and start harassing the teacher by saying, "Well, if you had three assaults, how come you are the one always complaining. You must have more observation or better planning, or this or that." So the teacher soon finds that bringing these reports to the attention of the principal is something that is not wanted and tends to suppress that information.

In conducting our survey, the Subcommittee found that many of the schools contacted did not keep records of violent incidents involving their students or personnel, which obviously makes the task of gauging the levels and directions of violence a difficult one. A uniform, national reporting {125} system for our schools would be particularly helpful in this regard.

In addition to the violence directed against both teachers and students within the school system, there is also a continuing and rapidly increasing level of destruction and theft of school property. A survey conducted by the Baltimore, Maryland, public schools of 39 cities across the country found that in 1968-69 these cities had reported vandalism losses of over \$12,000,000. In a 1971 report prepared by Education U.S.A. and the National School Public Relations Association, it was estimated that vandalism was costing \$200 million annually. Barely

two years later Dr. Norman Scharer, president of the Association of School Security Directors, stated:

A conservative estimate of the cost of vandalism, thefts and arson to schools in this country this year will be over a half a billion dollars. I say conservative because out of the almost 15,000 school systems the top five account for \$15-20 million dollars of this cost.

This \$500 million vandalism cost represents over \$10 per year for every school student, and in fact equals the total amount expended on textbooks throughout the country in 1972.

A 1970 survey conducted by the School Product News found that damages from vandalism cost an average of \$55,000 for every school district in the country. By the end of the 1973 school year the average cost per district had risen to \$63,031. Although these figures indicate that the incidents of vandalism are certainly widespread, it is in the larger urban districts with upwards of 25,000 students where the most costly destruction occurs. Almost 60 percent of all vandalism takes place in these larger districts, with an average cost per district in 1973 of \$135,297.

The source of this destruction ranges from broken windows, found in over 90 percent of our districts, to fires reported by 35 percent of the districts. Significant incidents of theft and malicious destruction of educational equipment occurs in 80 percent of the school districts in the country.

Staggering as these figures are they undoubtedly represent a very conservative estimate of economic loss attributable to school vandalism. A study of school vandalism by Bernard Greenberg of the Stanford Research Institute found:

It should be noted that the cost figure is grossly understated because it does not include in all instances losses attributed to burglary, theft and property damage repaired by resident maintenance staffs. Nor does it take into account costs to equip and maintain special security forces, which are considerable for the larger school districts, and law enforcement costs to patrol and respond to calls reporting school incidents. Many school districts carry theft insurance, but the costs are exceedingly high. Where data on selected school districts theft losses are available the dollar amounts are significantly high. {126}

Spiraling insurance rates are a significant, but often overlooked, factor in the overall cost of vandalism. The Greenberg study found a West

Coast state which underwent a 40 percent rise in fire insurance costs within one year. Another survey stated:

Many school administrators point out that only a few years ago schools were wooed by the insurance industry as good risks. Now this has changed. And school districts all over the country are reporting difficulty in obtaining insurance. Half the districts answering the Education U.S.A. survey said rates have increased. Many are either paying higher premiums, higher deductibles, or in all too many instances, having policies cancelled or flatly rejected.

In addition to insurance rates, school districts are facing increasing costs for security guards, fencing, intrusion and fire detectors, special lighting, emergency communications equipment and vandalism resistant windows. In 1965, for instance, the Los Angeles school system had a total of 15 security guards, but in six years that force was compelled to increase to over 100 members at a cost of over \$1 million per year. During the 1972-73 school year Los Angeles spent over \$2 million for security agents. A report of the Panel on School Safety for New York City found that in 1971 the taxpayers had paid \$1,300,000 for security guards, over \$3,500,000 for police stationed in schools, and in spite of such effort incurred at least \$3,700,000 worth of vandalism damage. It was estimated that New York City Schools had over 248,000 windowpanes broken at a replacement cost of \$1.25 million. Over 65 percent of the urban districts polled in the 1973 School Product News survey reported they were using special vandalism resistant windows and 62 percent had at least one security guard assigned to their schools.

The overall impact of violence and vandalism on our educational system cannot, of course, be adequately conveyed by a recitation of the numbers of assaults and the dollars expended. Every dollar spent on replacing a broken window or installing an alarm system cannot be spent on the education of students. J. Arlen Marsh, editor of a study on school security costs, estimates that:

The cost of replacing broken windows in the average big city would build a new school every year.

The School Public Relations Association study found that a \$60,000 loss, approximately the average loss for a school district, could pay for eight reading specialists or finance a school breakfast program for 133 children for a year. It is quite clear that in some areas of the country the

high cost of vandalism is resulting in the reduction or elimination of needed educational programs.

The natural reaction to these enormous amounts of wasted money is to wonder over the apparently senseless nature of this destruction. A study {127} entitled *Urban School Crisis*, however, questions whether vandalism is as irrational as it may appear:

Perhaps the most serious aspect of vandalism is the set of messages it conveys: that students look upon the school as alien territory, hostile to their ambitions and hopes; that the education which the system is attempting to provide lacks meaningfulness; that students feel no pride in the edifices in which they spend most of their days.

In addition to requiring the diversion of funds from academic and scholastic projects to security and repair programs, the atmosphere of violence and vandalism has a devastating impact on the ability of our educational system to continue with the instruction of its students. The extent to which this atmosphere permeates our children's educational experience can perhaps be best illustrated by a letter sent to the Subcommittee from a West Coast police official:

It isn't only in the school or the schoolyard that the students are likely to be exposed to violence. School buses, in addition to being mechanically unsound and totally devoid of the slightest semblance of safety devices, are frequently a terrifying experience for the children who are captive passengers. They are the scene of rip-offs for lunch money, physical violence, and pressure to indulge in the illegal use of drugs or narcotics. We appear to have accepted without effective challenge this mass intimidation simply because, naively, some of us hope it will "go away." Students who are normally nonviolent have started carrying guns and knives and lengths of bicycle chains for protection on campus. Though I am obviously concerned about the millions of dollars of property loss which occurs in our schools, I am far more concerned about our apparent willingness to accept violence as a condition of our daily existence.

Few students can be expected to learn in an atmosphere of fear, assaults, and disorder. There can be little doubt that the significant level of violent activity, threats and coercion revealed by the Subcommittee's preliminary survey would have a detrimental effect on the psychological and educational development of children and young adults. Moreover a continuous pattern of destruction of school equipment and buildings naturally makes nearly impossible the already challenging

process of education. The extent and continued growth of this chaotic and threatening climate in our schools is a serious threat to our educational system.

A. Northeast

For purposes of our survey the Northeastern region includes the states of Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Vermont.

138 questionnaires were sent to school systems in the northeastern region and 59.4 percent were returned completed. The pattern of increasing violence and vandalism in the northeastern {128} school districts surveyed by the Subcommittee was mixed. We found between the 1970-71 and 1972-73 school years that:

- Homicide increased by 20.1 percent;
- Rapes and attempted rapes increased by 37.9 percent;
- Robbery increased by 39.3 percent;
- Student assaults on students decreased by 2.2 percent;
- Burglary and larceny decreased by 2.9 percent;
- Weapons increased by 20.6 percent;
- Drugs and alcohol increased by 14.8 percent;
- Dropouts increased by 8.0 percent;
- Vandalism decreased by 12.0 percent; and
- Expulsions decreased by 9.7 percent.

During 1973, there were almost 10,000 reported crimes committed in schools or on school property in New York City alone, including three murders and 26 forcible and attempted rapes. In one year, New York City schools spent \$4 million to restore vandalism-caused damage.

Violence in the schools of the northeastern region is very strongly related to student gang involvement, drug abuse, alcohol abuse, and school integration. Large-scale gang warfare within this region is concentrated in two large cities—New York and Philadelphia. Many schools in these cities are severely disrupted by gang-involved students. In April 1972, a 17-year-old student at George Washington High School in upper Manhattan was clubbed on the head with a pistol butt

and stabbed in the spine outside the school by youths described as members of the Saints, a local gang. The stabbing followed a fight several days before between the Saints and the Galaxies, a rival gang.

Some 350 students were kept home from Adlai Stevenson High School in New York City from September 1971 to March 1972 out of fear for their safety. Parents stated that this action was warranted because of children being mugged, robbed, intimidated, harassed, and stabbed by other students who were members of Bronx gangs. Such spillover of gang activity into the schools occurs with alarming frequency. One New York City educator observed:

The values the schools try to instill are countered by the gang spirit—a dark, frightening, anti-intellectual credo that glorifies the violent life of the street.

Gang activity in Philadelphia has had severe impact on the city's schools. In 1974, there were 165 reported assaults on teachers by students. Pupils' fear of attack by other students has contributed to a drop-out rate which exceeds 30 percent. The Philadelphia system has initiated programs to bus children across "rival turf" and to provide "safe corridors" for students through hostile neighborhoods by using community volunteers to police safe routes to and from school.... {129}

The Subcommittee has found instances in which schools have been used for organized youthful criminal activity. The 1974 report, "Crime in the Schools," issued by the Select Committee on Crime of the New York State Legislature, revealed that in some New York City high schools there were student-run brokerages where teenagers buy and sell guns, narcotics, or the services of youthful male and female prostitutes. In many instances the student buys the guns and drugs for resale at higher prices on the streets. The report maintained that teachers generally know about these illegal activities, but they are usually afraid to talk about them for fear of retaliation.

Drug and alcohol abuse in the Northeastern region increased 18.8 percent between the 1970-71 and 1972-73 school years. This increase is lower than the national increase of 37.5 percent and lower than the increase in the other three regions surveyed. However, the Subcommittee views the increase in the Northeastern region as indicative of an ever-worsening problem since youthful drug abuse has historically been highest in the Northeastern United States. The Southern region,

for example, experienced a 151.6 percent increase in drug and alcohol abuse over the same period, reflecting a dramatic increase in a category of offense not historically prevalent.

A July 1971 report titled, “The New York City School System and Drug Addiction—The Price New York Pays for Drug Abuse and Addiction Among Young People,” is a poignant reminder of a crisis which potentially threatens every major school system in the nation. The report findings stated :

1. Drug addiction and abuse crosses all socioeconomic levels and reaches every high school in the City of New York.
2. Some high schools are marketplaces for the sale of drugs.
3. Some school principles admit to a serious drug problem in their schools. Others deny its existence.
4. Hospitalization, due to overdose of drugs, is a common occurrence in many high schools.
5. Some high school pushers admit selling up to \$600 a day in drugs at schools.
6. A very small percentage of the teachers in the school system have received some training to sensitize them to drug abuse and to drug abusers.
7. Many teacher colleges are not complying with the Education Law in training teachers about drug abuse.
8. Even when a student is known to be a heroin addict, school authorities do not exercise their authority under the law and discharge the student from school.
9. Since 1964, the Board of Education has reported to the Narcotics Register that only thirty-one students were heroin addicts.
10. Even if a child admits to dealing in drugs in a school building, {130} most school administrators do not discharge the student, as he is not “disorderly or disruptive.”
11. Even if a student is arrested for a serious drug crime, very often the Family Court (if under 16) or the Criminal Court (if over 16) releases the child only to return the next school day to his respective school as a hero.
12. Many Department of Health physicians assigned to the schools do not examine students for drug abuse and certify students as addicts.

13. Although a 1952-state law mandates narcotics education in the schools, very few schools have complied.
14. There is no policy from the Board of Education, regarding the proper procedures to be used when a teacher has reasonable cause to believe a student deals in drugs or abuses drugs.
15. There is an unofficial "exchange student policy," where drug addicts and disruptive students are transferred from one school to another. This policy is instrumental in creating mass truancy and encourages the dropout rate. There is no effective alternative education for the drug abuser or chronic truant.
16. The Board of Education has increased the number of security guards in the schools. However, there have been a number of cases of guards who were dealing in drugs at the schools.
17. Some school officials do not deem it to be their obligation, as educators, to stop drug traffic on school premises. In these schools, drug dealing is open and common.
18. Across the United States drug abuse is spreading to almost all urban areas. A survey by this office indicates that although the magnitude of the drug problem in areas outside New York is much less severe than in New York, there appears to be in many cities in the United States a greater dedication to tackling the problem and more resourcefulness used to stopping the spread of drug abuse among youngsters.

A recent survey of 10,000 New York City junior and senior high school students revealed that 12 percent of the students reported a pattern of drinking frequency, amounts, and effects which can be classified as alcoholic or problem drinking. Eighty percent of the students surveyed drank to some extent, most of them occasionally, and in limited amounts. It appears that too many parents are now saying, "Thank God, my child is only drunk." The emphasis on harmful effects of other drugs by school drug abuse and education programs has apparently enhanced the use of alcohol and the result has been an increase in alcohol abuse and alcoholism. Unfortunately, many youths believe that the abuse of alcohol is a "less harmful" means of dealing with peer pressures, family problems, and social aggressiveness.

Boston is the only major city in the country that does not have a security system. There are alarm systems in only 33 of the city's 204 school buildings. Five of these systems were stolen during 1973.

A considerable amount of food was also stolen from Boston schools that year, including 161 pounds of coldcuts, 580 pounds of hotdogs, 211 pounds {131} of hams, 186 pounds of sausage, 230 pounds of chicken, 1,048 pounds of butter, 60 pounds of pastrami, 65 pounds of salisbury steaks, and 18 fully cooked turkeys.

In 1973, 139 teachers in the Boston public schools were assaulted and 664 vandalism incidents were reported resulting in the loss of thousands of dollars worth of equipment and the destruction by arson of two high school facilities. Overall cost for that year exceeded \$1 million.

As of September 12, 1974, violence and vandalism in the schools of Boston, Massachusetts, increased drastically when school officials began busing more than 18,000 students under a federal court order to desegregate Boston schools. Opposition to the desegregation order has resulted in violent conflict between black and white students and their respective communities. The impact on students and the educational process in the city has been devastating. Attendance at newly integrated schools has at times dropped by more than 65 percent. Some parents have permanently removed their children from school and in many schools students and teachers have joined in opposition to desegregation.

A report prepared for the Boston School Committee has revealed that since the implementation of the desegregation order, at least 10,000 students, most of them white, have left Boston's public schools. School officials have stated that several of the city's 200 schools may be forced to close and cutbacks in teaching and other staffs made necessary. The withdrawals represent more than 10 percent of Boston's 94,000 elementary and secondary school students. Some 7,529 students are no longer in the public school system; 3,047 have transferred to private or parochial schools; 927 have been discharged to seek employment, and 3,555 are listed as dropouts.

An interesting feature of the Northeastern region was the number of categories of offense which, reportedly, declined, as compared to the other three regions. This may be attributed to incomplete returns from New York City or that the incidence of such offenses as student assaults on students and burglary and larceny have been so historically high in this region that percent increase is falling while actual frequency

remains disturbingly high. The Subcommittee will give further examination to this development.

B. North central

For purposes of our survey the Subcommittee included the States of Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, and Wisconsin in the North central region.

The Subcommittee sent a total of 172 questionnaires to school districts in every State in this region and received 68 percent of these in return. {132} The data compiled from these returns demonstrates a significant increase in almost every category of school violence and vandalism throughout this region.

The Subcommittee's preliminary findings are that between 1970 and 1973:

Assaults on teachers in schools increased by 52.4 percent;

Assaults on students in schools increased by 20.5 percent;

Number of weapons found in schools increased by 6.7 percent;

Rapes and attempted rapes in schools increased by 60 percent;

Major acts of vandalism increased by 19.5 percent;

Drug and alcohol offenses in schools increased by 97.4 percent; and

Burglaries of school buildings increased by 2.1 percent.

The only survey categories which did not show an upward trend throughout these years were in the areas of homicide and robbery. The number of robberies, in fact, decreased by almost 8 percent since 1970. In all other categories, however, the incidents of school violence and vandalism in this region continue to grow. Moreover, the results of the Subcommittee study indicate that no area within the North central region has been spared the costly results of this increase in school crimes.

The St. Louis, Missouri, school system, for instance, spent \$250,000 in 1974 on repairs for buildings and equipment damaged by vandals. Over \$7,000 worth of damage was caused by elementary school pupils at one school in the city's West End district. In a single wave of destruction these youngsters threw more than 100 desks out of windows,

smashed several filing cabinets and pushed the school piano down a flight of stairs.

The Subcommittee study found 16 shootings in Kansas City schools during the 1972-73 school year. The security manager for the school system spoke of the increasing problem of weapons in his schools:

We have a major problem and it's a tough one to beat. Some kids carry guns for protection. Others carry guns for extortion attempts. Some say they brandish guns as a status symbol.

The District Attorney for Kansas City announced that he was preparing a booklet for school administrators and teachers which would explain procedures for handling and apprehending students suspected of using drugs. The District Attorney explained, "I just don't know what else to do. Drugs have increased sharply in the last two years and we have to have something for the teachers to go by."

The Chicago school system reported a total of 2,217 assaults on teachers in their schools between 1971 and 1973. In one instance an 8th grade student brought a set of .45 and .38 pistols to school, where he killed his principal and wounded a school security official. Security personnel in Chicago schools are now permitted to carry firearms for their protection. {133} Another firearm related incident in Chicago schools last year involved a 16-year-old high school student who was shot to death when he refused to pay another student a 5-cent card game bet.

One teacher reported that a great deal of violence and vandalism within the city schools is caused by expelled, suspended, or truant students who return to the schools during the day:

They wait till lunchtime, when they sneak in and mingle with the students. You can tell which is which because the outsiders don't always know the rules. Anyway they smoke dope, threaten the kids, and try to mess with the girls.

The Subcommittee also learned that over \$3 million was spent in 1973 to repair or replace damaged or stolen property in Chicago schools. Several teachers and students indicated that at least part of this violence and vandalism within the schools can be attributed to gang activity. The number of gangs in Chicago has been estimated as high as 700, with several organized within the elementary school system.

The Detroit school system also reported serious problems with violence and vandalism. The school Security Department states:

For years, the main problem of building security was the protection against minor vandalism. Broken windows, ink and paint materials spilled about rooms, occasional loss of equipment were the general trend. In the past 12 years the problems have grown rapidly. We still face the occasional "rip-up" in schools, while the theft and burglary costs have skyrocketed.

In the 1972-73 school year over \$1,000,000 was lost to destruction and theft of school equipment in Detroit. In that same period there were 483 serious assaults on students. A teacher at one east side junior high school states:

It's just a sick place to be in. It's so chaotic, it's not like teaching at all. Sometimes I have to spend 40 of the 50 minutes of class time just getting the students to sit down. I'm hoarse from shouting when I leave school. I know I could lose my job for saying this but who minds losing a bad job?

Last year in Detroit, a 17-year-old girl in a city high school was awarded \$25,000 in damages for physical and psychological injuries following an incident where she was attacked by about thirty of her classmates who knocked her down, beat her and stabbed her with pencils. The motive for the incident was a feeling among these students that the victim was more attractive and had better grades.

A principal of a high school on the city's west side emphasized that most students are relatively well behaved and only a small percentage of the overall student population causes serious problems. This principal finds, {134} "They're usually students who are not doing well academically and students who have excessive absences."

In nearby Grand Rapids, vandalism cost the school system \$110,000 in 1973. In a letter to the Subcommittee the school board indicated that the installation of alarm systems, plastic windows and special lights was having some success in reducing vandalism losses.

A Duluth, Minnesota, public school district of about 20,000 students estimated that window breakage alone costs \$20,000 per year to repair. Burglaries resulted in equipment losses over \$10,000 per year.

The Cleveland Public Schools reported to the Subcommittee that 672 teachers were assaulted in its schools in the survey period, while

the number of narcotics violations being committed on school property increased from 26 in 1970 to 42 in 1973. Several years ago a 15-year-old student at Franklin D. Roosevelt Junior High School in Cleveland was shot to death in a second floor boy's room by four of his classmates who fired six bullets from a rifle into his head. At Shaw High School in East Cleveland, a student fired four shots from a revolver at the school football coach, who was standing in the hallway. On the day before this incident, the coach had reprimanded the student for reading a newspaper during class.

A school district in Cincinnati, Ohio, reported to the Subcommittee that burglaries at the school increased from three in 1970 to thirteen in 1973, while the number of serious vandalism incidents rose from ten to eighteen in that same period. The Toledo Public School system found that the number of students involved in drunk and disorderly offenses, both on and off the school campuses, increased from seventeen to forty-eight in a three-year period.

The Wichita Kansas Public School system told the Subcommittee that the number of windows being broken in their school buildings had increased by 300 percent between 1963 and 1973, and the overall cost to the system for vandalism and burglary had increased from \$18,777 to \$112,177 in that same ten-year period.

The Security Police Report of the Indianapolis Public School system for 1973 reported 142 assaults on students and 19 assaults on teachers. One school building had over \$3,000 in broken windows in that year alone.

In November of 1973, there were 18 burglaries of school buildings in the Indianapolis system with losses such as \$275 in tape records, \$12 worth of orange juice, \$315 in tape players, \$74 in athletic equipment, and a \$245 adding machine.

A school counselor for the Des Moines Public School system in a letter to the Subcommittee states that local school officials are particularly concerned over three disturbing trends: the increasing possession, use, and sale of narcotic drugs in the schools, the increasing number of vandalism {135} incidents directed against school property, and the consistently high percentage of dropouts within the system.

The Kenosha, Wisconsin, Unified School District No. 1 reported to the Subcommittee that the number of robberies within the school

increased from 6 in the 1970-71 school year to 53 in the 1972-73 school year. The number of major vandalism incidents went from 69 to 89 over that same period. In the Green Bay Public Schools the number of weapons being confiscated by school officials increased from 25 to 39, and incidents of robbery and vandalism have both increased dramatically over the survey period. In the 1970-71 school year there were 15 offenses in the Eau Clair schools involving the possession or sale of narcotics. By 1973 the number of such offenses increased to 26.

It is important to emphasize that although the schools briefly discussed above are located in predominantly urban areas, the problem of criminal activity within schools is not limited to, or even necessarily more severe in these particular institutions or in urban areas in general, than in suburban or rural districts. In a small town in Indiana, for instance, two boys were discovered operating an extortion ring in an elementary school which victimized more than 40 school children during the 1973 school year. A study conducted at a suburban high school in Illinois by the Columbia University School of Public Health and Administrative Medicine found that 34.1 percent of the students had used marijuana, 18.2 percent tried barbiturates, 15.7 percent used amphetamines, 26 percent used LSD or other psychedelics, 8.2 percent had tried cocaine, and 4.7 percent had tried heroin. The superintendent of the school stated:

The superintendent that says he does not have a drug problem in his high school either is guilty of a shameful cover-up, or he just does not know the facts.

It would be a serious mistake to infer from the few examples we have pointed out that violence and vandalism exist only in schools in the larger cities of the North central region. On the contrary, the Subcommittee study has found very few schools within this region that do not have serious problems in this regard.

C. South

For purposes of our survey the Southern region includes the states of Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, West Virginia, and the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

The Subcommittee sent 261 questionnaires to school districts in the southern region. One hundred eighty-seven or 71.6 percent {136} were returned, completed. This was the highest completion percentage of the four regions.

Our data indicate that all categories of school violence and vandalism offenses increased significantly between the 1970-71 and 1972-73 school years:

Homicide increased by 25.4 percent;

Rape and attempted rape increased by 28.4 percent;

Robbery increased by 51.7 percent;

Student assault on students increased by 276.9 percent;

Student assault on school personnel increased by 316.4 percent; and

Burglary and larceny increased by 28.1 percent.

The Subcommittee survey revealed dramatic evidence of the drop-out phenomena in this region. Dropouts increased by 18.8 percent, more than twice the increase of any other region. Expulsions, however, decreased by 5.9 percent. The “decrease” in expulsion rates may well reflect the application of the “force-out” practices which would account in part for the increase in “drop-out” rates in every region.

There appears to be no significant difference in the types of violent incidents in southern schools from those occurring throughout the country. We did learn of a rather shocking example of such conduct involving elementary school youngsters that vividly demonstrates the seriousness of problems confronting the school community. In April 1973, three third grade pupils in Winston-Salem, North Carolina, were charged with robbery for forcing two nine-year-old classmates to pay nearly \$1,000 in extortion payments over an eight-month period. The three boys, two aged nine and one aged eleven, allegedly threatened their classmates with beatings or death if the money was not paid.

In some communities teachers and school officials are responding to the increased level and seriousness of violence by arming themselves. In fact, some schools are literally armed camps. For example, it has been reported by the Birmingham Schools superintendent, Dr. Wilmer Cody, that last year so many school officials were carrying guns to school that he had to designate certain specified persons to carry firearms for their protection. School officials contended the guns were

needed because outsiders, including violent gang members, were destroying school equipment and threatening the lives of students and teachers. In response to this dangerous situation, the Birmingham Board of Education banned all lethal weapons from school grounds unless specifically authorized by the superintendent.

The possession of firearms and other lethal weapons in the schools is frightening, but even more startling is the growing number of reports of actual shootings in the schools. For example, in February 1973, in Richmond, Virginia, at the Armstrong High School, a 17-year-old boy was {137} killed and a 14-year-old girl was wounded when caught in the cross fire of a gun battle between two youths in a school corridor.

Lawlessness in this region's schools is also evidenced by the increasing level of personal violence, short of murder. Armed robbery, extortion, and assault are not uncommon in many schools. Gangs of thugs are often involved in these crimes. For example, in September 1973, nine students at Northwestern High School in Prince Georges County, Maryland, including a blind 12th grader, were robbed by what authorities described as a "roving band" of armed teenagers! Similarly, at one District of Columbia high school last year, three teenagers, one armed with a pistol, robbed the school bank at midday. The school principal claimed the fire regulations prohibited the school from locking its doors; however, the fire chief indicated that schools could arrange their doors to prevent entrance while simultaneously permitting quick exit in case of an emergency such as fire.

Likewise, vandalism of school property as well as that of school officials, teachers, and students is increasing in this region. For example, during the 1972-1973 academic year in Prince Georges County, Maryland, \$267,000 worth of school property was either damaged or stolen. This cost to the school system was 14 percent higher than the previous year's loss of \$226,000. We also learned that the maintenance cost of the Houston, Texas, school security force increased from \$20,000 in 1972 to \$389,000 in 1973.

Similarly, in fiscal 1973, 46,810 window panes were broken in the District of Columbia schools at a cost of \$621,660, and the Memphis Board of Education indicated in 1974 that in the previous 4 years vandalism had cost almost \$4 million. The Broward County, Florida, school board reported a 17 percent increase of assault incidents for the

1972-73 school year, including one murder. The number of arsons doubled compared to the previous year, and was responsible for losses of school equipment valued at nearly \$207,000.

Furthermore, in March 1974, three teenage youths were arrested in Dale City, Virginia, elementary school after inflicting approximately \$20,000 in vandalism. Police found nearly all the building's windows smashed, light fixtures ripped out, desks splintered and their contents strewn about, eight television sets and seven record players destroyed, and water standing throughout much of the building. One police officer said, "You name it and they did it."

One of the Subcommittee's primary concerns is the impact that the atmosphere of violence and vandalism in the school has on the ability of teachers to teach and students to learn. In this region, however, it appears that in addition to these concerns, the advent of school desegregation has had an important impact on the manner in which students and teachers are treated as well as student behavior in general. Numerous national and {138} local southern organizations have studied this special aspect of the problem in some depth.

The NEA estimates there are as many as 50,000 black "push-outs" throughout the South. A June 1973 report on suspensions, expulsions, and dropouts in the Raleigh, North Carolina, public schools prepared by the Raleigh Community Relations Committee gives some insight into the impact of desegregation on southern school children. Suspension records for the 1972-73 school year showed that black high school students composed 64 percent or 509 out of 791 dismissal cases in Raleigh schools. Comparisons of these figures with those of the two previous terms showed that black high school suspensions had increased from 40.4 percent to 59 percent since 1970-71. The largest categories of offense were truancy and fighting, which may be precipitated by the newly structured makeup of desegregated school populations.

The Raleigh Community Relations Committee observed several factors in their report which may present some insight into school violence and disruption in newly integrated schools both South and North:

Nearly 100 parents, students, or other interested persons talked with RCRC Staff during this study. Most were blacks who spoke repeatedly of rejection and uneasiness as feelings associated with the schools.

Black parents who made attempts to hold conferences with teachers, principals, or counselors spoke of lack of respect accorded them in many instances either because of direct insults or the general tone of their reception.

Those parents who did not attempt to look into problems experienced by their children said they feared the reception they would receive or felt there was no point in even trying.

Black students talked of:

1. Verbal insults from students and Administrators;
2. Their feeling that they were not wanted at the schools, high schools in particular;
3. A general uneasiness.

One student expressed this by saying "You just can't relax over there." A feeling of frustration and disappointment was also clearly apparent in most conversations.

During March 1973, 220 white children were removed by their parents from the Roger B. Taney Junior High School in Camp Springs, Maryland, after a racial brawl. The racial tension was attributed to court ordered integration in January 1973, which resulted in the busing of 250 black students from Seat Pleasant, Maryland, to Taney. Some black students and administrators said they saw the school as a white world hostile to the blacks, full of subtle and not-so-subtle racial slights and innuendoes that cut deep and have caused the hostilities to escalate on both sides. White {139} students and their parents on the other hand said they felt generally that the influx of blacks had lowered the quality of teaching by causing teachers to spend increasing amounts of time disciplining black students.

Leon Hall, director of the Southern Regional Council's School Desegregation Project, addressed this issue during a 1973 National Education Association conference on "Student Displacement/Exclusion." Mr. Hall makes pointed reference to the findings of his organization's joint study with the Robert F. Kennedy Memorial, on school conflict:

You have young people today who for eight hours a day, nine months a year, are having to go to school facing racism, isolation, and unfair treatment with the disappearing number of minority teachers and administrators. But these students just aren't going to take any stuff. We have found that there are variances in the student's response to the situation they're in. From a preliminary inquiry we learned from students and the few teachers who would respond that the major problem in the average school in our region is conflict. Under the umbrella of conflict we found that the number one problem was conflict between students and teachers. Ranking number two was conflict between students and administrators. Ranking number three was conflict between students and students and the unfair enforcement of rules.

The findings of the Southern Regional Council with regard to conflict is dramatically underscored by the Subcommittee's survey.

These special problems in the Southern region emphasize the need, nationwide, to assure due process for teachers and students in all school proceedings, but particularly those of a disciplinary nature.

D. West

For purposes of our survey the Subcommittee's Western region is comprised of Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, Wyoming, Guam, the Canal Zone, and the Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands and American Samoa.

Questionnaires were sent to 130 school districts in this region and 69.8 percent of them responded.

The Subcommittee found that in schools in the Western region between 1970 and 1973:

Assaults on students increased 77.4 percent;

Assaults on teachers increased 6.4 percent;

Major acts of vandalism increased by 15.7 percent;

Robberies increased by 98.3 percent;

Burglaries increased by 2.7 percent;

Rapes and attempted rapes increased by 52.3 percent;

Homicides increased by 26.6 percent; and

Drug offenses in schools increased by 18.1 percent. {140}

Perhaps one of the best indicators of the rising tide of school violence in this region is the fact that the number of weapons being seized from students by school authorities increased by 90.3 percent from 1970 to 1973. Obviously, more and more students are becoming acutely aware of the escalating level of violence within their schools.

The Subcommittee also found an increasing concern among state and local school authorities throughout the region. The California State Department of Education, for example, commissioned a year-long statewide investigation of the problem by a special task force. The final report concluded that:

Every relevant source of information studied by the Task Force indicated that general crime is a serious problem showing an unmistakable increase in the schools of the State. Vandalism in particular appeared to the Task Force to be a serious problem for most schools. Indications were that it was increasing in frequency although the rate of increase did not appear to be as great for vandalism as for some other types of school crimes.

The superintendent of schools for the city of Los Angeles, William J. Johnston, in a letter to the Subcommittee writes:

The problem of juvenile crimes in our communities and on school campuses gives us serious concerns. It should be noted that assaults and batteries in campus-related incidents increased 44 percent last year. Robberies on school campuses more than doubled, while a total of 167 incidents involved the use of weapons.

After an extensive, undercover investigation of 24 high schools last year, the chief of the Los Angeles High School Juvenile Division estimated that "80 percent of the students with whom police agents came in contact while posing as students and attending classes were using drugs of some kind." In the first four months of the 1972-1973 school year there were 60 gun episodes in Los Angeles schools, one of which involved the death of a Locke High School student. Last December a gun fight between two students at the Manual Arts High School campus left one 16-year-old dead and another 17-year-old badly wounded. A Los Angeles high school principal declared, "For teachers and students alike, the issue unfortunately is no longer learning but survival."

School and juvenile authorities attribute some of this increase in violence in Los Angeles schools to the presence of numerous well-organized gangs in these institutions. The head of the Youth Services

Division of the Los Angeles Sheriff's Department stated last year that the schools are "virtually armed camps" as a result of violence from gangs. In the 1971-72 school year there were 200 gang-related shootings, 29 of which were fatal. It has been estimated that Los Angeles has 150 gangs in the city, many of which are operating in the schools. One of the largest of these {141} organizations is called the Crips. The name is a short form of Cripples, which in turn is derived from the gang's trademark of maiming or crippling their victims. The Crips also have two auxiliary units: the Cripetts, composed of girl members, and the Junior Crips, made up of elementary school children. A social worker working with the Los Angeles gangs says:

The trend is toward even more violent acts. Our biggest problem is with the 8 to 11 year olds, not the teenagers. They're into everything—vandalism, assault, petty theft, and extortion at school.

Los Angeles, of course, is not the only city in the Western region with gang-related problems in its schools. In San Francisco many of the most organized gangs are found in Chinatown. Two years ago one of these gang leaders was assassinated by a rival 15-year-old high school student who riddled his victim's body with seven shots from a .25 caliber pistol he had concealed in his pocket.

Although only about 1 percent of the youths living in Chinatown belong to these gangs, they are capable of repeated serious acts of violence and disruption in the city schools. These groups have names like the Junior Wah Ching, reportedly found in Galileo and Washington High Schools, the Baby Wah Ching, made up of 12- to 15-year-olds, and the Suey Sing. In addition to this gang-related violence, San Francisco experiences the usual kinds of unorganized mayhem found throughout schools in the Western region. In the first two weeks of the 1972 school year, for instance, one student was killed and five others wounded in knife attacks at three different San Francisco schools. Additionally, three other separate fights resulted in serious injuries to six other students. During January 1973, four high school students, three of them girls, were expelled for carrying guns.

In Sacramento a school disciplinary officer reported that instances of extortion are increasing faster than other forms of school crime. Most of the students involved in these crimes are in the 6th, 7th, or 8th

grades and are apparently motivated by the "sheer delight of scaring the_____ out of the small kid."

The costs of vandalism in California are also extremely high. In 1971 Los Angeles lost \$3,700,000 to intentional destruction and theft of school property, enough to construct two or three new elementary school buildings. Superintendent of School Johnston estimates that between 1968 and 1973 vandalism cost Los Angeles approximately \$11 million.

The Orange County School system expended \$615,288.05 on vandalism-related repairs during fiscal 1973. Anaheim High School alone had over \$124,000 in costs attributable to vandalism. One study estimates that the State of California will be spending well over \$10,000,000 every year on vandalism repairs.

Although California is by far the most heavily populated State in the Subcommittee's Western region, and quite naturally therefore has the {142} largest volume of violence and vandalism in the area, the remaining States also report serious crime problems in their schools. In the Seattle schools, for example, serious assaults increased by 70 percent and robbery by 100 percent between the 1970-71 and 1972-73 school years. In 1972 alone there were 1,886 crimes committed against students and school employees, ranging from homicides to possession of firearms on the school grounds. Vandalism cost the Seattle schools over \$1 million in 1972. A report on school security for the State of Washington finds:

Additionally, the problem has taken a turn for the worse because our schools are no longer safe for the majority of students and faculty. Hardly a day goes by where an incident or incidents in our schools do not occur. Teachers are afraid, students are apprehensive, and parents are concerned with the mounting security related problems in our educational systems.

The Boulder, Colorado, schools reported \$65,000 in annual vandalism losses and a 1972-73 security budget of \$60,000. In 1970-71 that district had 17 robberies, but by the end of the 1973 school year that number had risen to 31. The Denver public schools recently installed a silent alarm system and hired a full time security supervisor in an attempt to reduce its vandalism costs. The administrative director of

the system states, "The installation of silent alarms is extremely difficult to finance within the parameters of a school budget."

Last September the Intermountain School in Brigham City, Utah, was the scene of a series of fights among Indian students from different tribes. Police arrested 14 students and confiscated numerous knives and clubs after a particularly serious flare-up at the school. School authorities also reported several attempts to burn down the school building. In 1972 Salt Lake County schools lost more than \$400,000 in destroyed or stolen properties. This loss was estimated to be equal to the yearly operating costs of two medium-sized elementary schools. A report prepared at the end of the 1973 school year by the Utah Association of School Administrators on violence in the state's schools found, "Dissent, disruption and violence are beginning to run rampant in some areas."

The Subcommittee found a total of 138 serious assaults on students and 16 assaults on teachers during the 1972-73 school year in the Phoenix Union High School System in Phoenix, Arizona. That same system also reported \$35,000 in vandalism-related damages. The Roosevelt School District, also located in Phoenix, had over \$16,000 in educational equipment stolen in fiscal 1973 and suffered an additional \$16,760 loss from equipment being maliciously damaged.

In Las Vegas, Nevada, the Clark County School District reported an increase in the number of narcotic offenses being committed on school property from 38 in 1970 to 134 by 1973. In the same period burglaries {143} increased from 79 to 200, and major vandalism incidents from 19 to 671.

The Subcommittee survey of the Western region indicates that the increasing trend of violence and vandalism found throughout this area is at least as serious, if not more so, than the other three regions of the country. Although the survey results show that the extent of the problem may vary somewhat between the extremely critical situation in some larger, urban and suburban areas and the less extreme problem in some of the more sparsely populated states, it should be understood that while the level of destruction and violence may differ, it has increased over the last several years to unacceptable levels throughout this area.

CURRICULUM, WICHITA COLLEGIATE SCHOOL²⁴

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY AND ECONOMICS

Form 1 (Grade 7)—Ancient History

A course in the history of ancient peoples, beginning with prehistoric man in the Nile and Tigris-Euphrates valleys, to the decline of the Roman Empire. The first four weeks of the course covers the Egyptian, Sumerian, Hebrew, and Minoan civilizations, while the second four weeks covers the Greek civilization, and the final four weeks the Roman World. This course is designed primarily to teach the student the method and techniques of study, and to develop the skills necessary to achieve this. Texts: Breasted, *Ancient History*; Starr, *The Ancient Greeks*; Starr, *The Ancient Romans*.

Form 2 (Grade 8)—American History

The purpose of this course is to introduce the student to the basic facts and issues in American history from the Colonial period to the mid-twentieth century. It is designed to teach basic research skills and to acquaint the student with the major events and personalities in our nation's development. Text: Baldwin and Warring, *History of Our Republic*.

Form 3 (Grade 9)—Medieval History

History from the barbarian invasions to the French Revolution (1789). This course examines the reasons for, and the consequences of, the transition from feudalism to the nation-state system. The first trimester covers the medieval period from the fall of the Roman Empire to 1500. During the second trimester emphasis is placed on the social, cultural, religious, and political developments of the Renaissance and the Reformation and their effects upon modern civilizations, 1500-

24. Wichita Collegiate School is a private academy located at 9115 E. 13th St., Wichita, KS 67206.

1789. Texts: Hayes and Clarke, *Medieval and Early Modern Times*. Col-lateral readings taken from Stavrianos, *Readings in World History*; Downs, *The Medieval Pageant*.

Form 4 (Grade 10)—Modern European History

Modern Europe after 1789, emphasizing the development of nation-alism in the revolutions of the first half of the nineteenth century, as well as its role in the unification of Italy and Germany. The first trimester deals with the revolutions up to 1948 within the context of the Con-cert of Europe and the development and breakup of the Bismarckian alliance system as a prelude to World War I. The second trimester deals with Europe and the Far {145} East between the wars, as well as the causes and consequences of World War II. Special emphasis is placed on the diplomatic, economic, and political developments that give rise to totalitarianism and its aftermath. Texts: Briton, Christopher, and Wolff, *Modern Civilization*; Nicolson, *The Congress of Vienna*; Eyck, *Bismarck and the German Empire*; Wright and Mejia, *An Age of Contro-versy*.

Form 5 (Grade 11)—American History

A history of the American people from Colonial times to the mid-twentieth century, with emphasis on the political, economic, and diplo-matic events that have shaped our development as a nation. This course is to give the student a well-grounded understanding of the interrelationships that exist between the United States and the world, and the roles that democracy, manifest destiny, nationalism, and inter-nationalism have played in the making of this republic. Text: Hofst-adter, Miller, and Aaron, *The American Republic*, vols. 1, 2.

Form 6 (Grade 12)—American History

A trimester course that exposes the student to conflicting explana-tions of the major issues in American history. This course is built around the Problems in American Civilization series, published by D. C. Heath and Co., and is designed to give the student an opportunity to evaluate the contributions of traditional and revisionist historians. This is a twelve-week course that will consider a major problem in Ameri-

can history each week and will include research papers, group study, and discussion. Prerequisite: American History, Form 5. Texts: George R. Taylor (ed.), *Problems in American Civilization*.

Form 3 (Grade 9)—Economics 1, Principles of Economics

A beginning course in economics designed to introduce the student to basic principles of economics, the free market system, and the concepts and methods of economic analysis. Texts: Belknap, *The Story of Free Enterprise*; Read, *The Free Market and Its Enemy*; Campbell, Potter, and Adam, *Economics and Freedom*.

Form 4 (Grade 10)—Economics 2, History of Economic Thought

This course is designed to introduce the student to the leading contributors to the development of economic thought, from Adam Smith to Karl Marx to John Maynard Keynes, with an analysis of the Industrial Revolution as a background for critical inquiry. It is intended to reinforce the Modern European History course (French Revolution to Europe, 1960), in order that the student will recognize the role of economic ideas in historical events. Texts: Heilbroner, *The Worldly Philosophers*; Ashton, *The Industrial Revolution*. {146}

Form 5 (Grade 11)—Economics 3, Introduction to Economic Systems

An examination of three basic economic systems: socialism, communism, and free market. Emphasis is upon the principles underlying each system and the practical results which follow from practicing these principles within the given system. Texts: Coleman, *Comparative Economic Systems*; Galbraith, *The Affluent Society*; Hazlitt, *Economics in One Lesson*; Friedman, *Capitalism and Freedom*; Chamberlain, *The Enterprising Americans*; Garrett, *The Peoples Pottage*; Bastiat, *The Law*; Lane, *Discovery of Freedom*.

***Forms 5 and 6 (Grades 11-12)—Economics 4,
Issues in American Economic History***

A trimester course that explores conflicting views of the major problems in American economic history from Colonial times to the present. This course seeks to develop in the student an awareness of the great importance of economics in the development of the United States and to acquaint him with the issues and the political consequences of industrialization and government intervention in the free market system. Text: Nash (ed.), *Issues in American Economic History*.

***Forms 5 and 6 (Grades 11-12)—Economics 5,
Free Market Principles and Government Intervention***

This course examines the rationale behind government intervention and the cause and effect relationships that intervention produces. Texts: Von Mises, *The Anti-Capitalist Mentality*; Hazlitt, *Man Versus the Welfare State*; Hayek (ed.), *Capitalism and the Historians*.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS

Form 1 (Grade 7)—Mathematics

Seventh grade mathematics is a pre-algebra course that includes a careful study of arithmetic with attention to both structure and skills. The properties of the set of whole numbers are studied first and then extended to include the nonnegative rational numbers, written as fractions and decimals. An intuitive look at geometry is given, and a brief introduction to statistics and probability is also presented. Text: *Modern School Mathematics*.

Form 2 (Grade 8)—Algebra 1 and Pre-Algebra

The course is presented as a mathematical system which affords a transition from arithmetic to higher mathematics using the language of sets. Inductive and deductive reasoning are used to study the properties of real numbers. Text: Vannatta, Goodwin, and Crosswhite, *Algebra 1*. {147}

Form 3 (Grade 9)—Algebra 2

The course is devoted fundamentally to a study of functions. The building blocks of “properties of numbers” and “postulates on a number field” ultimately lead to a study of linear, second degree, trigonometric and exponential functions. Complex numbers and vectors, which are related to the study of second-degree functions and trigonometric functions, are also presented. Text: Vannatta, Goodwin, and Fawcett, *Algebra 2*.

Form 4 (Grade 10)—Mathematics

Mathematics in the tenth grade is divided into two major sections, geometry and vector analysis. Geometry is a unified course involving both plane and solid geometry. The vector analysis section involves addition, subtraction, cross and dot product of vectors. Texts: Moise-Downs, *Geometry*; Daniel A. Greenbury, *Calculus and Vectors*.

Form 5 (Grade 11)—Algebra 3

Algebra 3 is an introduction to advanced mathematics with a review of topics in algebra. Trigonometry and analytic geometry are thoroughly covered. An introduction to calculus and probability theory are also presented. Text: Kline, Osterle, and Wilson, *Foundations of Advanced Mathematics*.

Form 6 (Grade 12)—Calculus

Calculus is taught as an advanced placement course in mathematics. It is achievement in this course for which advanced placement and credit are given by many colleges. The objective of the course, then, is to give substantial training in differential and integral calculus, with sufficient application to bring out the meaning and importance of the subject. Text: Johnson and Kiokmeister, *Calculus*.

HIGHER EDUCATION IN AMERICA: FRAGMENTS OF A DYING CULTURE

*Albert B. Friedman*²⁵

FRESHMAN YEAR

THE ARCHAIC SKILL OF WRITING

Why all the fuss over declining reading scores in our schools and the inability of college freshmen to write well?

As far as I'm concerned, it's a fuss over nothing. Indeed, I doubt whether all the superficial diagnoses and pious solutions being offered up these days are going to help matters much. Has anyone ever allowed himself to consider that perhaps matters don't need all that help?

Maybe college freshmen, like the rest of us, don't need to write so well at all any more. We have electronic and other kinds of servants to do that sort of brain and finger-cramping work for us.

Many have pointed to the detrimental effects of television and films on student expository ability, and it is certainly true that TV suppresses family discussions in which a student might learn better to describe a situation or argue or otherwise express himself. While it goes without saying, apparently, that students who don't read books or magazines are deprived of models to emulate in their own writing, television and film are merely the more obvious culprits. Here are some others:

—Car and plane travel and the telephone, especially the now comparatively cheap long-distance calls, obviate a large amount of the social and business correspondence that was once necessary (or at least customary).

—On those few occasions when the proprieties require that we must bite the pen and write something, we can always amble down to the drugstore and find a rack of cards, prettied up with multicolored

25. Albert B. Friedman is chairman of the English and American Literature Department at Claremont Graduate School. I hope this is a satirical essay.—ed.

graphics, to convey every imaginable sentiment. Sign your name and lick a stamp, and a legacy is kept safely warm or a friend dutifully consoled, prodded to get well, whimsically cheered up, or congratulated on some anniversary.

—Even the most serious of us scan rather than read newspapers. For {149} most of the opinions we spout, we depend on condensations or abstracts from books or on reviews or breezy digest magazines like *Psychology Today*, *Time*, or the *Reader's Digest*.

The jolly fact is that we are no longer a reading and writing culture, and, once the pocket calculator takes over, arithmetic will rejoin the basic trinity.

Freshmen don't write so well any more because they are caught in a transition in cultural technology. The solution is not better courses in teaching teachers how to teach writing, but rather showing teachers how to develop an archaic accomplishment in students whose cultural environment is out of phase with this particular set of skills.

To those made anxious by the new illiteracy, it might be a comfort to remember that preliteracy produced great epics and ballads with nothing but memory to preserve the results. What we have now, in reality, is electronic literacy, which has in addition to its many other advantages (consider, for example, how much more vividly tapes represent the phonic stream than written symbols do), excellent means of recording its works.

Somehow the educational system must adjust to these new conditions and learn to value the student who is well informed, intellectually sophisticated, and emotionally reflective, thanks to long hours of listening to radio and records and viewing television and films, but who reads nothing at all outside his school assignments.

In teaching the electronic generation to write, educators are instructing an accomplished musician who plays by ear how to read musical notation.

—Reprinted from the Los Angeles *Times*, December 16, 1974.

UPPER DIVISION

FOOD TASTING CLASS LIKES DOG BISCUITS

KINGSTON, RI (AP)—A University of Rhode Island professor teaching a course in sensory evaluation of foods made attendance voluntary for a recent class with dog food on the menu.

But fourteen students and a short-haired hound named Jubilee showed up.

The students normally sample cheeses, ice cream, and other dairy products in the three-credit course designed to develop food-tasting skills, reports Clifford Cosgrove of URI's college of resource development.

One of the students, Michael O'Hanian of Providence, RI, was required to analyze dog food for a food chemistry course, and he asked Cosgrove's class to help him choose which product he should analyze.

"I warned them they didn't have to show up," Cosgrove said. About half of the class attended. {150}

The professor said, "They all wanted to bring their dogs, but I decided to limit it to just one," so the class could compare its reactions to those of a dog.

He gave this account of the session:

Three different types of dried dog foods were tasted, along with a crunchy type of cereal marketed for human consumption. The four products were ground up to give them the same look and texture, and students sampled each two or three times.

The students could not detect which of the four was the human food, and a common brand of dog biscuits was chosen most often as the best tasting of the samples.

Jubilee proved less discriminating. After sniffing each dish, the dog proceeded to devour the dog foods and the cereal at the same time, without indicating a favorite.

O'Hanian said he chemically analyzed the dog food most popular with the class and found it to have three times the protein contained in the same amount of cornflakes.

—Reprinted from Los Angeles *Times*, April 19, 1974, p. 8, sec. 1-A.

MASTER OF ARTS

STUDENT FRAMES A QUESTION THESIS IN PERIODS

NORMAN, OK—An eight-page thesis, consisting entirely of lines of periods, won't be filed along with other theses in the University of Oklahoma (OU) library, but it has been accepted as fulfilling a requirement for a master of fine arts (MFA) degree.

University officials say they have decided the thesis submitted by Jeffrey W. Rubinoff, twenty-three, for a MFA degree in art was intended as a good-natured criticism of some graduate requirements.

But Dr. Arthur McAnally, director of OU libraries, said the library has the right to reject any thesis that is incomplete, improperly typed, or otherwise not properly submitted. He said Mr. Rubinoff's thesis was "full of typographical errors."

Dr. Carl Riggs, university vice president, said the School of Art had simply pointed out "one of those cases where we need to look at the requirements." He said the master's course Mr. Rubinoff pursued called for fifty-six hours of graduate work, compared with thirty for most.

"He met the requirements so far as I am concerned, so far as the chairman of the Department of Art is concerned, and so far as the committee is concerned."

—Reprinted from the *National Observer*, June 30, 1969. {151}

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

A stroll through Xerox's *Comprehensive Dissertation Index* suggests a dissertation topic for some budding Gloria Steinem: "An Analysis of the Woman's-Place-Is-in-Home-Economics Method of Choosing Dissertation Topics." Among the dissertations Xerox attributes to female scholars: "The Comparative Lifting Power of Magma from Fresh and Aged, Pasteurized, and Dehydrated Eggs When Used in Sponge Cake"; "Basic Distances in 100 Farm Homes for Preparing and Serving Food and Washing Dishes"; "Practices and Attitudes of Homemakers in Cleaning the Living Room"; "The Relative Importance of Various Factors in Maintaining the Whiteness of Laundered Fabrics."

—Reprinted from the *National Review*, May 10, 1974.

THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF MODERN UNIVERSITIES

Henry G. Manne

Introduction

An attempt will be made in this paper to examine the modern private university from an organization theory approach. The organizational arrangements of the modern university will be analyzed in an effort to explain the behavior of various individuals connected with these institutions. The list of characters includes trustees, administrators, faculty, graduate students, and undergraduates. The approach of this paper is somewhat different than that of related works by such authors as Ben Rugge, Armen Alchian, and James Buchanan. These authors have focused on the economic effects of less-than-full-cost tuition, and, while many of their points will be touched upon in this paper, the principal focus here is somewhat broader.

The theme of this paper is that the nonprofit organization of universities is probably the principal determinant of less-than-full-cost tuition, with all its implications, and also of many other aspects of university life. Hopefully, this broader approach will explain a wider range of issues and behavior patterns that can be related exclusively to the less-than-full-cost tuition circumstance.

No effort will be made to examine in detail the full behavioral implications of state-owned and state-operated universities, though the development of state universities, it will be argued, played an important role in establishing some aspects of the modern private university. Obviously, there are a number of similarities between the two, but these extrapolations will be left to the reader.

This paper is offered in some respects as a complex hypothesis about universities rather than as an absolute proof of the propositions offered. To this end some historical developments in the American university scene will be sketched, but only to serve certain analytical purposes. No historical research has been done on the development of

American universities, and, for the most part, conjecture about that development is offered here rather than hard data. Nonetheless, the broad outlines of the development are well enough known that any errors in this regard should not affect the analysis significantly. {153}

Origins of Modern Organizational Form

Until near the end of the nineteenth century there were basically two traditions in American universities, all of which, for practical purposes, were private, nonprofit institutions. The first, and unquestionably more important, of these traditions was that of the church-related college. These were schools founded either to promote religion and inculcate certain values or to train students for the ministry. And, of course, some schools did both. In one fashion or another the great bulk of private universities in America, ranging all the way from the very early schools like Harvard and Dartmouth to the later group of small Midwestern colleges like Antioch or the primeval University of Chicago, had strong denominational influence.

The fact that many of these schools were founded in order to give religious training had a direct effect on the behavior of everyone concerned with these schools. Unlike the modern university, with many and diverse goals, these schools had a specific objective. The trustees, administrators, and faculty, as well as students, all understood that the school was basically a means to achieve doctrinal conviction. It could be said that the donors of funds were purchasing primarily religious training and only incidentally other kinds of education.

The founders of these schools, in effect, “purchased” their own utility in the form of religious training for their and others’ children. Presumably their satisfaction came from the knowledge of the religious values held by the students. Had the market provided purveyors of college religious training, the founders of these schools might as well have taken advantage of market specialization and allowed others to produce what they purchased. As it was, they had to produce this commodity for their own use. Their situation was analogous to that of mid-nineteenth-century farmers who mortgaged their lands in order to help finance railroads. The farmers did not do this to become investors in the railroad industry. Their motivation was rather to purchase transportation in order to get their commodities to market. Their concern,

as illustrated by numerous nineteenth-century law cases on the subject of *ultra vires*, was with access to freight cars rather than with profitability from the operation of the railroad.

Under this approach, discretion in the allocation of the college's resources was very limited. The responsibility of all individuals to maximize the religious training purchased with the given funds was well understood. Thus, the behavior of trustees and administrators was not unlike that of any businessman interested in producing at a specific and definite cost the largest amount of a specific commodity possible; and the trust form of organization was eminently suited to this outlook. It allowed the donors of funds or the friends of the organization to manage the operation without any interference from market competitors; that is, they did not want the {154} flexibility and potential for change inherent in a business firm competing in a marketplace. That form of organization would only have been appropriate for entrepreneurs planning to profit from the sale of education to the consumers of it.

Another special aspect of academic denominationalism played a role in the development of modern universities. Probably because of constitutional doubts on the issue, these schools were regularly extended exemptions from local taxation. Most nonprofit institutions that received this privilege in late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century America were church-related, and the First Amendment's interdiction of laws "respecting a religious establishment" thus gave some comparative semblance of a government subsidy to denominational colleges. Again, the legal history of this phenomenon is not altogether clear, and there were nondenominational charitable institutions in America as well. But the fact remains, nonetheless, that quite early tax exemption was well established for private schools. Clearly, it influenced any schools founders to adopt the nonprofit form of organization.

The second great tradition in American private education, while not inconsistent with the other, is distinguishable enough to be addressed separately. This was the notion of elitist, liberal education. In this tradition, education was viewed as a kind of luxury "consumption good," designed to train an affluent class of aristocrats or dilettantes in the humane arts. Undoubtedly, a number of the private colleges originally founded as denominational schools moved into this second category.

At the present a great many of these have ceased to acknowledge any denominational interests whatever.

Strangely, however, the political economy of this kind of school was not fundamentally different from that of the denominational school. These institutions were, in the truest sense of the word, “class” establishments, and the class was unmistakably upper. It would have been very difficult in nineteenth-century America to find many people who could afford the luxury of three or four years of humane studies. This would be true even though tuition was free and other costs were subsidized, since few students would have the necessary educational background, a vast number would simply have no interest, and even larger numbers would not be able to afford the sacrifice of four years without gainful employment.

But be that as it may, these institutions were in large measure consciously managed so as to preserve them as intellectual and social sanctuaries for America’s version of an aristocracy. Again, the trustees of such schools had a clear purpose by which to test their every action. So long as administrators and faculty understood the purpose, there could be no question about the location of authority.

Manifestly, the ultimate locus of control rested with those individuals {155} who financed the institutions. It is probably the case that individuals giving large sums to quasi-denominational or nondenominational private schools did so with the idea of benefiting their own social class and perhaps occasionally the “deserving poor.” This class, of course, was not a European-type aristocracy. However, that made no difference, since the goals were fundamentally the same, i.e., to insulate their children from other social classes, to educate them in a rather luxurious fashion, and, finally, to inculcate in them the values of the system in which their families had prospered.

There were certain characteristics of these schools, of which Vassar, Northwestern, Vanderbilt, and Stanford could serve as prototypes, that followed from their purpose and mode of organization. The individuals who gave large sums of money to these schools either became the trustees of the schools or selected the trustees or had fairly close relations with them. That is, these individuals, like the churches and religious donors to denominational schools, were still primarily interested in producing a certain kind of education for a select group of individu-

als. They did not intend to be establishing anything like a business firm selling to the public but incidentally operated on a not-for-profit basis. Since the money was really used to “purchase” a commodity, trustees kept a close watch on who were admitted as students, who taught courses, and indeed what was taught.

Certainly, no one in most of these schools would have thought of admitting blacks, or even whites who could not readily afford some financial drain, albeit subsidized. When members of minority religious groups were admitted, it was inevitably on a strict quota basis. Brilliance and scholarship were not the virtues most highly regarded for either students or teachers. Loyalty to the cultural or religious ideals of the institution must have been far more important than grades, publications, or inventions. This is not to say that trustees were necessarily opposed to the other qualities in teachers, but rather that there was no reason to focus exclusively on intellectuality.

Further, there must have existed something approaching an implicit oath of loyalty to the ideals and attitudes the institution was established to preserve. Certainly the notion of academic freedom as a protection for teachers in their search for truth would not have been advanced in most nineteenth-century universities. This is not to say that scientists would not have been concerned to protect their objectivity and integrity, but science was not the kingpin of the universities then.

Clearly, if universities were to function efficiently as the means by which donors “produced” attitudes for a certain set of students, it was necessary to avoid a competitive market situation. This could only be guaranteed if the education was offered at a “bargain” price; that is, below full cost. If schools began to cover all costs by tuition, students or their parents would {156} have been converted into “consumers” and would have exercised normal market controls over competing sellers. Only by maintaining the form of a nonprofit institution subsidizing, as it were, the students who could take advantage of the program could the donors continue to control the substance of what was taught, who taught it, and to whom it was taught. Thus, there were no “consumers” who could be sovereign, since no school was established to “sell” its product on a competitive, businesslike basis.

This pattern, which probably predominated in the late nineteenth century, generated much of the popular image of universities. The col-

lege graduate had not only an education but also a certain social status that others aspired to. But it was not a potential for high income resulting from education that gave him this status; on the contrary, this status was proof that he had “already arrived,” socially and financially.

In passing, we might note what this pattern would probably dictate for the behavior of college administrators. Presidents would be selected by the trustees to carry out their bidding on all aspects of educational policy. There would be no other constituency to which college administrators would even think of answering. Disapproval by the faculty or students of administrative actions could only influence the administrator if the actions were also disapproved of by the trustees.

All in all, then, there was a fairly neat package, in which university donors caused the kind of education they wanted for certain students to be produced and the entire institution was managed to that end. While there was no consumer sovereignty on the part of the students or their parents, at least in the usual sense, there were likewise none of the problems we find in the modern university. The reason for problems today, as we shall see, is not that the organizational form adopted by founders of colleges was not appropriate then. It is, rather, that it is no longer appropriate to the changed attitudes about education.

New Influences

Probably the pattern just described could have gone on almost indefinitely. As vocational training became more desirable, and as larger numbers of people recognized that education was a good investment, proprietary schools of various sorts developed. At one time these probably predominated in the United States in such areas as medicine, law, dentistry, accounting, engineering, and other vocational areas. The story of the disappearance of those schools is an interesting chapter in itself, but not directly germane to the present paper. Typically, these schools declined because of governmentally imposed “standards,” which, in fact, were political devices to curtail competition for existing professionals. But the big change in American higher education patterns came with the expansion of state university systems, particularly after the Morrill Acts of 1862 and 1890. {157}

State universities probably illustrate nicely the thesis of Allen Wallis that government welfare programs are generally adopted only when

the need alleged is already being adequately served in the private sphere. The economic point of this is that only those already purchasing a particular service receive 100 percent of the value of the government's contribution. Anyone who was not already purchasing the service must value it at less than its market price; thus, he benefits less by the government's largess than the actual market consumer. The chances are pretty good that research would show political pressure for state universities to have come from the economic class that already realized the value of higher education for its children. Like all welfare programs, this one, too, was undoubtedly alleged to be for the welfare of the poor; that is, for those who could not "afford" college education for their children. In fact, as is true even today, the allocation of public funds to students in the form of university education usually represents a reallocation of wealth from the relatively poor to the relatively more affluent.

There were significant educational effects that flowed directly from the introduction on a large scale of political forces into the world of higher education. Though the children of wealthier parents gained the advantage of this subsidized education, it is also true that there ceased to be any guiding purpose for these institutions. Especially with the constitutional inhibitions on religious training, the goal of state-operated universities became a matter of considerable uncertainty. We know, of course, that the tradition of liberal arts education survived in considerable measure. More important, as schools came to be thought of as places where one learned a vocation, political pressures pushed schools toward the more "practical" programs, ones designed to help students earn a living. Even today, the tradition of humane letters and liberal arts is felt more strongly in the private universities than the public ones. No longer does the provider of funds, now the taxpayer, have much opportunity to exercise control over the educational program offered. So long as state universities do not interfere with the interests of the politicians responsible for channeling public funds into the ventures, things go smoothly. But if politically unpopular activities become too prevalent, the government must respond.

With the advent of the public university, a great deal of the support that had formerly gone for private universities disappeared. Competition for students became much more keen, as few parents could afford

to forgo the implicit subsidy of the low-tuition state university. And very important for the analysis to follow, the demand for teachers became much greater. Since the state universities could not politically or legally hold to a particular religious or cultural standard, instructors began to be selected from religious and socioeconomic groups which were not regularly considered previously. These individuals, of course, could not necessarily be expected to feel a {158} loyalty to a different culture. Thus, the attitudes prevalent on campuses began to undergo a radical shift, if for no other reason than that they became neutral or positivist, rather than religiously oriented or culturally directed.

Other important influences on the modern university are strictly twentieth-century developments. First among these would be high personal income tax rates, with contributions to nonprofit universities or foundations deductible from gross income. This had the effect of lowering the “price” of charity, thus increasing the amount of utility “purchased” through charitable contributions. This increase in contributions might have generated more of the kind of control traditional donors exercised over universities, but, by and large, it was too late. No longer could a donor “purchase” anything but the satisfactions afforded by his contributions to education as directed by others. Only in rare instances and for very large sums could he impose his will on the object of his charity. This might not be true of the modern foundation, which, on occasion, may make very large contributions. By and large, however, the foundations have avoided giving any positive direction to universities, while they have certainly done almost nothing to counteract economic and political biases of most of them. In effect, then, both individual and foundation donations have probably tended merely to strengthen the pattern which has developed in the universities for other reasons.

Recent years have also seen a tremendous increase in the amount of government-sponsored research, as well as government contributions to private universities for buildings, salaries, and tuition. And, finally, the advent of large-scale private consulting, particularly by the science faculties, has probably had a significant influence on the behavior of academics.

The effect of most of these new influences has tended in the same direction. Trustees and other individual sources of funds who might

have tried to direct the policies or values of universities are simply not as important to administrators and faculties as they originally were. As competition has driven the real income of faculties higher, the faculties have also discovered that a nonprofit institution allows them to take part of their gain in various nontaxable forms, like more leisure time or time for research on a personally preferred topic. Furthermore, as government foundations increased in financial importance relative to individual donors—at least for many of the specific things that individual faculty members wanted—it became more and more difficult for trustees to influence faculties at all. And as outside consulting and research became readily available for academics, this, too, tended to loosen the financial hold of donors and trustees.

There is no longer any way for trustees to keep faculty members “in line.” There is not even a “line” for trustees, as such, at all. Their interest {159} in serving has become only the kite weak reed of community status or prestige. Instead of being directed by trustees, the modern private university has become “democratized,” with an almost total loss of trustee control over student admissions, faculty hiring, and curriculum.

Behavior of University Functionaries

The Trustees

The most significant characteristic of the modern university trustee is his almost total lack of real interest in exercising any authority. He could hardly feel a real personal responsibility for the “values of western civilization” or whatever amorphous goal he might talk about at annual dinners. He does not have any feeling, certainly, for the question of who, generally, should be admitted to receive the school’s subsidy in the form of lower-than-full-cost tuition. This right was given up long ago, as American society culturally forbade the older, restrictive standards and as the faculty, the only group with a real interest in selecting students, took over the task.

Somewhat similarly, the trustees have no power whatever to determine what views will be taught in universities. There are still denominational schools where this is not completely true, but, save these, the modern notion of “academic freedom” has given the faculty effective power over subject matter in the university and its curriculum. Partic-

ularly in very technical fields, this was said to have represented merely the trustees' deferring to the expertise of the faculty. But what that indicates is that the trustees had nothing significant to gain by exercising this power; therefore, it was no great loss to give it up to teachers who have something to gain by it, as we shall see.

While it might be possible for one very wealthy individual to organize a university along certain lines, it would be extremely difficult for anyone to influence an existing institution by the use of donations. First of all, professional associations of teachers and accrediting agencies have removed some of the power to deal with that group. Secondly, laws now exist that forbid certain types of discrimination in the selection of students and faculty. Finally, even a very large donation to an existing institution does not give the donor any legal power of disposition over preexisting funds.

There is always a board of trustees that operates as a self-perpetuating oligarchy. Even though an individual may "buy" his way onto such a board, he will still be one among many. This is not to say that in some instances wealthy individuals have not exercised considerable influence over an entire board of trustees, which in turn actually gave some direction to the university. Normally, however, this would require a rather unusual set of circumstances, including a top administrator committed to the goals of this individual.

Any prestige left to the position of university trustee no longer comes {160} from the power the position carries. No longer are these favors that can be allocated to one's friends. Such prestige as there is today comes only from the traditional prestige of the office and certainly not from fighting for any particular ideology or standard. Although the trustees are still expected to assist in fundraising for the university, it is largely on the same basis as they would assist in fundraising for the local art gallery, orchestra, or museum. It is just that the university is usually larger and still carries greater prestige than other community activities. But it is doubtful whether, in years to come, the relative status position of universities' trustees will be much higher than that of any other comparable-sized eleemosynary institutions' trustees.

The last sporadic fights for the vestiges of control left in the hands of trustees are now being waged. These fights may frequently result in

great losses of time, in embarrassment, or in unfavorable publicity for members of boards of trustees. These have become new “costs” of being a trustee. Consequently, we should anticipate that, in future years, there will be some lessened willingness on the part of prominent individuals to assume the risk of serving on a university board. Thus, trustees’ power will shrink even more.

This is a rather bleak forecast for the future of boards of trustees of universities; in fact, that group seems well on its way to complete impotence. Since universities and faculties have developed independent sources of funds, there is not the compulsion that used to exist to appoint affluent trustees. In fact, the composition of these boards is already changing, as we find students, teachers, and even employees serving on the boards. It must be acknowledged, however, that for most schools there is still some concern with the flow of funds from trustees and their friends. Where that factor is still important, the college board tends to exercise more control of university policy. Probably this degree of control will never completely disappear.

The legal form of trustee “ownership” of the university is a fairly efficient one, and it has the added advantage of familiarity. Like the English monarchy, it would probably change only if the trustees actually tried again really to control academic policy. And that does not seem very likely, since there is really very little for them to gain by the exercise of such power. All indications are that the sterilization of boards of trustees will continue, with occasional signs of life here and there, usually based on an unusually strong individual personality. But these will be like comets that flash brilliantly for a while and then disappear.

The Administration

When we refer to the administration, we generally mean the top administrative executive, here called the president. Not surprisingly, the general {161} style and character of a university president will reflect the real power interests within the institution. That is, he will be selected on the basis of characteristics that please those individuals actually exercising the selection power.

It should be possible, therefore, to make some accurate deductions about the characteristics that will be demanded under different selection-power arrangements. Thus, in the goal-directed, traditional uni-

versities, presidents were probably subservient to an active and powerful Board of Trustees. We would not expect such individuals to be selected for, or show, qualities of imagination, competitiveness, and innovation. Only as trustees delegated part of their managerial power to the president do we find imposing figures like Nicholas Murray Butler at Columbia or William Rainey Harper at Chicago. Unquestionably, such appointments reflected a true dedication on the part of trustees to creating an institution of very high academic standing.

But the much more significant change in preferred characteristics of college presidents came as the real decision-making power shifted from the trustees to the faculty. Whereas, in an earlier era, the trustees may have wanted simply a supply-and-personnel manager, the interest of faculties was a different kind of president. Perhaps first and foremost they were interested in a fundraiser. He was not supposed to bring his personal influence to bear on issues of educational policy. He was simply supposed to keep the money flowing in from outside sources.

Thus, as the main source of funds began to shift from individuals to large foundations and government, the interest of presidential selection committees shifted to individuals with political know-how or good contacts in the government and foundation worlds. Recently, as money matters have seemed to take a back seat to the explosive issue of campus violence, the search has been for men best suited for resolving disputes and mediating between contending factions. Thus, it is no accident that Duke, Case Western, and Harvard have in the past year tapped the deans of their law schools as top university administrators. But this is probably only temporary. As the violence dies down, faculties will again recognize that the president is the key man for raising funds, and probably the earlier presidential recruiting pattern will reappear.

None of this is to suggest that in some simpleminded fashion the committee of trustees that used to select presidents is now a committee of tenured professors. As we shall see, the traditional form in universities has been maintained, while the real power has shifted. In the case of presidential selection, it is largely a matter of trustees having no interests that they feel need to be protected or furthered by the selection of an individual dedicated to those interests. The faculty, however, address themselves to amorphous but generally accepted standards like

“a man {162} of high academic reputation” or “someone prominent in the university world” to guarantee that the man selected is, in fact, dedicated to the kind of university that faculties want.

University presidents today have almost no authorized discretionary power over academic matters like faculty selection and course content. They can, however, still wield some influence by tactical use of their power over budget matters. A strong president, with trustee support, can use the budget as a lever to gain some academic policy ends. But actually, in crucial areas like personnel selection and course content, few presidents really have any preferences contrary to those of the faculties.

A skilled president can still make matters uncomfortable for professors who are personally obnoxious to him, but even that power must be used sparingly, since faculties today understand the techniques necessary to force a president to resign. If enough trustees are made uncomfortable or embarrassed by complaints rightly or wrongly aired by the faculty about the president, most trustees will probably take the easy way out. Since trustees usually have no great interest in the doctrinal aspects of the dispute between the president and the faculty, their best strategy is generally to capitulate in a face-saving way to the faculty. In the last few years we have seen numerous examples of precisely this process. Cornell is probably the most notable.

All of this is not to say that a university president is a eunuch simply there to do the faculty's bidding. The principal point is that it requires a very different personality to serve a goal-directed board of trustees than it does to serve an amorphous, ill-directed power group like a university faculty. But it is the latter that most presidents must serve today in order to survive.

The publicity given to university disruptions in recent years generally suggested that there was a power struggle going on, with the faculty and students on one side arrayed against the administration on the other. The trustees were normally depicted as sitting on the sidelines or else grudgingly intervening only when the situation had become hopeless. But that is not what the real struggle was. What we have been witnessing is simply one of the last battles in the conflict between faculties and trustees for control of universities. The ultimate conclusion of this struggle is already foregone, and these are mainly mopping-up opera-

tions by the faculties. The students' interest, apart from the fact that they were largely manipulated by the faculties, seems to have been mainly in having a good time.

In this struggle the administration frequently served as a scapegoat, though just as often it operated as a shield or a battering ram for the faculty in dealing with the trustees. Only in the few unusual cases of presidents with strong views and a strong personality was the president {163} a significant force in this power struggle. Not unexpectedly, then, he felt an obligation to protect the power position of the trustees and, indeed, to protect the integrity of the trustees themselves. But, unless the board itself is highly unusual, the faculty need only bide its time until it can select a president who will behave as it wishes.

The Faculty

So much has been said about the economics of faculty behavior that very little that is new can be added here. Professors Rogge and Alchian have both pointed out many of the circumstances that flow from less-than-full-cost tuition, and James Buchanan has shown how the university provides insulation between the economic force of the buyers (students) and the producers (faculty) so that no normal market response to demand is likely. It is, indeed, a topsy-turvy world in which grown men actually receive great powers with no responsibility for how they are wielded and large rewards without having to produce anything in return.

As we saw earlier, the development of American universities can be viewed as a transition from an arrangement in which trustees or donors, in effect, purchased an economic good to one in which we think of students as purchasers of a different economic good. The trustees established certain arrangements for the allocation of the educational goods it was in their power to distribute. The thing that has now changed so radically is the trustees' ability to secure any personal satisfaction or gain from the power to allocate this good. Since they could no longer guarantee that the kind of education they were offering certain students would be accepted by the students, they had less incentive to "buy" this right. But the power to make this allocation did not disappear as a result of the trustees' loss of interest in allocating in a particular way. Faculties developed real interests in exercising this power, and it was a simple matter for the faculty to move in the power

vacuum created by the trustees' loss of interest, since no one else offered any objective standards for selection of students.

It was, of course, very much in the interest of faculties to select the most intelligent and intellectual students they could for admission to the university. In the first place, these students were simply more enjoyable to teach. Related to this is the fact that outside sources of funds are always available to a school that has a "good reputation." Since academic reputation came to be based on the quality of students, a strong incentive was built into the system to secure as good students as possible, since this, in turn, meant a greater claim on public or private funds.

In a slightly different vein, the faculty preferred intellectual students to make their own work easier. Frequently, this simply meant that inexpensive or free research assistance was readily available to the teacher. Related, but probably more important, was the fact that better students {164} frequently became teachers; they could thus carry their own professors' fame with them. This last point, of course, is more relevant for graduate students than undergraduates, but it was all part of the intellectualization of universities.

There is another reason, too, why this demand for intelligent students developed. As faculties ceased to be selected on the basis of commitment to either religious or cultural ideals, some other objective standards for discriminating between those to be hired and those who were not to be hired was necessary. Camaraderie, similarity of outlook, friendships all played a role in this, but they cannot be the announced and avowed criteria for selection. Only one possible criterion suggests itself, that of intelligence and scholarly accomplishment. The race for senior professorships became, in effect, a race to produce the most highly regarded scholarly works. This, in turn, created a value system permeating the entire university. As Professor Tonsor has pointed out, this may have very little to do with the search for objective truth in most areas of scholarship, but it did tend to put a premium on certain intellectual characteristics, not the least of which were high IQ, verbal facility, and an ability to copy and regurgitate the works of others in the profession without seeming to plagiarize them. Quite clearly, if professors were to act as if they honestly believed in the standard of intellectualism, they must extend this to the selection of students as well. One

wonders at times, however, how many would not have preferred to select only pretty girls if other constraints were not present.

In recent years we have witnessed a somewhat strange phenomenon. Faculties have insisted on the selection of black students for admission to college exclusively on the basis of color and regardless of their lack of the usual intellectual achievements. Part of the reason for this departure from direct self-interest may have been the money available from government and other sources for black student programs. For the most part, however, the professors were simply following their own inclinations, since there seemed to be no cost to them in doing so. But it is interesting to notice what is now happening. The expansion of outside funds has stopped, and there have actually been cutbacks. Those individuals who wished to establish desirable positions for themselves have already done so, and the rest find that they receive little satisfaction any longer from the issue. Furthermore, the black students who are ill equipped for the work they confront demand a great deal more time and effort than the faculties originally contemplated. Interest is clearly beginning to wane in special programs for black students, and the next few years will probably witness, under various rationalizations, a return to the standard of scholastic ability as the near-exclusive criterion for admission, other than payment of tuition. The cost of this episode will be a small generation of very peculiarly educated {165} black students convinced of the hypocrisy of a white university world that did not live up to its promises.

There is one other odd aspect to the policy decision that has been made to allocate the available educational subsidy to the more intelligent. Since local and federal taxes underwrite the cost of education to a significant degree, the universities are involved in a peculiar reallocation of wealth, in this case from the relatively less intelligent to the relatively more intelligent. That this is probably undesirable public policy goes without saying, but the rationalizations and dogma of intellectualism run very deep.

Although the change in desired characteristics for students has been one of the most significant results of the shift in authority from trustees to faculty, other aspects of the shift have been written about more frequently. Probably no other has received quite the attention given to the professors' single-minded interest in not teaching. The light teaching

load has become almost the stock joke among university faculties today. And, of course, the principal device for attracting a “star” has long been the promise of little or no teaching. Undoubtedly, this reflects to a considerable extent the greater payoff to professors from research and consulting, but the significant thing is that there is no meaningful way of rewarding a professor for more or better teaching, and thus competing for the time he spends on other pursuits. This, of course, was not the case when trustees took responsibility for running universities; it is, rather, one of the direct results of the shift to faculty power. Only if someone has a direct interest, financial or otherwise, in transmitting knowledge to students will there be any increase in the incentive to teach. At this time, the incentives are very small, if not actually negative.

The same idea runs throughout other administrative policies in faculty-run institutions. The faculties argue that these matters are not really their responsibility, since they do not exercise university-wide authority. That is true. But it is also true that the aspects of university life that most affect students educationally come through the academic departments, and here the faculties reign supreme. We find, for instance, that the list of courses offered in a department will strongly reflect the individual, and often very peculiar, interests of the faculty and not, in any degree, the interests of the students. Graduate students will naturally be preferred to undergraduates, and gradually budgets and programs will be shaped to that end. The policy of the department and the university must be very liberal with regard to leaves of absence and consulting. And, of course, the faculty must not be asked to spend much time out of class with undergraduates. Signs on faculty doors like “Office hours—Wednesday, 2-3 P.M.” are not uncommon. They are outdone only by signs reading “Office hours—by appointment only.”

Another more serious consequence of faculty control of universities {166} develops in the area of faculty hiring. Again we can draw on some of the economic behavioral theories of Armen Alchian to set the general framework for this discussion. Basically, faculty members making decisions about hiring colleagues are subject to almost no competitive market constraints. Like the public utility manager who cannot take home all the earnings he might be able to produce for the company, the faculty, too, tries to maximize its self-interest at the office. As

a result, tenured faculty will inevitably look for young professors who (a) will not disrupt the department and (b) have views that seem reasonable to the senior people. Given the proclivity for personality fights sometimes to follow doctrinal lines, these two may not even be very different, but, in any event, for present purposes, the second is the more interesting.

The problem for tenured professors considering a new man is to find out what his real views are. By and large, fairly safe guesses can be made. Actually, little attention is paid to other than the appearance, the personality, and perhaps the level of intellect of a candidate for a teaching position. Much more important is the recommendation given him by a senior professor under whom he has done his doctoral research. Since the views of that individual will almost certainly be widely known, it can be safely assumed that any graduate student he strongly recommends will have substantially the same point of view. Graduate students who understand this process ingratiate themselves with their senior professors by never advancing views fundamentally contrary to those of the older man.

This process almost guarantees a kind of monolithic uniformity of viewpoints, at least in those academic areas where complete objectivity is not possible (and perhaps even in the hard sciences where this objectivity is claimed). An open market for varying points of view would mean that varying views would be publicized and schools selected by students on the basis of their preference. At any given moment, the professors already in teaching have little incentive to create this kind of competition. It would, of course, almost automatically result if schools were generally profit-oriented, competitive firms. It should be noted that there are some exceptions to the generalization about monolithic viewpoints. An economics department like that of the University of Chicago or the political science department at the University of Rochester does attract students because of the publicized point of view of these departments, but such “sports” are rare.

Since a professor competes for a higher salary from universities rather than for a higher payment from students, faculty members tend to write for the former audience and to hold views that will not cause them to lose professional status. This further reinforces the pressures for a single point of view to be popular at any given moment in all

departments in all universities within a given discipline. Change in this general viewpoint can {167} come only very slowly, much in the style of changes in taste in the arts. Thus, if a radical point of view becomes popular in a field, then, regardless of its merits and its lack of popularity in the world at large, it becomes nearly impossible to root it out or even to challenge it from within the university. Almost every area of the social sciences and humanities reflects the process just described.

The Students

The role of graduate students has been sufficiently explored in connection with the question of faculty appointments. But the position of undergraduates still deserves some additional consideration. Though the more vocal of these students may talk about the “reactionary” trustees and the “fascist” administration, the real truth is that among the various participants in the university community, the only real and significant conflict of interest exists between the faculty and the undergraduate students. Each of these groups wants more of exactly the same thing, and that is the faculty’s time. Students want smaller classes, more courses, more liberal faculty office hours, and more individual conferences. The faculties avoid these things as much as they can.

As has been well described, particularly by James Buchanan, there is really no way that students can make their demands felt in this non-profit environment. Those who make decisions in universities cannot profit personally by operating the university in the educational interests of students. The result, therefore, is from the students’ point of view an appalling disregard of their wishes. A lot of what passes as modern permissiveness at the university level would more accurately be characterized as utter disinterest.

There are two principal factors that have prevented students from more effectively revolting against this monolithic system. One, obviously, was the draft, but the repeal of the college students’ exemption removed that circumstance. The other is much more complicated. In many occupations, there is simply no way to secure the necessary government licensing without showing compliance with certain educational prerequisites. This is true of such popular fields as medicine, law, teaching, architecture, and many others. Obviously, many students do not realize why they are in a lockstep from high school to college to a professional school, and they probably see this simply as an initiation

rite that our culture requires of its young. That they do not particularly care for it is clear from the variety of suggestions students make for varying their educational fare. Unfortunately, the one appropriate suggestion, forcing universities to compete for the students' favor, is unthinkable to them, since they have been so carefully taught through high school and college that that form of competition is evil and immoral.

THE POLITICAL STATE AS A TEACHER OF MORALITY

Zach Montgomery

This article first appeared as chapters 11 and 13 of Montgomery's book, *Poison Drops in the Federal Senate: The School Question* (1886). A reprint of the book is available from St. Thomas Press, P.O. Box 35096, Houston, TX 77035.

Section 1702 of our California School Law provides, among other things, that "*It shall be the duty of all teachers to impress upon the minds of the pupils the principles of morality.*"

But just here the question arises, "What is morality?" And how is a teacher to know what it is that he or she is required to teach in order to comply with this requirement of the statute?

The immortal Washington has said: "*Let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion.*" But if morality cannot be maintained without religion, then how is it possible, we would inquire, for the teacher to inculcate the principles of morality without inculcating the principles of religion? But the principles of religion are understood by the Jews differently from what they are by the Christians, and by the Roman Catholics differently from what they are by the Protestants, by the Episcopalians differently from what they are by the Presbyterians, by the Presbyterians differently from what they are by the Unitarians, and by those who reject the authority of both the Old and New Testaments differently from what they are by either Jews or Christians of any denomination whatever.

Then how is it possible for the State to require the teaching of morals in the public schools without requiring as the basis of such teaching the inculcation of religious principles, such as are necessarily antagonistic to the conscientious convictions of the parents of at least a portion of the children attending these schools? It is true we hear a great deal about the "*broad principles of common morality*" and of a common religion, but we have never yet had the good fortune to find anybody who

was able to give a definition of this common morality or common religion to the perfect satisfaction of anyone, except perhaps the self-conceited author of such definition.

A certain professor of our State Normal School, to whom we not long ago addressed an open letter (which, by the way, we believe has never {169} been answered), in an address of his which was published in the May number of the *Defender*, 1881, took the ground that “the ethics of the Ten Commandments and of the Sermon on the Mount are as absolutely unsectarian as the law of gravitation.” Now to assume that the Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount are absolutely unsectarian is to assume that people of all religious sects or denominations, as well as all nonreligionists, understand them in the same sense, and accept them as coming with the same authority and having the same binding force.

But is it true that people of all religious denominations, as well as non-religionists, do understand either the Ten Commandments or the Sermon on the Mount in the same sense, or as coming with the same authority, or as having the same binding force? We say no! Most emphatically no. Waiving the differences in the various translations of these important parts of the Bible, we shall proceed at once to consider some of the various and conflicting beliefs which have been made to rest for their foundation either upon those Ten Commandments or upon the Sermon on the Mount. Take, for example, the commandment, “Remember thou keep holy the Sabbath day,” and we find even Christians differing widely as to whether under the Christian dispensation the keeping holy of Sunday is a sufficient compliance with the requirements of that commandment. As an illustration of this fact we may remark that the leading printing and publishing house of Oakland, and in fact one of the foremost establishments of its kind on the Pacific coast, is owned and run by an association of Christians who would conscientiously regard it as a sin to do unnecessary work on a Saturday; and we all know that pretty much our entire Jewish population entertain a similar belief. But not only do our people differ as to the particular day which is required by the above commandment to be kept holy, but they differ also as to the proper mode of keeping it holy. Thus, the Catholic believes that unless released from the obligation by some lawful excuse, such as distance, sickness, or the like, he should

sanctify Sunday, in part at least, by assisting at mass, while other Christian denominations recognize no such obligation. Some Christians believe it sinful to engage in hunting, fishing, or almost any kind of amusement on Sunday, while others, equally conscientious, regard these pastimes as harmless. Then, again, a large number of people disbelieve in both the Old and New Testaments, and consequently do not look upon the commandment to keep holy the Sabbath day as having any binding force. We here state these different views with reference to the above-quoted commandment, not for the purpose of discussing the question as to which are right and which are wrong, but for the purpose of showing that such differences exist; and in view of the fact that they do exist, we maintain that it is impossible for the public-school teacher to teach said commandment according to any of said views without violating Section 1672 of our public school law, which {170} declares that "no sectarian or denominational doctrine must be taught therein." Perhaps we shall be told that the commandments should be taught just in the words in which we find them, without interpretation or comment.

But let us see for a moment how this would work. Here is a ten-year-old boy, we will suppose, who has just read from his Bible the command, "Remember thou keep holy the Sabbath day." The boy being naturally of an inquiring mind, turns to his teacher and asks the very natural question, "What is the Sabbath day?" What ought the teacher under such circumstances to say? Ought he to say, I don't know; or, I am not allowed to tell you, because to tell you would be sectarian teaching? To such an answer, the boy in his own mind would probably reply, "Of what earthly use is this command to keep holy the Sabbath day, if I am not to know what the Sabbath day is?" And suppose that the boy, still pressing his inquiry, asks the further question, "In what way am I to keep the Sabbath day holy? What is it necessary to do, and what necessary to abstain from doing in order to obey this commandment?" Must the teacher again reply, "I am not allowed to tell you."

If anything in the world is calculated to bring both the teacher and the Bible into ridicule, we think that such a teaching as this would surely accomplish that result.

We do not propose in this connection to discuss the question as to the State's right to enact and enforce Sunday laws; but we may remark

in passing that it appears to us as if legislation in that direction ought to be limited to the enactment of such laws as have for their object the protection of citizens in the uninterrupted discharge of what they believe to be their religious duties, and not such as may be designed to compel an observance of the Sunday in any particular manner for the spiritual welfare of those thus compelled. We think there would be but little merit in a man's attending church on a Sunday, not for the love of God, but for the love of the *money* which he might have to pay as a fine for his failure to attend. Persecutions against conscience may make hypocrites, but never genuine converts to the doctrines thus sought to be enforced.

With reference to the Sermon on the Mount, its different interpretations are no more harmonious than are those of the commandment referred to. Even people professing themselves Christians differ widely as to whether that sermon was a divine or only a human utterance. The Unitarians, for example, not believing in the divinity of Christ, only look upon that sermon as a human production, while other Christian denominations accept its every word as the infallible teaching of infinite wisdom; so that the teacher cannot undertake to tell his pupil in the public school, after reading to him that sermon, whether he is to accept it as the word of God or only as the word of a man, without again invading the realms of denominational teaching. And all will admit that there is an infinite difference between the {171} weight to be attached to the language of an All-wise God and even the wisest utterances of a mere man when giving expression to the deductions of his own finite and feeble reason. Then, again, as it is with the interpretation of the commandments, so it is with the interpretation of the Sermon on the Mount. There are many passages in that sermon which are very differently construed by people of different religious denominations. For example, it is there said, "Ye have heard that it was said to them of old, Thou shalt not forswear thyself, but shall perform unto the Lord thine oaths; but I say unto you, Swear not at all." This passage is by many very conscientious people interpreted as prohibiting an oath as a witness or otherwise, and hence they never swear, even in our courts of justice, but affirm.

Again, it is said in the Sermon on the Mount, as read in the Douay Bible, "If thy right eye scandalize thee, (or as the new version has it,

‘cause thee to stumble,’) pluck it out and cast it from thee, for it is expedient for thee that one of thy members should perish, rather than that thy whole body go into hell.” Now suppose that some public school teacher, when reading or having read this passage to his pupils, should be asked the question, “What is the meaning of hell?” what answer could he give which would not be sectarian or denominational in its character? How could he so frame a definition of the word “hell” as to make it acceptable both to the Universalist and the Presbyterian, or the Roman Catholic?

In this same sermon it is said, “When thou fastest, anoint thy head and wash thy face that thou appear not to men to fast, but to thy Father, who is in secret, and thy Father who seeth in secret will repay thee.” Now, if the public school teacher were asked by a pupil whether this passage was to be taken as a Divine authority for the practice of fasting, how could he answer this question without again violating that section of the Code which forbids all sectarian or denominational teachings in the public schools?

Again, Christians of some denominations interpret the Sermon on the Mount as authorizing the absolute dissolution, by divorce, of the valid bonds of matrimony for certain causes, so as to allow one of the divorced parties to marry again during the life of the other, while other Christians maintain that all such second marriages during the lives of both the divorced parties are, morally speaking, invalid and wrong.

Indeed, it would require a volume to point out all the different interpretations which have been placed upon the Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount. How, then, is it possible to teach even these portions of the Bible in the public schools without teaching sectarian or denominational doctrine? It certainly would not be called *teaching* in any *other* educational institution in the wide world (except it be an American public school) to simply cause the pupil to pronounce, like a trained parrot, a {172} certain form of words and at the same time refuse to tell him the meaning of those words.

Our conclusions, then, are these, namely: First, that Washington was right, when he said, “Let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion.” Second, that the State cannot teach morality without teaching religion as its foundation. Third, that the State cannot teach either morality or religion without

either establishing a new religious denomination, or else teaching it as it is taught by some of the existing denominations. Fourth, that the State can neither teach religion as it is now taught by any existing denomination, nor as it might be taught by a State-begotten denomination, without a fatal infringement upon the doctrine of religious liberty; and that, therefore, the true and proper business of the State is not to teach nor pay for teaching either morality or religion, but to foster and encourage the teaching of both, by carefully and scrupulously guarding and protecting the equal rights of all citizens to worship God and to educate their children according to the dictates of their own consciences.

We say, let the State neither undertake to teach nor to pay for the teaching of morality or religion, because it is impossible to teach a State morality without teaching a State religion, and it is impossible to teach a State religion without the destruction of the religious liberty of the citizen. Should the State ever assume the burden of paying for religious teaching, its next step would logically be to assume the right to say what that religious teaching should be. It is in order to make it harmonize with the principles here asserted that the seventh proposition of our platform is so framed as to allow every parent, whose child is entitled to receive a secular education at public expense, to select the school wherein that secular education shall be given, so that if in obedience to conscience he elect so to do, the parent may without cost to the State secure for such child a moral and religious training at the same time that, at the State's expense, it is receiving its secular training.

In order to do this, we see no practical way, except to pay the teacher, not according to the *time* he is employed in teaching, but according to his success in imparting to his pupils secular knowledge—the only kind of knowledge for which (as we believe) the State can venture to pay without ultimate danger to the principles of religious liberty. We can see no more objection to the State's paying a religious teacher according to results for imparting secular knowledge to a child which has to be educated at public expense than there would be in its paying a religious stonecutter by the job for dressing a certain quantity of building stone to be used in the erection of a public building.

If two stonecutters are working by the piece for the Government, and one of them works and curses, while the other works and prays, we can

{173} see no good reason why the man who prays should get less pay for his work than does the man who curses, for work of precisely the same quality and quantity. So, likewise, if there be two teachers working by the job for the Government in the business of teaching children to read, write, and cipher, and if one of them should teach Tom Paine's "Age of Reason" as a reading book, scoff at everything which Christians regard as sacred, and finally complete his work by turning over to the State a score of infidel scholars, perfect in reading, writing, and arithmetic, while the other uses the Bible as a class reader, speaks reverently of God and religion, and eventually graduates from his school some twenty Christian gentlemen, perfect masters of the three R's, would there be any good reason why the first-named teacher should be paid for his secular teaching and the other get nothing for his?

In the cases supposed, we would ask the State to pay nothing for inculcating the principles of Tom Paine, and nothing for teaching the doctrines of the Bible, but in each case we would have the teacher paid for teaching his pupils how to read without regard to the fact that in one case they had used Paine's "Age of Reason," and in the other case the Bible as a class-book. And we would do this, not because we claim that there is any comparison between the writings of Tom Paine and the Bible, but because we are opposed to having the State step between the parent and the child in a matter of so much importance as that which concerns the child's education touching religious subjects.

If we recognize the State in its political capacity as having the right to decide for us and for our children as to the relative merits of the Bible and Tom Paine's "Age of Reason" as class-books, we virtually agree to stand by its decision; and for a Christian to agree to stand by its decision would, in effect, be to agree to apostatize from his faith whenever the State demands such a sacrifice.

To reiterate our position, the principle for which we are contending is not that the political State ought to enforce the teaching of some particular kind of religion, or any religion at all, but that it ought to leave parents perfectly free to obey the dictates of their own consciences in that regard.

It has sometimes been suggested that the plan we propose might enable the teacher to proselytize his pupils to his own faith against the will and consciences of their parents. To this suggestion we reply that

one of the very strongest arguments in favor of this plan is that it would place in the hands of the parents of each child the very best possible safeguard against such proselytizing. The safeguard to which we allude is found in the fact that, upon the very first intimation of any such proselytizing, the parent could and would withdraw his child from school and thereby diminish the teacher's pay. In that regard the proposed system would be infinitely superior to the present one; for it is a well-known fact that, notwithstanding {174} the statutory law forbidding the teaching of sectarian doctrines in the public schools, yet whenever the teachers, the school directors, and a majority of the public in any given locality have a leaning in favor of or against any given sect, that fact is pretty sure to make itself felt in the public school-room, either in the books used or the instruction given. Under such circumstances, the teacher has everything to gain and nothing to lose by overriding the law and the rights of those belonging to the unpopular creed, in obedience to the wishes of the more popular sect, at whose will and pleasure he holds his position and draws his salary. Under the plan which we propose, the teacher or principal of each school, being master of his own time and the author and architect of his own discipline, could easily adjust matters in such a way as to give moral and religious instructions to the children of such parents as might so desire without any encroachment upon either the time or the religious prerogatives of pupils belonging to a different faith or to no faith at all.

In proof of this we need but to look around us right here in the cities of Oakland and San Francisco, where there are scores of private schools being taught, in some instances by Presbyterians, in others by Congregationalists, in others by Methodists, in others by Roman Catholics, etc., and in pretty nearly, if not quite, all of these schools there are pupils whose parents belong some to one creed and some to another, and some to no creed whatever, and there are classes in which denominational doctrines are taught to those children whose parents desire it without the least interference with others whose parents are of a different way of thinking.

We frequently hear of troubles and contentions in the public schools, though pretendedly nonsectarian, because of the sectarian teachings therein practised, in defiance both of the statutory law and of the rights

of parents and children, while in schools professedly denominational we seldom or never hear of any such complaint.

The reason for this difference is obvious. In the former case the teacher is not amenable to the parents of his pupils, but in the latter case he is.

We want no Board of Education, sitting in judgment, to determine whether certain teachings in the public schools are antagonistic to the faith of some of the parents whose children attend these schools. If parents themselves do not know what they religiously believe, we are at a loss to know how a board of politicians, called school directors, can inform them. We want no State standard for either morality or religion. If any one desires to see a specimen of State morals and State religion as taught by the State authority, let him read the recent proceedings of the California State prison investigating committee. In the course of those proceedings the fact was revealed that certain convicts, whose terms of penal service for crimes of which they stood convicted were about expiring, and against whom other criminal charges were awaiting trial in the courts, found in {175} their moral instructor a most willing, efficient adviser and assistant in their efforts to baffle the officers of the law, avoid rearrest, and thus defeat the ends of justice. Such is *State* morality, taught under *State* authority, and at the *State's* expense.

It must be clear to every thinking mind that the chief reason why the present anti-parental and crime-producing public school system has obtained so strong a hold upon the country is to be found in a want of united and harmonious action on the part of those who see and lament its pernicious influence over the rising generation, but differ as to the precise thing which constitutes the fundamental evil of the system, and consequently they equally differ as to what ought to be the remedy for said evil. For example: Many honest and conscientious people believe that the great wrong committed by the political State, through its public school system, consists in its prohibiting the reading of the Bible in the public schools, while many others, equally conscientious and equally opposed to the present system, believe that the State is right in forbidding the use of the Bible in the schools, but that it is wrong in allowing "Johnson's Cyclopaedia" and certain other books, believed to have either a sectarian or a partisan bias, to be taught in these schools. Still another class objects to the system because of the immoral or

incompetent character of many of its teachers, or because of the objectionable methods of teaching in use in its schools, or because of the commingling of the sexes, or for other kindred reasons.

But to our mind, the chief vice of the system lies in its usurpation of parental authority, and in attempting to do for each child, through political agencies, that which can be properly done by nobody else in the world, except by its own father and mother. We contend that this usurpation of parental authority by the political State is the main trunk out of which naturally grow the other evils just mentioned, and that, until this parent tree be rooted up, we shall never be able to rid our country of its poisonous branches, or their bitter and deadly fruits.

The question which we are discussing, and the question which we urge every intelligent citizen to consider, is not whether the Bible ought or ought not to be read in school; nor whether "Johnson's Cyclopaedia" is a proper book for school libraries; nor whether a particular class of teachers are or are not the best adapted to school work; nor whether the commingling of the sexes in the schools has a moralizing or a demoralizing tendency; nor whether the teaching of religion and the physical sciences ought or ought not to go hand in hand; nor whether good children, who have been carefully and morally trained at home, ought or ought not to be sent to the same school with the vicious and depraved, with the view of {176} reforming the latter. That there is a wide and an honest difference of opinion amongst the American people as to these questions no candid and intelligent citizen will deny. And accepting this honest difference of opinion as an existing *fact*, the question which we now propose to discuss is this: does it rightfully belong to the political State to determine these questions for parents and children, and to compel them to submit to its decision? If the political State has the right to decide these questions for parents, and to enforce obedience to its decisions, even as against their judgments and consciences, then it necessarily follows as a consequence that in all cases of conflict between the judgment of the political State on one side and the judgment of the parent on the other, touching any of the above-mentioned questions, it becomes the duty of the parent to subject his own judgment to the judgment of the State. For surely it cannot be claimed that, where the State has the right to command, the citizen has the right to disobey the command. But in cases of conflict between

his own conscientious judgment and the judgment of the State as to the fitness of teachers, or books, or school companions, etc., *can* the parent, without moral crime, subject his own judgment to that of the State?

Suppose, for example, the case of a strictly conscientious Protestant parent who, by the use of all the lights within his reach, has come to the conclusion that the constant presence and daily reading of the Bible in the school is one of the indispensable means of preserving the moral purity of his child; of protecting it against what he firmly believes are the dangerous and damnable doctrines of atheism; and of preparing it for a life of virtue, honor, and usefulness in this world, and a life of eternal happiness in the world to come; and suppose the political State, in the exercise of its judgment, forbids the Bible to be read in its schools: can such a parent, without crime, send his children to such schools, believing in his heart that by doing so he is preparing them for a life of sin and shame, and an eternity of woe? Be it remembered that we are not now discussing the question as to whether the Bible is or is not a necessary or a proper book for daily use in the schools, but we are discussing the proposition as to the State's jurisdiction to decide that question, and to enforce obedience to its decision as against the judgment and consciences of parents. If the political State has the legitimate power and the rightful jurisdiction to make a binding decision on this disputed question, then whichever way it decides the question—whether it be in favor of or against the use of the Bible in the schools—its decision must be equally binding. For the power to decide a disputed question, on condition that it be decided *one* particular way and no other, simply means no power to decide the question at all. Therefore, if the State has a rightful jurisdiction over this question, and should decide to teach the Bible in the schools, to the children of parents who do not believe in the Bible, such parents would have no right to complain. For {177} if the parental judgment and conscience are subordinate and ought to yield to the State's judgment and conscience, where would be the ground for complaint?

Again, if the State may rightfully, and without trenching upon the doctrine of religious liberty, *forbid* the teaching of the Bible in the schools, to the children of parents whose judgments and consciences demand such teaching, or may *enforce* the teaching of the Bible to the

children of those whose judgments and consciences are opposed thereto, it then follows, as a matter of course, that the State must have jurisdiction to decide as to which one of all the various versions and translations of the Bible is the correct one. In other words, it must have jurisdiction to determine which one of the various books known as the “BIBLE” is entitled to be called by that name. Not only that, but if the State can, without encroaching upon the just liberty of conscience, decide what book is *the* Bible, and then enforce the teaching of such Bible in the schools, against the judgments and consciences of the parents of the children who are so taught, it must also have jurisdiction to decide, as between conflicting interpretations, what is the *meaning* of the various texts of the Bible, for it would be as absurd and as barren of good results to simply teach the *words* of the Bible to a child, while leaving it in ignorance as to their signification, as it would be to teach the same child to repeat, in a parrot-like manner, the words of its arithmetic or of its grammar, while allowing it to grope in darkness as to the real scientific meaning which those words were intended to convey.

But if the State has the rightful jurisdiction to decide *pro* or *con* upon the authenticity of the Scriptures, and also to interpret them for its schools, and in defiance of the judgment and consciences of parents to teach the Scriptures, as it interprets them, to the rising generation, does not this of itself involve the right—within the limits of its educational domain—to establish a State religion? We can see no escape from an affirmative answer to this proposition. In other words, we maintain that it is impossible, logically, to justify our present anti-parental State-controlled educational system, without the maintenance of principles which would justify the political State in establishing, at public expense, a State church, and teaching to the rising generation a State religion, and compelling every child to learn and practise such teachings. If the true and just relations between the political State and its citizens are such that, in settling the question as to the *kind* of education that shall be given to the children of the latter, it is the right of the State to command and the duty of the parent to obey, then it follows that if we were citizens of some barbarous country, where the political State requires every child to learn and practice the doctrine of snake-worship, it would become our bounden duty to allow our children to be taught these vile and revolting doctrines.

Here again we insist upon its being borne in mind that we are not {178} discussing the question as to what kind or whether any religion *ought* or *ought not* to be taught to children; but we are only considering the question as to whether or not it rightfully belongs to the “political State” to determine that question, and in doing so, to override the judgments and consciences of the fathers and mothers of children.

It seems to us that, from the innermost depths of every human heart, not wholly dead to the noblest impulses of man’s nature, there rises up one spontaneous universal protest against this vile and monstrous usurpation of parental authority by the political State. And we firmly believe that the only thing necessary is that the people of this country, of all creeds and parties, be brought fairly and squarely face to face with this deadly foe to their liberties, so as to see the horrid monster in all its hideous deformity, and that they will then promptly stamp it out of existence. Therefore, in our humble opinion, the true and proper course to be pursued by the friends of educational reform is to keep prominently before the people as the fundamental, the vital issue, this question, namely: shall the parent or the political State determine for a child who shall be its teacher, its companions, and what books it shall or shall not study? Let all other issues be made subordinate to this. As long as we make our chief fight on the question of Bible or no Bible, religion or no religion, division of public school funds or no division, mixed or separate schools for girls and boys, and similar questions concerning which men will differ—and as things are, naturally and honestly differ—so long will there be contention and strife amongst the real friends of educational reform. Each of these contending factions is willing to see, and does see, the evils of an anti-parental system of education when that system strikes at his *own* rights, as he understands those rights; but is slow to see the same evils when they only affect the rights of his neighbors, who choose to exercise *their* rights in a manner different from himself.

This should not be so. If we expect the assistance of our neighbors in our struggles for our own parental rights, we must be willing to assist those neighbors in securing *theirs*. And we must not demand, as a condition precedent, that these neighbors shall agree to exercise their parental rights just as we do ours, because this would be as intolerant and oppressive, and as opposed to parental liberty, as is the present

public school system; or rather it would be simply a new application of the same system. It would simply be the taking of the martyred victim who is being roasted on one side, and turning the other side to the fire.

We must realize the fact that in union there is strength, and that we can only have union by being just and liberal towards each other. While standing firmly by our own rights and the rights of our children, we must realize and act upon the fact that our neighbors' rights and our neighbors' children are as dear to them as ours are to us. And however widely mistaken {179} we may believe our neighbors to be in *their* manner of educating their children, we should remember that it is not *our* business, nor our right, to force *our* views upon them any more than it is *their* business to force *their* views upon us. It is not for *their* children but for our *own* that we shall be called upon to render an account to that God who gave them.

If, then, we would work for *union* if we would work for success in the cause of educational liberty, let us lay aside all those side issues, which every parent should settle according to his own judgment and conscience, and let us raise aloft the broad banner of parental rights and equal educational liberty, without distinction of creed, party, or calling. Under this banner we *can* conquer; under any other I believe we shall surely fail.

RELIGION IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

A. A. Hodge

The New Princeton Review 3, no.1 (1887).

There is no question upon which there prevails more confusion of thought, and, consequently, difference of opinion among those fundamentally agreeing in principle, than that of the relation of religion to the education furnished by our public schools. It is agreed that the perpetuity of a free state necessarily requires the general education of the people. It is also agreed that no agency can so effectually secure this necessary end as a school system supported by public taxation and controlled by the state herself. But if the American principle of the absolute divorce of church and state be maintained, how can the state have any definite religious character? And, if not, how can it administer a system of education which embraces a religious element? Of all the conflicting systems of religion represented in the national population, how is it possible for the state to select one in order to embrace it in its educational system? If Christianity be adopted as the religion of the majority, shall it be in its Papal or in its Protestant form? How can it ever be equitable to take the money of even a small minority of Jews or infidels in order to disseminate a faith which they abhor? And, especially, how can it be endured that their children should be indoctrinated with the hated creed?

The infinite importance of this problem has hitherto failed to be appreciated by the mass of our Christian people, because the inevitable tendencies of our present system of public schools have been disguised during the period of imperfect development. In the East these schools have been kept under local control, in decidedly Christian communities of fixed traditions, and they have been supplemented and restrained by numerous Christian academies and colleges. But a very wide, profound, and silent change has been rapidly effected. The system has been developed in the newer states from the common school to the state university. In the East the system has been gradually cen-

tralized, and local schools have been conformed to the common rule of the State Boards of Control. Congress has been asked to assume the reins by the appropriation of millions for the supply of schools throughout the Southern States and the Territories, and by the erection of a National University. The entire literature provided has been laboriously purged from every theistic or Christian {181} reference. The school Readers of former times, as the *Columbian Orator*, published in Boston in 1797, the *New English Reader*, published in 1841, and the *McGuffey Readers*, so universally used in Ohio a generation ago, were full of extracts from the best Christian classics. These have been everywhere superseded by Readers embracing only secular, nonreligious matter. Doctor Guyot's Series of Geographies, the best in the market, was rejected by the School Board of Chicago, after a year's trial, because they recognized the existence of God. A Christian college president said to Reverend H. D. Jenkins, DD, "That is my *Political Economy*, prepared for use in high schools and academies. I sent it the other day to one of our State Superintendents of Education; but it was returned to me with the note that its first sentence condemned it for use in public schools." That first sentence was: "*The source of all wealth is the beneficence of God.*" For the first time in the world's history a complete literature is being generated from which all tincture of religion, whether natural or revealed, is expurgated, for the education of the youth of a whole nation.²⁶ "Non denominational" used to mean that which does not discriminate between the various Christian sects. Now it means that which does not discriminate between the sects of theists and atheists, of Christianity and of unbelief. A "nondenominational" college is a nonreligious college.

Under these problems, therefore, there lurks the most tremendous and most imminent danger to which the interests of our people will ever be exposed, in comparison with which the issues of slavery and of

26. Ex-President Theodore Woolsey, in his great work on *Political Science*, vol. 2, p. 414, asks urgently: "Shall it come to this, that not even the existence of the Supreme One is to be assumed in the schools, nor any book introduced which expresses any definite faith in regard to Providence or final causes?" And it has long since come to this that a minister of the Gospel has justified the state, inasmuch as he affirms it "proposes to give only a secular education, that would be useful and needful in this life, if there were no God, and no future for the human soul."—*Religion and the State*. Rev. Dr. Spear, 52–53.

intemperance shrink into insignificance. We feel sure, moreover, that although an absolute solution of these questions may be very difficult, that a comparatively just and safe practical adjustment is clearly within the grasp of our Christian people, if they clear their minds and use their power.

A. It is absolutely impossible to separate religious ideas from the great mass of human knowledge. In many connections, where these are not positively implied, they are virtually denied. By "religion" we connote two related ideas: (1) natural theism; (2) Christianity as a supernatural revelation, whose organ and standard is the Bible. In affirming the absolute impossibility of separating religious ideas from the instruction given in our public schools, we do not mean that it is the proper function of any of them to teach a complete system of Christian doctrine or duties. It is only meant that they cannot successfully ignore that religious element which {182} enters into the essential nature of the subject matter of their teaching.

First.—This is proved from the very nature of the case. Education involves the training of the whole man and of all the faculties, of the conscience and of the affections, as well as of the intellect. The English language is the product of the thought, character, and life of an intensely Christian people for many centuries. A purely nontheistic treatment of that vocabulary would not merely falsify the truth of the subject, but would necessarily make it an instrument of conveying positively anti-theistic and anti-Christian ideas. All history is a product of divine Providence, and is instinct with the divine ends and order. This is especially true of the history of the Anglo-Saxon race, which is a record of the conflict of religious ideas and forces from the first. It is self-evident that a nontheistic or a non-Christian treatment of that history would be utterly superficial and misrepresenting. It cannot be questioned that morals rest on a religious basis, and that a nontheistic ethics is equivalent to a positively anti-theistic one. The same is no less true of science in all its departments. It ultimately rests upon the ground that the universe is a manifestation of reason. If God is not therein recognized, he is denied, and a nontheistic science has always been and will always be a positively atheistic and materialistic one. The universe can be interpreted only in terms of mind or of molecular

mechanics. Wm. T. Harris well says in the *Journal of Social Science*, May 1884, page 130:

Faith is a secular virtue as well as a theological virtue, and whosoever teaches another view of the world—that is to say, he who teaches that a man is not immortal, and that nature does not reveal the divine reason—teaches a doctrine subversive of faith in this peculiar sense, and also subversive of man's life in all that makes it worth living.

It is obvious that the infinite evils resulting from the proposed perversion of the great educating agency of the country cannot be corrected by the supplementary agencies of the Christian home, the Sabbath school, or the church. This follows not only because the activities of the public school are universal and that of all the other agencies partial, but chiefly because the Sabbath school and church cannot teach history or science, and therefore cannot rectify the anti-Christian history and science taught by the public schools. And if they could, a Christian history and science on the one hand cannot coalesce with and counteract an atheistic history and science on the other. Poison and its antidote together never constitute nutritious food. And it is simply madness to attempt the universal distribution of poison on the ground that other parties are endeavoring to furnish a partial distribution of an imperfect antidote.

It is greatly to be regretted that this tremendous question has been obscured and belittled by being identified with the entirely subordinate matter of reading short portions of the King James Version of the Bible in {183} the public schools. Another principal occasion of confusion on this subject is the unavoidable mutual prejudice and misunderstanding that prevails between the two great divisions of our Christian population, the Romanist and the Protestant. The protest against the reading of the *Protestant* version of Scripture came in the first instance from the Romanists. Hence, in the triangular conflict which ensued, between Protestants, Romanists, and infidels, many intelligent Christians, on both sides, mistook the stress of battle. Every intelligent Catholic ought to know by this time that all the evangelical churches are fundamentally at one with him in essential Christian doctrine. And every intelligent Protestant ought to know by this time, in the light of the terrible socialistic revolutions which are threatened, that the danger to our country in *this* age is infinitely more from scepticism than from

superstition. We have, Protestant and Romanist alike, a common essential Christianity, abundantly sufficient for the purposes of the public schools, and all that remains for specific indoctrinization may easily be left to the Sabbath schools and the churches respectively. We are in the same sense Christian theists. We believe in God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, in His fatherly providence and love. We believe in the same divine-human Saviour, and place alike all our hope of salvation in His office and work as Mediator. We believe in the infallibility and authority of the inspired Word of God, and we nearly approximate agreement on all questions touching the Sabbath, the oath, the rights of property, marriage and divorce, etc., and with regard to the religious elements of science, physical and moral, and on all questions in which the state, or the schools of the state, have jurisdiction. Let us mutually agree, as citizens, not as ecclesiastics, upon a large, fair, common basis of religious faith, for the common needs of the state and her schools, leaving all differences to the churches, and, thus united, we shall carry the country before us.

The testimony of the Reverend H. D. Jenkins, DD, a Presbyterian minister, in the *Christian at Work*, August 19, 1886, seems to show that our Romanist brethren are nearer this infinitely-to-be-desired position than are most of us Protestants, who are so divided that common understanding and action is in our case more difficult. Doctor Jenkins says:

Permit me to say that I have never in my life examined a series of schoolbooks with more minute scrutiny than I have given to this set, and I have no hesitation in saying that they are truer to the ideals of our fathers [the Puritans] than any set of books I know to be in use in the state schools of America. There is a higher literary excellence to be found in their *Readers* than is to be found in those used in our public schools; than it is possible to find, when from our literature the ethical and religious element is so carefully weeded out. And apart from one or two dogmatic books, which are used as textbooks—notably their Catechism—there is not a page in the whole didactic series which I could not freely put into the hands of my own children, or give to the {184} children of my Sunday school. Not only are they largely composed of extracts from our best evangelical writers, but Protestants and Romanists appear in their pages with equal impartiality. Their *Readers* present a truer and juster view of the state of literature in America today than can be gotten from the books in use in the public

schools. Their *History of the United States*, not seeking to ignore all those spiritual factors which gave shape and power to the past, is a far more complete exhibition of the formative elements in the national life than that taught under the patronage of the State. Throughout the entire series there is not taught one single doctrine distinctive of Romanism, or hostile to the evangelical truth; not one reference to the mother of Jesus that would sound strange in a Protestant pulpit; not one allusion to the invocation of the saints; not one hint of the existence of purgatory, and not one suggestion of salvation by any other means but by simple trust in Jesus, the Saviour of men.

In view of the entire situation, shall we not all of us who really believe in God give thanks to Him, that He has preserved “the Roman Catholic Church in America today true to that theory of education upon which our fathers founded the public schools of the nation,” and from which they have been so madly perverted.

Second.—The proposed attempt at erecting a complete national system of public schools, from whose instruction, in all grades, all positive religious elements are to be expurgated, is absolutely without precedent in the history of the human race. The schools of China have always been penetrated with the religion of China, such as it is. The schools of Europe of every grade, Protestant as well as Romanist, have, from the time of Charlemagne, been the children of Christianity. The schools of Germany, hitherto the most efficient in the world, provide even for the teaching of the whole outline of dogmatic Christianity. The schools of revolutionary Paris alone emulate the agnostic profession and practice of our own system.

Third.—This new principle of the absolute elimination of the theistic and Christian elements from the instructions of our common schools is in direct opposition to the spirit and declared convictions of their founders. At the first, the population of New England was religiously homogeneous. The conflict has been precipitated by the unfortunate misunderstandings of Protestant and Romanist Christians, and by the utterly unwarrantable claims of a relatively small but aggressive party of recently imported foreign infidels. For two hundred years after the first colonization of the country every college and almost every academy and high school was erected with Christian ends in view. Massachusetts established Harvard College in 1636. The president and each professor was obliged to profess “his belief in the Scriptures of the Old

and New Testaments,” “and in every year and every week of the college course, every class was practised in the Bible and catechetical divinity.” Yale College was founded in 1701. The charter defined its end to be the propagation of the Christian Protestant {185} religion. The Assembly’s catechism, in Greek, was read by the freshmen; the sophomores studied Hebrew; the juniors, sophomores, and seniors, both at Harvard and Yale, were thoroughly instructed in divinity in the admirable compend of Wollebius.

Horace Mann was Secretary of the Board of Education of Massachusetts eleven years, from 1837 to 1848. He was, more than any other man, the author, expositor, and eloquent defender of the system. He may well be called the Father of the American common school system, and is able to speak of its original character and intention as an unquestionable authority. The changes he made, in order to render the schools of that state more homogeneous, and available for all classes of the people, necessarily drove many of the old grammar schools and academies out of the field, and excluded the teaching of the peculiar dogmas of any particular Christian denomination. This inevitably excited anxiety as to the spirit and ultimate bearing of the system on the essentials of religion held in common by the great majority of the people. In order to remove all apprehension on this score he expressed his view and those of his associates frequently, and in the most emphatic manner, in his annual reports. He says,

Such is the force of the conviction to which my own mind is brought by these general considerations, that I could not avoid regarding the man who should oppose the religious education of the young as an insane man; and were it proposed to debate the question between us, I should desire to restore him to his reason before entering upon the discussion (*Reports*, “On Religious Education,” 710-15).

He did not depend for this religious instruction upon any agencies exterior to his own schools. The education he proposed to give the whole people in his schools he defines as “a training of the whole man” (573-75).

“I wish to vindicate the system with which I have been so long and so intimately connected, not only from the aspersion, but from the suspicion, of being an irreligious, or anti-Christian, or un-Christian system” (717).

“But our system earnestly inculcates all Christian morals; *it founds its morals on a basis of religion*; it welcomes the religion of the Bible, and in receiving it allows it to do what it is allowed to do in no other system—to speak for itself” (729-30). “The Bible is received, therefore it is not un-Christian” (735). “Further, our law explicitly enjoins morality, therefore, it cannot be un-Christian” (736). “Our system explicitly calls upon the “resident ministers of the Gospel to cooperate” (737).

B. This is a Christian country, in the sense that Christianity is an original and essential element of the law of the land.

[At this point, Hodge begins a lengthy and learned discussion of Christian {186} origins of the original colonies, and how Christian influences were still basic to the American legal system in Hodge’s day. We will reprint this section in the issue on Christian politics, scheduled for publication in the summer of 1978.—ed.]

C. What, then, shall we conclude is the demand of simple, rational equity as between the rival claims of the believing and of the unbelieving contestants in the case in hand? The anti-Christian minority consists of two parties: (1) the Jews, who believe in God, and in the Old Testament as the revelation of His will; (2) the agnostics, many of whom do not really know that they do not know, and only half believe that they do not believe. They have no fixed convictions and no inherited institutions. Has the great mass of the nation, the true heirs in succession of our Christian sires, the subduers of the wilderness, the conquerors of independence, the founders of Constitution and laws, no rights? Shall the Christian majority consent that their wealth shall be taxed, and the whole energy of our immense system of public schools be turned to the work of disseminating agnosticism through the land and down the ages? Ex-President Woolsey²⁷ asks,

What right has the state to permit a doctrine of the earth or the solar system which rests on atheism, if theism and revelation must be banished from the scholastic halls. Why permit evolution to be publicly professed more than predestination?

D. The alternative is simple. Christians have all the power in their own hands. Says President Woolsey,²⁸

27. *Political Science*, vol. 2, 408.

If this should be [the policy of excluding all religion] the course of opinion growing out of the doctrine of personal and family rights, will not one of two things happen—that all the churches will become disaffected toward the common schools, as the Catholics now are, and provide teaching for themselves, while the schools will be left to the *foex infima populi*; or that some kind of compromise will be made between the sects and the state, such as all of them, with one exception, would now disapprove?

The danger arises simply from the weak and sickly sentimentalism respecting the transcendental spirituality of religion, the nonreligious character of the state, and the supposed equitable rights of a small infidel minority. All we have to do is for Catholics and Protestants—disciples of a common Master—to come to a common understanding with respect to a common basis of what is received as general Christianity, a practical quantity of truth belonging equally to both sides, to be recognized in general legislation, and especially in the literature and teaching of our {187} public schools. The difficulties lie in the mutual ignorance and prejudice of both parties, and fully as much on the side of the Protestants as of the Catholics. Then let the system of public schools be confined to the branches of simply common school education. Let these common schools be kept under the local control of the inhabitants of each district, so that the religious character of each school may conform in all variable accidents to the character of the majority of the inhabitants of each district. Let all centralizing tendencies be watchfully guarded against. Let the Christians of the East, of all denominations, increase the number and extend the efficiency of all their Christian academies and higher colleges. And let the Christians of the vast West preoccupy the ground, and bend all their energies in their efforts to supply the rising floods of their incoming population with a full apparatus of high schools and colleges, to meet all possible demands for a higher education.

One thing is absolutely certain. Christianity is ever increasing in power, and, in the long run, will never tolerate the absurd and aggressive claims of modern infidelity. The system of public schools must be held, in their sphere, true to the claims of Christianity, or they must go, with all other enemies of Christ, to the wall.

28. *Ibid.*, 414.

SHALL WE HAVE A FEDERAL DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION?

J. Gresham Machen

An address delivered before the Sentinels of the Republic, Washington, DC, January 12, 1926. Reprinted from *The Woman Patriot* (Feb. 15, 1926).

“If liberty is not maintained with regard to education, there is no use trying to maintain it in any other sphere. If you give the bureaucrats the children you might just as well give them everything else.”—
Professor Machen

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: I may say, if you will pardon a personal word, that the Chairman is incorrect in connecting me with Princeton University. As a matter of fact, I am connected with an institution which by some persons in certain fields is regarded as an opponent of liberty. But the charge is really very strange. I come, indeed, of a very strict sect, in company with my colleagues in the faculty of Princeton Theological Seminary; but I come of a sect that has always been devoted to the great principles of liberty. And to my mind one of the fundamental principles of liberty, which is involved in the present issue, is the principle of the right of voluntary association, the right of persons to associate themselves voluntarily for the propagation of their own views, however erroneous they may be thought to be by others, in the field of religion or in other spheres. You will find, I think, if you investigate the matter, that it is this principle of voluntary association which, strangely enough, is being attacked by some persons in the name of liberty.

People seem to have a notion that a voluntary organization, religious or otherwise, is not free to exclude from the body of its official representatives those who hold principles which are diametrically opposed to its own. But as a matter of fact the principle of voluntary association, with maintenance of the purpose for which a voluntary association is formed, is at the very roots of human liberty.

But with that right of voluntary association goes insistence upon the most complete tolerance on the part of the State (which is an involuntary association) over against all other bodies, religious or social or whatever they may be, no matter how deleterious to the common welfare some men may think that they are. {189}

It is time to come to the special subject upon which I have been asked to speak. Shall we have a Federal Department of Education?

One bill (S. 291—H.R. 5000) has been introduced to the present Congress which looks directly to the establishment of such a department. Another bill (H.R. 4097) not only provides for the establishment of such a department, but also provides in very radical form for the principle of federal aid to the States, laying down even very definite conditions on which that aid may be received.

Another bill (S. 1334) has been introduced, and various proposals, as you know, have been made looking to the reorganization of the federal departments. What the ultimate relationship between these measures and the establishment of a federal department will be, we cannot now tell; but I think that it is clear that just at the present juncture, in view of the very widespread support which the proposal has received, the question of a Federal Department of Education is very decidedly before the country.

Do we want a Federal Department of Education, or do we not? I think we do not. And I am asking your permission to tell you very briefly why.

We do not, I think, want a Federal Department of Education because such a department is in the interests of a principle of uniformity or standardization in education which, if put into practice, would be the very worst calamity into which this country could fall.

This measure cannot be understood unless it be viewed in connection with related measures, like the so-called Child Labor Amendment; or like the Sterling-Reed Bill with its predecessors and its successor, which provided for federal aid to the States and which really would have taken away what measure of States' rights we possess.

People think very loosely in these days about receiving gifts. But on the basis of some observation of the reception of gifts in the educational field, I think I may give it as my opinion that a gift, in the educational field, always has a string tied to it. That may be observed with

reference to various educational foundations. They provide ostensibly, sometimes, that the liberty of the institution to which they appropriate the funds is to be maintained. But in a very few years you will find that such institutions have become completely subservient to an outside board of control. And how much more obviously is the case when we are dealing with the federal government, an agency which in every way possible is encroaching upon the power of the States. Federal aid in education inevitably means federal control.

But the same result will be accomplished even by the measure that we now have directly in view. The establishment of a Federal Department of Education would be a step, and a decisive step, in exactly the same direction as those measures of which we have just been speaking.

{190}

We are, indeed, sometimes actually asked to believe that a Federal Department of Education is a very innocent thing, that when it is established it will not do anything, and will not ask for any funds, except funds that are already provided for various federal agencies. But in this company I need not say that such modesty on the part of federal departments is hardly in accordance with precedent. As a matter of fact it seems to be the fixed habit of every federal bureau to ask for all the funds that it can get. I think that we may lay it down as a general principle that the more these bureaus get, the more they want. And if we have a full-fledged Department of Education, with a secretary at a salary of \$15,000, and with hosts of other officers below that, we shall have a great federal agency which is certain to embrace a larger and larger number of activities. And we shall have taken the really decisive step towards centralized control. It will be an extremely difficult, if not an absolutely impossible, thing to keep a Federal Department of Education as a merely paper affair and to prevent it from so extending its activities as to secure exactly the same results in the long run as the results that were aimed at by the so-called Child Labor Amendment and by the Sterling-Reed Bill.

It is clear, therefore, that if we want to defeat this tendency in the educational field, now is the time to do it.

The reason why I am opposed to this proposal is that it represents a very ancient principle in the field of education, which, it seems to me, has been one of the chief enemies of human liberty for several thou-

sand years—the principle, namely, that education is an affair essentially of the State, that education must be standardized for the welfare of the whole people and put under the control of government, that personal idiosyncrasies should be avoided. This principle, of course, was enunciated in classic form in ancient Greece. It is the theory, for example, that underlies the *Republic* of Plato. But the principle was not only enunciated in theory; it was also, in some of the Greek states, put into practice. It is a very ancient thing—this notion that the children belong to the State, that their education must be provided for by the State in a way that makes for the State's welfare. But that principle, I think you will find if you examine human history, is inimical at every step to liberty; and if there is any principle that is contrary to the whole genius of the Anglo-Saxon idea in government, it seems to me that it is this principle of thoroughgoing State control in education.

Of course, we have a great many prophets of it today. I suppose it is the basic idea of Mr. H. G. Wells, in his popular *Outline of History*. The solution of the problem of state, Mr. Wells believes, is in education; and by undertaking this problem in a more efficient way, possible because of increased ease of communication, the modern state can accomplish what the Roman Empire failed to accomplish.

I am willing to admit that in some fields standardization is an admirable {191} thing. For example, standardization is an admirable thing in the making of Ford cars. But just because it is an admirable thing in the making of Ford cars it is a very harmful thing, I think, in the case of human beings. The reason is that a Ford car is a machine and a human being is a person. There are, indeed, a great many men in the modern world who deny the distinction. At this point we have an illustration of the utter falsity of the popular notion that philosophy has no practical effect upon the lives of the people, that it does not make any difference what a man believes in the sphere of ultimate reality. For the whole tendency that we are fighting today has underlying it a rather definite theory. Ultimately underlying it, I suppose, is the theory of the behaviorists—that the human race has at last found itself out, that it has succeeded in getting behind the scenes, that it has pulled off from human nature those tawdry trappings in which the actors formerly moved upon the human stage, that we have discovered that poetry and art and moral responsibility and freedom are delusions and that mech-

anism rules all. It is a mistake, we are told, to blame the criminal; the criminal is exactly what he is obliged to be, and good people are obliged to be exactly what they are. In other words, liberty is a delusion and human beings are just somewhat complicated machines.

It is probably not a thing which has come into the consciousness of very many people, but it is a fact all the same, that present-day education to a very large extent is dominated by exactly this theory, in one form or another. It is dominated partly by persons who hold the theory consciously; but it is dominated a great deal more by persons who have not the slightest notion what the ultimate source of their ideas in the field of education really is or what the result of them will be, but who are putting them into practice all the time.

What is the result of the application of this mechanistic theory in the sphere of education? I have no hesitation for my part in saying that the result is most lamentable. The result is simply intellectual as well as moral decline. It is obvious, I think, that there has been a moral decline; but what is not always observed is that there is also today a most astonishing and most lamentable intellectual decline. Poetry is silent; art is imitative or else bizarre; and if you examine the products of present-day education you will have to search far before you find a really well-stocked mind. I am not unaware, indeed, of the advantages of modern education; I am not unaware of the fact that a larger number of persons can read and write than formerly was the case. But despite all that I am still obliged to bring against the educational tendency of the present day in the sphere of public education the charge that the product is lamentably faulty. We are told, you know, that the old-fashioned notion of really learning things is out of date. Some time ago I heard one educator, a rather well-known {192} man, tell a company of college professors that it is a great mistake to think that the business of the college professor is to teach the student anything; the real business of the college professor, he said, is to give the students an opportunity to learn; and what the student is in college to do is to “unify his world.”

I am afraid that the students make a poor business of unifying their world—for the simple reason that they have no world to unify. They have not acquired a large enough number of facts even to practice the mental business of putting facts together; they are really being starved for want of facts. There has been an absurdly exaggerated emphasis on

methodology at the expense of content in education; and the methodology that is actually advocated is based upon the false and vicious theory to which I have just referred—a false and vicious theory that destroys all the higher elements in human life.

With the persons who advocate this theory I cannot bring myself to agree. Somehow I cannot believe that the higher things in human life are delusions and that only the lower things are real. And therefore I do believe in freedom, and I do believe that persons are different from Ford cars.

What you want in a Ford car is just as little individuality as you can get. Sometimes, indeed—I may say that on the basis of my experience with a Ford car—sometimes you get entirely too much individuality. I soon learned by my own experience, before the days of self-starters, that sometimes a Ford will start and sometimes it won't, and that if it won't there is no use whatever in giving it any spiritual advice. Sometimes, in spite of what Mr. Ford can do, there has been an undue amount of individuality in the Ford car. But the *aim* of the whole activity, at any rate, whatever the result may be, is to produce a thing that shall have just as little individuality as possible; the aim is that every Ford car shall be just as much like every other Ford car as it can possibly be made.

The aim of education, on the other hand, dealing, as education does, with human beings, is exactly the opposite; the aim of education is not to conform human beings to some fixed standard, but to preserve individuality, to keep human beings as much unlike one another in certain spheres as they possibly can be.

But that great aim of education, that personal, free, truly human aspect of education, can never have justice done to it under federal control. And that is the reason why the standardization of education that has already been carried on through the federal bureaus is deleterious. I have observed this in general: that when people talk about uniformity in education what they are really producing is not something that is uniformly high, but something that is uniformly low; they are producing a kind of education which reduces all to a dead level, which fails to understand the man who loves the high things that most of his fellowmen do not love. This degrading {193} tendency is furthered, I

fear, by the present federal activities in education, and it will be given a stupendous impetus if the federal department is formed.

Just at this point, however, there may be an objection. I have been arguing, some men will tell me, against control of education by the State. But, it will be said, we already have control of education by the State, namely by the instrumentality of the individual States of our Union; and so—thus the objection runs—the authority of a federal department would not differ in principle from the authority which the State governments already possess. I have been talking about individuality; I have said something about the rights of individual parents, by implication at least. “Well now,” it will be said, “are not those rights already subject to the control of the individual States? But if they are, is not all that is being accomplished by this federal measure merely the transference of this authority already possessed by government to an agency that can exercise it in a wiser and more efficient way? Does not the principle, then, remain exactly the same?”

With regard to this objection, I am perfectly willing to admit that the State governments have, in the sphere of education, in recent years committed some very terrible sins. We need think only, for example, of the Oregon School Law, which sought to take children forcibly from their parents and place them under the despotic control of whatever superintendent of education happened to be in power in the district where the residence of the parents was found. Or we need only refer to the Nebraska Language Law (similar laws being enacted in a number of other States), which provided that no language other than English should be taught in any school, public or private, up to a certain grade—in point of fact until the children were too old ever to learn languages well. That was a law which actually made literary education a crime. Or we may think of that one of the two Lusk laws in the State of New York which provided that every teacher in all classes, public and private, formal and informal, should take out a State license and become subject to state visitation and control. These laws were blows, it seems to me, against the very vitals of liberty.

But the fate of all these measures is illustrative of the safeguards which we shall have if we keep this important concern of education under the control of the individual states. The Lusk laws were repealed. The Oregon School Law and the Nebraska law fell before the last bul-

wark of our liberty, the United States Supreme Court. As Justice McReynolds said in the great decision in the Oregon case, the child, in America, is not the mere creature of the State—a great principle which I think includes all that we are here endeavoring to maintain.

So it is to be observed that State measures—partly for reasons that have been brought out in what the previous speaker has said regarding the difficulty of securing a review of Congressional actions, and partly for other {194} reasons—are very much more likely to be checked, if they are oppressive and against the spirit of our institutions, than are federal measures.

Furthermore, there is a great safeguard in numbers. The beneficent fact is that there are forty-eight States in the Union. Some of them may become very bad in the sphere of education; but it is perhaps not likely that all of them will become utterly bad. Thus there is a great safeguard in the multiplicity of the States. For various reasons, then, I maintain that the principle is *not* the same when education is put under federal control as when it is placed under state control.

Personally, indeed, I am opposed to certain tendencies in the sphere of public education in the States; I am opposed to the tendency by which the public school is made to do things that parents ought to do, such as providing moral instruction and the like. I am opposed to “morality codes” in the public schools. I have examined some of them and I think they are vicious. They are not only faulty in detail, but they are wrong in principle. They base morality upon experience, instead of upon an absolute distinction between right and wrong. Despite the good motives of their compilers, therefore, they undermine the sense which children (and all the rest of us) ought to have of the majesty of the moral law.

That is, indeed, only a matter of personal opinion. I do not know whether it comes under the principles for which the Sentinels of the Republic stand. But you can take it for what it is worth. I, for my part, think that the functions of the public school ought to be diminished rather than broadened; and I believe that the public school ought to pay just a little bit of attention, perhaps, to that limited but not unimportant function which it is now almost wholly neglecting—namely, the impartation of knowledge.

Thus there are criticisms which I might make with regard to public education in the individual States. But those criticisms do not fall directly under the subject with which we are dealing here, and I am not sure whether I can claim for them the authority of the Sentinels of the Republic. In these matters, I am giving voice to my own personal opinion. But perhaps I have said enough to show at least that as citizens we have important questions to decide when we are dealing with public education in the individual States.

At any rate, in the light of what I have just said, I do maintain that the danger is very much greater when education is placed under the control of the federal government, than the danger which undoubtedly does prevail even now on account of a mistaken use of State authority. Federal control of education, despite what is often said, most emphatically is not the same in principle as control by the States. And so I believe that this measure which would establish a Federal Department of Education ought to be defeated. {195}

But I think that a great deal more than that ought to be done. I think that not only this particular measure ought to be defeated but the whole tendency that is represented by this measure ought to be defeated, the tendency towards a centralized standardization in education.

At this point, it is true, some persons hold up their hands in horror. "Do you mean to say," they ask us, "that we are actually going to continue to turn this important matter over to forty-eight separate and distinct states, to say nothing of the idiosyncrasies of individual parents, who want to send their children to all sorts of peculiar private schools and church schools? What utter confusion we shall have if we permit this sort of thing! Why, if we have this unlimited freedom of private schools and so on, we shall make a perfect mess of it."

Well, with regard to that, I may say that I think it is a good deal better to have confusion than it is to have death. For my part, I believe that in the sphere of education there ought to be the most unlimited competition—competition between one state and another and competition between state schools and private schools.

"But," it is said, "do you not believe in equal opportunity? Surely the federal government ought to help the States so that there will be equal opportunities for all the children in the whole country."

Now I am bound to say quite frankly, with regard to this matter of equal opportunity, that I am dead opposed to it. What ought you to do to a State that does not provide opportunities for its children equal to the opportunities that are provided by some other States? Ought you to tell the people of that State that it does not make any difference, because if they do not do the thing somebody else will do it for them? I think not. There ought to be unlimited competition in the sphere of education between one State and another State and between State schools and private schools. The State schools ought to be faced at every moment by the health-giving possibility of competition on the part of private schools and church schools. Only that will keep State education in a healthy way.

Of course, I understand perfectly well that competition in certain spheres has its disadvantages; and I am not going to talk about that. In some spheres it may have to be checked—we are not discussing that difficult question here. But when it comes to the sphere of the mind, I believe in absolutely unlimited competition. Anything else than that, it seems to me, will cause stagnation and death.

“But,” people say, “how about efficiency?” Well, I think, if the truth must be known, that that word “efficiency” is one of the most misused words in the language. Many persons seem to suppose that the mere use of that word constitutes an argument; they seem to suppose that you ought to regard it as a sufficient argument in favor of anything whatever when that thing is said to be efficient. {196}

I notice also another word that is used in a somewhat similar way. It is the word “sincere.” It often seems to be supposed that it is an argument in favor of a person who disagrees with us, when the fact is established that “he is perfectly sincere.” It seems to be supposed that the fact that he is sincere constitutes a reason why I ought to agree with the person in question. But how absurd that is! As a matter of fact, the more sincere a man is in his advocacy of a thing that is wrong, the more opposed to him I am—not the more opposed to him in my estimate of his moral character (I may respect him personally because he is sincere), but the more opposed to the measures that he advocates. The more sincere he is in favor of something that I regard as bad, the more dangerous he is likely to be.

It is somewhat the same with regard to this matter of efficiency. Some men think that it is admirable for its own sake. But surely efficiency involves doing something, and our attitude toward the efficiency all depends on whether the thing that is being done is good or bad.

A man does not admire efficiency very much when the efficiency is working to his disadvantage. You have all probably heard the story about the tramp that got up to the fourth floor of the department store. The floorwalker on the fourth floor kicked him down to the third floor; and there he fell foul of the floorwalker on the third floor, who kicked him down to the second floor; and then the floorwalker on the second kicked him down to the ground floor; and then the floorwalker on the ground floor kicked him outside. He landed on his back outside, and when he got up he remarked in great admiration, "My, what a system!"

I am unable to attain quite that measure of complete detachment that was attained by that tramp. Men want us to be overcome by admiration for a system that is working us harm. For my part, I flatly refuse. I am reminded of what Dr. Fabian Franklin said some years ago in an article in the *Yale Review*. Some persons, he said in effect, think that an objection to socialism is that it would not work. But so far as he was concerned, he said, his objection was rather that it might possibly work.

So it is with this federal control of education. The better it works the worse it suits me; and if these people had their way—if everything could be reduced to a dead level, if everybody could be made like everybody else, if everybody came to agree with everybody else because nobody would be doing any thinking at all for himself, if all could be reduced to this harmony—do you think that the world would be a good place under those circumstances? No, my friends. It would be a drab, miserable world, with creature comforts in it and nothing else, with men reduced to the level of the beasts, with all the higher elements of human life destroyed.

Thus I am in favor of efficiency if it is directed to a good end; but I am not in favor of efficiency if it is directed to something that is bad.

As a matter of fact, federal departments are not efficient, but probably {197} the most inefficient things on the face of this planet. But if

they were the most efficient agencies that history has ever seen, I should, in this field of education, be dead opposed to them. Efficiency in a good cause is good; but I am opposed to federal efficiency in this sphere because the result of it is a thing that I regard as bad—namely, slavery. And I am not inclined to do what a great many people do today; I am not inclined to write “freedom” in quotation marks as though it were a sort of joke. I believe, on the contrary, that it is something that is very real. An ounce of freedom is worth a pound of efficiency. I think, too, that we may discern within the last year just the beginning of the rise of the love of liberty again in our people. I hope therefore that this measure may be defeated, and that all measures may be defeated that look in the same direction, and that we may return to the principle of freedom for individual parents in the education of their children in accordance with their conscience, and to the principle of freedom for the States, and to the reliance upon the multiplicity of them for a preservation of those things that have made our country great.

It is to be hoped that the indications of a returning love of liberty which are just beginning to appear are not illusory, but that America, despite opposition, is going to return to the freedom that used to be the very atmosphere that she breathed. But let us be perfectly clear about one thing—if liberty is not maintained with regard to education, there is no use trying to maintain it in any other sphere. If you give the bureaucrats the children, you might just as well give them everything else. That is the reason why I think that every one of us ought to be opposed with all his might and main to the sinister legislative measure that we have been considering today. No, we do *not* want a Federal Department of Education; and we do not want, in any form whatever, the slavery that a Federal Department of Education would bring.

2. BOOK REVIEWS

REVIEWS

The U.S. Primary and Secondary Educational Process,
by Frank E. Armbruster.

Croton-on-Hudson, NY: Hudson Institute, 1975, \$15. Published in its final form as *Our Children's Crippled Future: How American Education Has Failed*. New York Times—Quadrangle, 1977. 300 pp., \$15.

Reviewed by Gary North

If this book receives the attention it deserves, it will become as celebrated, berated, debated, attacked, and explained away as the 1966 Coleman Report became. This study presents the statistics of American public education, and in doing so it has struck a telling blow against America's only established church. The high priests of this state church will wish they had never heard of Frank Armbruster.

The statistics in this book are startling, even for those who are in principle opposed to tax-supported education, but who have never taken a careful look at the available data. All of this book's data have been gleaned from the public record, meaning primarily the statistical reports published by the federal government, school testing services, and state governments. When assembled into a critical format like this one, the effect is staggering.

Fact: Total government expenditures on primary and secondary education—federal, state, and local—in 1950 reached \$6.7 billion. Total expenditures in 1974 had risen to \$61.6 billion. Most of this increase came after 1960, the year total costs reached \$18 billion. Yet the school population in this quarter century did not even double: 28.6 million students to 49.7 million. Of the \$61.7 billion, \$56 billion is spent on the public school system. The cost per pupil, *when adjusted for inflation*, rose 141 percent between 1950 and 1973. This means that the per capita cost of educating an American student rose 141 percent more than the general price level during this period.

While such aggregate statistical entities as the gross national product are misleading if they are taken too seriously, they do provide a crude measure of comparative costs over time. In the mid-1940s, something like 2.5 percent of the nation's GNP was spent on all education, includ-

ing universities. Today, something like 8 percent is spent on education. It is illuminating to reflect on the fact that proponents of a national health care plan—socialized medicine, phase two—have screamed bloody murder because Americans spend 8 percent of the GNP on medical care. Medical care is offered to the entire population, while education is aimed at a limited segment of the population, yet the fact that medicine absorbs about the same amount of resources as education—overwhelmingly, socialized education—sends the critics of American medicine into apoplexy. There has been almost no criticism of the spiraling costs of government education, apart from the taxpaying public (“unprofessional”) which is tired of footing the bills for the tenured elite that is staffing the school system.

What about the supposedly overworked and underpaid teachers? At the university level, of course, the teaching load is a huge joke. The University of California, ranked about sixtieth in the nation in terms of pay scale, requires six hours a week of teaching, and the average paycheck is over \$17,000 a year, for eight months of teaching. Even this is not the whole story, since my source of information is a six-year-old Los Angeles *Times* story, and pay has risen since then (*LA Times*, May 9, 1971). As one of my professors once said in class, “If the {199} taxpayers of California ever found out what a racket this job is, they would line us all up against a wall and machine gun us.” But what about the average public school teacher? How hard is the job?

How about the much-publicized *pupil/teacher ratio*? To start with, there is no statistical evidence that it has any effect on the learning of children. It is a myth. In fact, reading scores of third grade students in Arizona indicate that students in larger classes learn more efficiently, with the best scores occurring in classes of forty to forty-five students (Appendix: Arizona). Second, the pupil/teacher ratio has fallen in the public schools to levels once thought to be the prerogative of universities. If you count supervisory personnel—principals, counselors, psychologists, and all the other support personnel for the teachers—the teacher/pupil ratio is about 10 to one or 12 to one. Nationally, the pure pupil/teacher ratio, with the support personnel eliminated, has fallen steadily since 1932, from about 31 to one to today’s figure of 21 to one. The sharpest drop in this figure came in 1961-68, which were the years beginning the decline of student achievement. In the fall of

1973, New York City classes were 18.4 to one, but on any given day, the actual attendance was only fifteen students per teacher. Nationally, the figure of actual attendance is about 20 to one. Contrast this with the conditions of New York City schools in the 1890s, when rooms were filled with immigrant children who lived in tenements:

One should note that even the harshest critics of schools in the depths of New York slums in 1893 (with eighty children to a class) obviously had considerable expectation of the wretchedly deprived foreign born and children of the foreign born in these institutions. They complained when these expectations were not realized. The critic cited earlier who condemned these schools stated that *second* graders “are scarcely able to recognize new words at sight” and that “*even* the third year reading is miserable.” [Author’s emphasis.] He apparently had no criticism for fourth and fifth grade reading, and one feels today critics of our vastly more expensive, relatively uncrowded core city schools might often expect less from third graders.

What about the *pay scales*? The book demonstrates clearly that teachers are paid comparably to those college graduates in other professions in the same age brackets. This is true, despite the fact that teachers, on the average, have fewer years of graduate work beyond the BA than other professionals, and they attend schools, or study in departments, that are less rigorous than their competitors. If you count *fringe benefits*, which are worth an additional 30 percent or more, they are well paid indeed. (This claim is questionable, to the extent that teachers rely on pension benefits heavily; such benefits will be swallowed up in inflation and bankruptcy. However, other professionals may be equally immersed in false hopes about future pension benefits, so a more thorough study is necessary.) Furthermore, most teachers enjoy *tenure*, so the security factor has to be considered as part of their income. They enjoy four months of *vacation*, too, which is income that can be taken tax-free: leisure income. Though teachers have tended to be *younger* in the past than other professionals (which will not be true for long, given the fact of a teacher glut and tenure, which keeps out younger competitors), they have earned 20 percent more than the average of all workers (1972-73), and they have looked good in comparison to full-year professionals. In 1972, professional and technical workers, including *salaried* physicians and surgeons, earned \$13,000; women earned \$8,700. Teachers earned as follows: men, \$11,000; women,

\$8,700 (two-thirds of the teaching force). They received this for 180 days a year instead of 240, the average for professional salaried people in other fields. Not bad. {200}

So much for teachers. What about *student performance*? The book offers all the statistics we are likely to need in making an assessment of the failure of modern education. Large gains in achievement came in the late 1920s and early 1930s. The author does not explain this, but the obvious explanation is the immigration restrictions after 1924. Immigrant children with language barriers were kept from entering the school system, while older immigrant children began to master English and reading skills, and their scores went up. Thus, average student performance in the large Eastern city school systems increased. Still, the advances were noted in other areas, indicating that improved performance was widespread. I suspect that students who stayed in school in the 1930s, especially in rural areas, had to justify their presence in school to their struggling parents. Everyone worked harder in the 1930s, all over the world. As the book shows, results began to drop in the early 1940s. Performance increased in the mid-1950s, and then began its continual decline after 1963 or 1964. Try as they will to explain this unprecedented erosion of student performance, the tenured elite of the public school systems cannot hide the obvious: schools cannot reverse the trend at this time. Not the public schools, anyway.

This decline has been far more pronounced among the upper 10 percent of the student body than among the lower 10 percent. In fact, there may have been a slight improvement in the lowest groups, possibly based on the fact, says the author, that scores have reached a theoretical lower limit, statistically, in the ghetto schools. The drop in scores has affected rural schools, suburban schools, and private schools. No one is immune, as far as the data indicate. Even IQ scores have dropped. The environmental determinists simply cannot explain this phenomenon.

Above and beyond these speculations, however, is the question of why IQ is falling in states where it seems likely [that] it is, and why the drop is more severe in the higher percentile brackets, as it is in California and seems to be in New Mexico in the fifth grade.... The home environment of the ninetieth percentile achievement children (where the largest drop in national ITBS [Iowa Tests of Basic Skills] scores occurred in 1964-71), and the seventy-fifth percentile IQ children

(where the largest drop in California IQ scores occurred in 1969-1970 to 1972-1973), is normally thought to be ideal by educators. Their parents are most likely to have high IQs, college degrees, interest in education, etc. The schools these children are most likely to attend are in the affluent suburbs, small cities and better parts of large cities, normally considered the best endowed by educators. Such data could raise some very important questions as to why *these* children should be dropping so rapidly in achievement, and perhaps also in IQ.

What has gone wrong? It costs more per pupil to educate him, and the greatest increases in these costs have paralleled the decline in student performance. Everything that the professional educators have suggested has been tried: higher pay for teachers, lower pupil/teacher ratios, better buildings, more expensive audio-visual equipment, the new math, “learn by doing,” social studies in place of grammar, child-centered education. It has all been tried, concludes the author, and it has all failed. Now the educational elite say it just is not possible to teach students effectively. The students just refuse to perform. Educators refuse to take any responsibility for this multibillion-dollar failure. The parents want national tests, the educators resist this demand, desperately afraid that they, indirectly, will be “graded” on these exams. As the author comments:

This recent phenomenon of school boards more readily accepting excuses by {201} administrators and teachers in lieu of doing what they are paid to do—teach children academic subjects and see that each pupil performs to the best of his ability—may constitute a large part of our current problems. If teachers and administrators are told to teach children to read, write and cipher, or to give a good reason why they cannot, we should perhaps not be surprised if we create a generation of teachers and administrators which include many with a distorted sense of priorities. It is much easier to eliminate the student requirement to take difficult (though important) subjects, or to offer excuses why children cannot be taught, than it is to teach them, or to relax the rules of conduct than to make children behave, etc. In days gone by, except in the case of the small fraction of a percent of pupils who are always incorrigible and must be placed in special schools or correctional institutions, teachers were not allowed this luxury. They had to teach children, even if they had to stay after hours to help them keep up with the class: in essence, nobody told them that administrators or school boards would accept excuses why children could not be taught.... What is disturbing, however, is the apparent low opinion of

the pupil as an individual really held today by many progressive educators. Schools now seem to operate on the premise that current students are somehow less competent than those of old, that if we give these young people information they will not see analogies or know how to apply this knowledge to evaluation and decision making.

The author has hinted at a true irony of progressive education. The child-centered school has now become a child-demeaning school, since this has been the only way to preserve the tenured positions of progressive educators. The environmental determinists have now produced an educational system in which there is no personal responsibility—not for teachers, school administrators, school boards. The parents may have failed, or taxpayers may have failed, or students may have failed, but the demonstrated, tested failure of the schools is not the fault of anyone inside the educational guild.

What can we conclude? *First* of all, the old teaching of Professor Ludwig von Mises is once again reaffirmed: without a free market, there is no way to run a meaningful cost-benefit analysis. We cannot know what something costs under socialism. There are no economic tests of performance in a socialist commonwealth. Without question, the most socialistic part of the American commonwealth is the public school system. It does not perform well precisely because there is no true market for education, with one unsubsidized school competing directly with other unsubsidized schools. Thus, the elitists who run the schools as subsidized priests can resist any testing system that would challenge their continued right to hold their sinecures. Now that tests show falling student performance, it is the whole concept of testing that professional educators reject. Consider these statements that appeared in *National Elementary Principal* (Summer 1975):

Standardized science achievement tests for the elementary school are almost uniformly poor in quality. They are incorrect, misleading, skewed in emphasis, and irrelevant.

Comparing people to one another along a single scale of ability is fundamentally demeaning and unfair.

The scores purport to be measures of the educational health of a community or a school. But in fact, it would make as much sense to take the blood pressure of each student, apply the usual statistical procedures, and publish the results district by district, to measure the health of the student body.

Nothing was suggested about improved testing. All testing is bad, in other words. {202} This is, of course, what generations of failing students have maintained, in a less articulate way. *The educators are failing the tests*; therefore, tests are misleading, irrelevant, etc.

What we are witnessing is not simply the decline of the public schools. We are witnessing the disintegration of the supporting institutions in a secular society that is increasingly unsure of its first principles. The dry rot of secular humanism has now visibly begun to erode the established, state-financed church: public schools. It would be silly to expect the public schools to resist this erosion in any successful fashion. How could they? Where do they recruit their administrators, teachers, child counselors, propagandists, and other “professionals”? From other public schools. It is *self-certification*, and yet the reigning principles of environmental determinism are in open conflict with concepts of personal responsibility and demonstrated performance. It is *certification without permanent standards*. How could any system survive in terms of such a foundation? How could any institution preserve itself from the effects of bureaucratic paralysis—the inevitable cost of all government subsidies—if it has no standards of performance? I think of Dr. Louis Gasper’s comment about the university, and I think it can be applied to all public education. “The university is a dinosaur sinking slowly into the tar pit.”

To the extent that the public schools are no more than the subsidized institutions of the American people, we should not expect them to be able to perform successfully in the long run. The taxpayers may complain, as all taxpayers always do, but until they are willing to abandon their principles of secular humanism, and until they are willing to abandon the whole idea of coercive, tax-supported, monopolistic, inevitably bureaucratic education, they cannot expect positive change. We see the school systems in a state of decline, and our public response is to throw more money into them. *We are subsidizing bureaucratic failure*. The “market” responds with even more bureaucratic failure.

A *second* point should be mentioned. The Coleman Report, as well as most of the subsequent studies based on its findings, made the observation that nothing done to change the schools in terms of money, equipment, teachers with more course work, and so forth, seems to affect student performance. This report was published in

1966, and its data were based on performance prior to the decline in performance and standards. Now, if anything, the additional funds appear to have a negative correlation: more money, poorer performance. Yet the point of the Coleman Report seems well taken: it is the family, first of all, that is central to student performance; the community (especially peer group standards) is second in importance; and the school is no higher than third in importance. Some interesting data in this regard are presented by Armbruster:

In 1909, of the major immigrant groups of 30 cities studied, those with the most “retarded” (more than two years below the grade in which they should be enrolled, e.g., 6 years old, first grade) were the Italians, Poles and Russians (almost entirely Russian Jews).... Whatever the reasons, however, the large identifiable groups of children of immigrants, the children of Italians, Poles and Russians, were on the bottom of the heap. Two generations later, the 25- to 34-year-old descendants of these groups (those who left high school in or prior to the early 1960s, before almost automatic promotion and graduation had become quite so prevalent) showed themselves to be above the median educational level of that age group of the population as a whole for that year (between 12.5 and 12.6 years of schooling). Some were also above earlier immigrant groups, and the Russian Jews surpassed all groups.

{203}

The Jews averaged 16 years of school; no other group was above 12.8. The schools, obviously, had little to do with that statistical “abnormality.” The educational and religious heritage of the Jews did.

If the family is central, then there are two conclusions that are likely to be made. First, the environmental determinists will argue that children should be removed from their parents even earlier, in order to give every child an equal opportunity to achieve success in (ungraded and untested) public schools. The alternative—upgrading all families, or downgrading most families—is too expensive. The second possible conclusion is that families should be permitted to educate their own children in terms of their vision, standards, and financial ability to meet educational expenses—since it is the family which is the most dominant in educational performance anyway. This is the answer of responsible liberty. It will not be accepted in this century—pragmatic voters need to be shocked in order to get them to abandon their reli-

gious faith in coercive, statist education—but there is hope for the future.

The standards are declining in the secular schools. This means that independent schools that are not in step with the prevailing standards—through certification, shared textbooks, shared secular humanist principles, shared tax dollars, or whatever—will be able to train up a new generation of successful, competent graduates. The elite of the future will be less and less the product of the statist educational system. This is not the message of Armbruster, but it is the message of the data he presents.

If a single book on the failure of state-financed education is to be placed on your shelf, this book is your best choice. The final version published by the New York Times-Quadrangle is the one to buy.

***How to Establish and Operate a Successful Christian School,*
by Robert L. Thoburn.**

11121 Pope's Head Rd., Fairfax, VA 22030:
Thoburn Press, 1975. 238 pp., \$125.00.

Reviewed by Gary North

To understand the importance of this book, you need to know something about the Reverend Thoburn and the institution he created. He is a graduate of Westminster Seminary in Philadelphia, with a Master's degree in Old Testament. Babylonian was all Greek to him, and he understood Greek. He has found, though, that the willingness of people to pay for up-to-date translations of Babylonian tablets is limited.

He arrived in Fairfax County, Virginia, at the end of the 1950s. He started a church mission work and went to work as a teacher. He began his own school in the spring of 1961. It had six students. He and his wife operated the school, including transportation. They had four children of their own, and the oldest was five years old. They had no capital, except human capital. The Fairfax Christian School was begun with "sweat equity."

By 1963, Thoburn had raised enough capital to buy (on time) his first thirteen acres of land. In 1965 and 1969 he purchased more land,

so that the school's holdings are now thirty-four acres of prime land in the rapidly growing area around Fairfax City. His first building went up in 1964, a \$57,000 construction job. The next year another unit went up, this time a \$138,000 building. In 1969, the third building was constructed for \$148,000. Today, the total debt on the school will be paid off within three years. The value of the land has probably tripled, and the value {204} of the buildings may have doubled. The Thoburn family owns every nickel's worth of it.

The school has a fleet of buses, most of them Dodge Maxi wagons, totaling around forty, plus half a dozen VW automobiles (Beetles). The school has about 600 students and a long waiting list. A dozen other Christian schools have sprung up in the last ten years imitating parts of his program. The school was the first profit-making, sole proprietorship Christian school in the Virginia area, and the first to receive national recognition.

The profit-making aspect of the school makes it unique. The Reverend Thoburn has every incentive to cut costs, improve performance, and keep the parents happy. He answers to no bureaucratic board; he answers to the parents directly. They control the school by their willingness to take their children out if the school's performance drops. The school has no cafeteria, no gymnasium, and no wasted building space. With tuition at \$1,100 a year, the school has proven to be remarkably profitable. The Reverend Thoburn never asks parents for additional donations. He never has to ask churches for support. His own church meets in the school building, thereby saving on rent. The children receive good educations at tuition fees that meet the national average for private schools, and transportation is included, unlike most private schools. Graduates have never been turned down at their chosen colleges, and several have won honors and scholarships. The school is not accredited, and Thoburn never intends to seek it. "If the public schools want to come to me to accredit them, fine, but that's the only time I'll bother about accreditation," he says.

He has made what most Christians would regard as a small fortune. He did it in fifteen years, starting with no financial backing. He did it by pioneering a new educational concept: profit-making Christian education. He keeps parents happy. The students do well. It works.

What Fairfax Christian School has demonstrated is that the free market is a safe place to operate if you have a good product to offer people who want that product. He had no assistance from traditional Christian educators, with their boards, deficits, used textbooks (secular), raffles, bingo, underpaid instructors, and full accreditation. He beat the system, and in doing so, he made a lot of money. He sold the public what it needed, while others have gone bankrupt trying to give away a similar (though inferior) product.

His book reflects his philosophy. It is priced to make him a profit. The royalties on sales so far have made him more money than he could have made had he sold 10,000 of them at \$1.95—and he would never have sold 10,000. He realized early that he faced what economists called an “inelastic demand curve”: lower the price, and you lose money.

The book will pay for itself in a few weeks, if someone puts its recommendations into action. It will not pay for itself if you do not apply its findings. Thus, he has limited its sale to those who mean business. Furthermore, when people call him on the phone and expect him to tell them everything he knows, free of charge (as many people have tried for many years), he has a simple answer: buy the book first, read it, and then call me back. That weeds out the “free lunch” brigade, whose name is legion in Christian circles. The book is priced rationally. Those who plan to build a school will see it pay for itself very rapidly; those who are hearers of the word, and doers only if someone subsidizes them, can go search for free information elsewhere. They will discover eventually that free information is usually worth twice what you pay for it.

The trouble with a \$125 price tag is that such prices are very seldom associated {205} with books. The solution to the problem is to call it something else. No one in business objects to paying \$125 for a seminar. He could call it a “printed transcript of the famous R.L.T. Seminars.” Or he could call it a “course.” How about a “manual”? People might be willing to pay \$125 for a “school technician’s manual.” After all, technical manuals are very scientific, so they have to be expensive. I think this is a very reasonably priced “home study guide.” Just don’t think of it as a book; it has “modules,” not chapters.

Thoburn's course covers the most important steps involved in the establishment and successful operation of a private, profitable school. The printed learning modules include the following topics: financing, facilities, curriculum, faculty, transportation, scheduling, discipline, admissions, advertising, government regulations, grading, equipment, accounting, and (for profit-seeking schools) taxation. All the basics are here. Money-making and money-saving ideas are found in every section of the course. Thoburn has a gift for smelling a buck, and he shows you how he goes about it. For those who want dollars and cents advice on how to run a successful education business, this is the best single source of information.

Consider transportation. Should you locate in the city or in a less expensive rural area? Should you buy larger or smaller buses? Should you hire full-time drivers? Where can you recruit drivers? How much should you pay them? Thoburn has his buses painted with the school's name, for advertising. He hires mothers of students to run the buses. He lets them take the buses home, thereby getting free advertising and reducing parking problems. For drivers who come from a long distance, he bought VW Beetles. The mother drives the bus to school and parks it. It costs more per mile to operate a bus than it does to operate a VW Beetle, so she picks up her Beetle and drives home. Then she returns the Beetle, picks up the bus, and drives home for the night. This saves money. About a month after he bought his VW Beetles, the Arabs announced the oil embargo, and the price of used Beetles rose rapidly. In effect, Thoburn had "gone long" in the used VW "futures market," and reaped his entrepreneurial reward. It is this kind of thinking that makes the difference between profit and loss, between middle-class income and wealth. He drives a new Cadillac, not a VW. Fifteen years ago, he would have been happy to have owned a new Beetle. Entrepreneurship makes a difference.

How to Establish and Operate a Successful Christian School may not make you rich, but it is the best introduction to the financial possibilities associated with private education that you can buy today. There is service to be rendered and money to be made out there, and the worse the government schools become, the more profit opportunities will appear. When you start a private school, you are betting against the

competence of the government, and the odds are surely on your side when you make a bet like that.

Disaster By Decree: The Supreme Court Decisions on Race and the Schools, by Lino A. Graglia.

Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1976. 351 pp.

Reviewed by Tommy W. Rogers

An understanding of the nature of constitutional law has to be derived from the Court's actual performance in specific areas of constitutional law. No other area so well illustrates the fact that the Constitution is what the judges wish to say it is. The 1954 Supreme Court decision of *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka* gave {206} impetus to a revolution in race relations that was already gaining noticeable momentum with dire warnings of future success. Of even greater importance was the fact that a decision of such consequence could be made, and be made to prevail, by our least accountable and least representative institution of government. The result was a drastic change in the perception, both inside and outside the Court, of the Court's role and power in the American system of government. The Court was to increasingly become "a tempting, willing, and seemingly omnipotent instrument for effecting fundamental changes without obtaining the consent of the American people or their elected representatives ... it has become ... the most important institution of American government" (14).

The Brown decision as announced meant simply the prohibition of racial discrimination by government officials. The alleged basis was the fourteenth amendment, adopted by legislative bodies of both the central government legislature for District of Columbia schools, as well as a number of State legislatures which enacted the amendment which the Court in 1954 claimed prohibited segregated schools. Subsequently, the Court moved from a decision which Graglia feels could "be understood and justified" to a compulsory integration which has meant "that the use of racial discrimination by government officials was not only

permitted but, for the first time in our history, was constitutionally required” (15).

The Court’s strategy has been to claim one thing while requiring another. By this strategic coup, the Court released itself from a need to justify compulsory integration on any alleged constitutional or other merits, and helped minimize any potential national concern by seemingly confining the applicability of the requirement to the South. However, each succeeding decision made it clear that the Court’s declaration of requiring the elimination of segregation was, in practice, superseded by requirements of racial discrimination in order to promote integration.

The increasing gap between what the Court was doing in fact and what it was required to say it was doing in order to maintain its desegregation or “remedy” justification for compulsory integration caused it increasingly to resort to methods of decision-making so unprincipled and unscrupulous, so heedless of both fact and reason, and disrespectful of federal statutory law (the 1964 Civil Rights Act) that they would not be tolerated by the American people if practiced by even the avowedly political institutions of American government. Even if compulsory school racial integration could somehow be defended, the performance of the Court in imposing it could not. If, as is often asserted, the Court’s extraordinary power in America ultimately rests on a moral foundation, its power to compel school racial integration rests ultimately on nothing. (16)

In 1896, in *Plessy v. Ferguson*, the Court upheld a Louisiana statute which provided equal but separate accommodations for the white and colored races in passenger trains. In accordance with judicial tradition, the Court in *Brown* made an appearance of continuity while effecting a complete reversal of direction. In *Brown*, the Court stated: “Whatever may have been the extent of the psychological knowledge at the time of *Plessy v. Ferguson*,” the *Brown* reversal of the principle was, allegedly, “amply supported by modern authority.”

As many commentators quickly pointed out, both those supporting and opposing the decision, the “finding” that school segregation had adverse educational effects on Negroes was not “amply supported,” if supported at all, by “scientific” knowledge. In addition to opening itself up to the contention that the decision was social science rather than law, and fallacious social science at that, the Court clearly left itself

open to further consideration of its decision on the basis of new evidence. {207} No further consideration of evidence was to be allowed, as illustrated in the Court's reversal of *Stell v. Savannah-Chatham City Board of Education* (1963) and denial of certiorari on reappeal (1964). The Fifth Circuit decision in *Armstrong v. Board of Education* (1964) stated: "Insofar as the opinions of experts in the fields of psychology and anthropology ... may constitute an attack upon the major premise (separate educational facilities are inherently unequal), they are rejected out of hand." So much for moral credibility.

If justification of the *Brown* decision depended on the Court's explanation of why segregated schools are necessarily unequal, its decision, based on the evidence which has become available since *Brown*, would still be without justification. That the *Brown* decision did not in fact turn on its alleged "finding" of educational harm from segregated schools was apparent in *Bolling v. Sharp*, which involved the District of Columbia and was decided on the same day as *Brown*. The "equal protection" clause of the Fourteenth Amendment was not available in *Bolling*, since its restriction applies only to the states and not the federal government. "Because constitutional provisions have little to do with constitutional law, however, this presented no difficulty" (29). School segregation in the District was accordingly found to violate the "due process" clause of the Fifth Amendment.

The Court had purportedly "distinguished" *Brown* from *Plessy* rather than overturning it. However, in *Bolling*, decided on the same day, it simply pronounced racial discrimination as a feature of the Constitution. *Plessy*, the Court had said, dealt with transportation, not education. Within a week the Court was reversing and remanding cases dealing with racial segregation in public parks and universities in the light of *Brown*; within a year the Court simply cited *Brown* to invalidate racial segregation in recreational facilities, and, within two years, in transportation itself.

A decision is justified, Graglia points out, when it is based on a principle whose validity and applicability cannot be persuasively challenged. If one assumes that the issue in the *Brown* case was a proper one for the Court to decide, and assumes that one should not be disadvantaged by government on the basis of his ancestry (admittedly a principle that is neither absolute nor the answer to all racial questions,

but which “may be as close to a useful absolute as any we have”), then the *Brown* decision, Graglia feels, is justified by the point that “there is no way that a trip of ten, five, or even two miles can be made no more disadvantageous than a trip of only one mile” (31). Graglia says,

The appeal and general acceptance of a simple prohibition of all official racial discrimination are so great, indeed, that it is hardly possible to quarrel with the *Brown* decision [Graglia points out that the Court did have uncited constitutional precedent in the 1890 case of *Strauder v. West Virginia* for the *Brown* decision on the basis that the law was not the same for the black as for the white]—as distinct from the opinion—except on the ground that so important a social change should not have been made by unelected, lifetime appointees. The *Brown* case was less a traditional law suit than a call for a social revolution, and in a healthy democracy social revolutions are made by elected representatives authorized to effectuate their political views and accountable for the results. The fact that this revolution was made, or greatly advanced, by judges soon led to many other revolutions, much less justifiable, being made in the same way. (32)

In *Brown 2* (1955) the Court refused to grant relief even with regard to the individual black school children who were the nominal plaintiffs. Uncertain that its new law, which contradicted the approval of already existing segregated schools or {208} the establishment of segregated schools by each of the twenty-six states having any substantial racial differences among their populations that enacted the law the Court alleged it was enforcing, would prevail, despite its own shaky legality and the principled opposition mounted against it, “the Court’s decision lost sight of the individual plaintiffs, whose rights, in legal theory, provided the Court’s only warrant for making a decision” (36).

Acknowledging that at times individual interests must be subordinated to group classification, Graglia feels that the “Court’s refusal to grant plaintiffs individual relief in effect utilized the very classification by race it began by condemning” (36). To Graglia, the most charitable interpretation is that the Court, evidencing a less than subtle notion that Negroes (unlike whites) possess rights as a race rather than as individuals so that particular Negroes could be delayed the enjoyment of their alleged (by the Court) constitutional rights if progress is being made in improving the legal status of Negroes generally, the Court had

determined to deal with the problem as involving the rights of the Negro race rather than the rights of individuals.

Failure to require present compliance with *Brown* enormously complicated and confused the issue. Instead of a relatively straightforward requirement of assignment without regard to race, the requirement became the production of a “desegregation plan.” The acceptability of different plans was then to be litigated for more than a decade. Under cover of the resulting confusion and delay, the original prohibition of segregation was metamorphosed into a requirement of integration, a drastic change that was never openly admitted and, thereby, never had to be justified.

That the *Brown* gamble of the Court was successful was established by the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which adopted the *Brown* prohibition as national legislative policy. No longer fearing the *Brown* atrocity would not be made to prevail, the Court became arrogant and indignant at the recalcitrance and delay its ten years of hesitance had done much to encourage. By the time *Griffin v. County School Board of Prince Edward County* was decided (less than two months before passage of the Act) the prohibition on racial discrimination announced in *Brown* had become a requirement for maintenance of a public school system in practice.

Neither the written words of the bill itself nor specific congressional intent could in debate have been plainer than what was the clearly enunciated principle—that prohibition of discrimination in federally assisted programs could not be used to require positive integration. “The possibility that a requirement of racial discrimination to achieve integration or racial balance might somehow result from the act was the strongest argument of its opponents and was repeatedly and emphatically denied by its proponents” (47). Congressman Celler and Senator Humphrey repeatedly assured under the most precise questioning that such a result was impossible, a contention that was regarded as essential to its passage.

In practice, however, every assurance written into the act and reiterated by its sponsors and supporters that it could not be made the basis of a requirement of integration proved to be worthless. The act’s provision that “no rule, regulation, or order” would become effective without presidential approval afforded no protection against the Office of

Education or the federal court system. A clearer illustration of administrative and judicial perversion of legislative purpose, states Graglia, would be difficult to find.

By this time the federal courts at all levels had become long-accustomed to formulating and supervising methods of school assignment and to prodding school boards to ever more vigorous efforts. The court's exertions had gained {209} not only acceptance but endorsement and applause; the moral superiority of the judicial to the political process came to be widely recognized. Full compliance with Brown could not be achieved, but judicial withdrawal from control of the schools could no longer be expected. (45)

By means of wordplay and charlatanism, the constitutional mandate alleged in *Brown* was changed from a *prohibition of racial integration to separate the races* to a *requirement of racial discrimination to mix them*. With reasoning sufficiently illogical and obscure to defy explanation, the Court defeated congressional pronouncement and turned the provisions of the act against itself.

Administratively imposed requirements prohibited by the Civil Rights Act of 1964 were raised by the courts to the level of a constitutional requirement. "Congress would lose the power to eliminate it, even by repealing the original legislation. There was, the opponents of the act were proved correct in contending, no way to combat a recognized evil without bringing about a possibly greater one" (66). The Supreme Court itself endorsed administrative misuse of the act for the purpose of requiring integration. Instead of providing a restraint on the excesses of other government officials—a traditional justification of the Supreme Court's extraordinary power—the Court proved itself to be the most dangerous source of excess.

The Supreme Court failed to justify compulsory integration for its own sake by claiming that integration is not required for its own sake but only in order to "remedy" the segregation prohibited in *Brown*. Graglia shows how this claim became more obviously fictional with each succeeding case. The Court's logical sophistry and semantic stratagem "served to minimize national attention and concern and, consequently, opposition and to make the decision seem but another step taken by a patient Court to counteract still another attempt by the recalcitrant South to evade the requirement of *Brown*" (83).

Court requirements of busing to achieve integration are described by Graglia as a “bizarre” development. It was, he states, “almost as if the weakening of public support for public schools and the increase of racial separation in schools and cities had become, not only the inevitable concomitant of what the federal courts required, but, in the blindness of unrestrained tyranny, the objective” (144). The decisions of the four justices appointed by a President “who made opposition to busing a major part of his program for domestic peace” resulted in no infusion of responsibility into the Court.

... Roosevelt did ultimately succeed in stopping the Court’s invalidation of the New Deal, but that was a conservative Court, seeking to impede basic social change. The Court since *Brown* has become the nation’s principle engine of change. The superiority of its policy-making over policy-making by elected representatives has, therefore, been so long and so loudly proclaimed by many of our most articulate and influential citizens that the power of the Court is now much more difficult to overcome. (202)

The Supreme Court decision in *Milliken v. Bradley* (1974) is said to provide a fitting conclusion to the “unhappy story” of the Supreme Court’s decisions on race and education since *Brown*. Here, desegregation could be required in a district shown never to have been segregated. Apparently suburban districts of Detroit had violated the constitution by building their own schools rather than sending their children to schools in Detroit.

Graglia articulates some of the costs of abandoning neighborhood schools and enters some caveats to the supposed benefits of compulsory integration in education. He suggests, rather mildly in this case, “There appears to be a general and {210} growing agreement that the claim of improved black academic performance as a result of compulsory integration is dubious and that compulsory integration is not likely to be justified on that basis” (271). He also contends that compulsory integration is self-defeating of the Court’s own intention in the sense that compulsory integration often operates to create more rather than few majority-black schools. Furthermore, the Court’s requirement of integration has introduced into the political process a gross distortion of traditional representative government.

BOOKS FOR SALE

[The following is an advertisement that appeared in 1977
but is no longer valid.]

FAIRFAX CHRISTIAN STARTER KIT for New Christian Schools

The following books have been recommended by Mr. and Mrs. Robert L. Thoburn for persons who are starting a Christian school. Mr. Thoburn is the Headmaster of Fairfax Christian School and Mrs. Thoburn is the Supervisor of Elementary Education. These books are not the only ones that will be needed by a new school, but they do provide a representative sample of books that Fairfax Christian School has found very valuable. The chapter on curriculum in Robert Thoburn's book provides the detailed information that is needed in developing the whole curriculum in Grades K-12.

In order to acquaint Christian educators with these books this special starter kit is being made available. The regular prices of these books are listed. The special discount price is available only by purchasing the entire package. This offer may be withdrawn at any time without notice.

<i>How to Establish and Operate a Successful Christian School</i> by Robert L. Thoburn (238 page manual on every aspect of operating a school)	\$125.00
<i>Reading Without Dick and Jane</i> , by Dr. Arther Trace Jr. (This is the best book available on the subject of reading)	4.50
<i>An Acorn in My Hand</i> , by Bouldin (a must for teaching phonics and reading)	5.00
Hay-Wingo Phonics (Teacher's Edition)	9.20
Victory Drill Book (Very important for a good phonics program)	5.00
Victory Drill Book Teacher's Manual	5.00
Animal Number Family Cards 1-10	5.00

Boxed set of 7 McGuffey Readers (kivar cover)	15.00
McGuffey Primer Workbook	3.00
McGuffey First Reader Workbook	3.00
Bremner-Davis Phonics Records (School Edition)	59.50
Chart One, Two, and Five Books to accompany Bremner-Davis	9.00
<i>Child's Story Bible</i> , by Catherine Vos	6.50
Little Chick Chick (sample of a Beacon Reader)	3.00
Reading Is Fun (sample of Open Court Reader)	5.53
<i>The Messianic Character of American Education</i>	3.15
Bremner-Davis Multiplication Records	12.95
Total Retail Value	\$279.33
Special Discount	-\$84.33
Your cost for Package	\$195.00

The starter kit is available from:
Fairfax Christian Bookstore,
11121 Pope's Head Road,
Fairfax, Virginia 22030.
Phone: (703) 273-3040.

BOOKS NOT FOR SALE

"DECLARING UNTO YOU THE WHOLE COUNSEL OF GOD"

WESTMINSTER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

CHESTNUT HILL • PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA 19118

The Campus Bookstore
Westminster Seminary
Box 27009
Chestnut Hill, PA 19118

11 April 1977

Dr. Gary North
Journal of Christian Reconstruction
P.O. Box 1608
Springfield, VA 22151

Dear Sir:

It has been called to my attention that on p. 4 of the Winter issue (vol. 3, no. 2) of your journal you advise your readers that J. A. DeJong's AS THE WATERS COVER THE SEA is available from us. I wish you had checked with us before making that announcement.

We do not now have the book in stock. We have not carried it for at least two years (to my certain knowledge). I think it has been longer. As far as I can tell, the book is out of print.

Even if we did have a few copies in stock, we do not seek out business by mail. That takes time and energy (both are limited commodities) from our first job: serving our students.

We have already received one letter and one long distance phone call. So the whole matter will cost both us and your readers time and money. That expense could have been avoided had you undertaken the courtesy of checking with us.

Please advise your readers at your first opportunity that we are unable to supply them with this book.

Thank you.

Yours,
Jim Meek, mgr.
The Campus Bookstore

PUBLICATION SCHEDULE

VOLUME 5

Volume 5 (1978) of *The Journal of Christian Reconstruction* will feature symposiums on “politics” and “Puritanism.” Manuscripts dealing with either topic are now being reviewed for publication. Anyone wishing to submit a manuscript for consideration would be wise to clear the topic in advance with the editor. Manuscripts should be between twenty and forty pages in length, typewritten, and double-spaced. The University of Chicago’s *Manual of Style* is preferred, though not mandatory. If accepted, *The Journal* will pay the author \$75 upon publication. Shorter manuscripts (under fifteen pages) receive \$35. Book reviews (five to ten pages) receive \$10; books dealing with the symposium’s topic are preferred. Suggestions concerning the reprinting of important documents or published articles, if accepted, are worth \$20, if accompanied by a clear photocopy of the recommended piece.

Manuscripts suitable for publication in the sections on “Christian Reconstruction” and “Defenders of the Faith” are always given careful consideration, as are suggestions for reprinting. Again, it is wise to clear the topic in advance with the editor. Summaries of dissertations are acceptable.

DEADLINES:

POLITICS: March 15, 1978

PURITANISM: August 15, 1978

CONTACT :

GARY NORTH, *Editor*

P.O. Box 1608

Springfield, VA 22151

(703) 941-3354

THE MINISTRY OF CHALCEDON

(Pr. 29:18)

Chalcedon [kaISEEdon] is a Christian educational organization devoted exclusively to research, publishing, and cogent communication of a distinctly Christian scholarship to the world at large. It makes available a variety of services and programs, all geared to the needs of interested laymen who understand the propositions that Jesus Christ speaks to the mind as well as the heart, and that His claims extend beyond the narrow confines of the various institutional churches. We exist in order to support the efforts of all orthodox denominations and churches.

Chalcedon derives its name from the great ecclesiastical Council of Chalcedon (AD 451), which produced the crucial Christological definition: “Therefore, following the holy Fathers, we all with one accord teach men to acknowledge one and the same Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, at once complete in Godhead and complete in manhood, truly God and truly man ...” This formula directly challenges every false claim of divinity by any human institution: state, church, cult, school, or human assembly. Christ alone is both God and man, the unique link between heaven and earth. All human power is therefore derivative; Christ alone can announce that, “All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth” (Matthew 28:18). Historically, the Chalcedonian creed is therefore the foundation of Western liberty, for it sets limits on all authoritarian human institutions by acknowledging the validity of the claims of the one who is the source of true human freedom (Galatians 5:1).

Christians have generally given up two crucial features of theology that in the past led to the creation of what we know as Western civilization. They no longer have any real optimism concerning the possibility of an earthly victory of Christian principles and Christian institutions, and they have also abandoned the means of such a victory in external human affairs: a distinctly biblical concept of law. The testimony of the Bible and Western history should be clear: when God’s people have been confident about the ultimate earthly success of their religion and committed socially to God’s revealed system of external law, they have been victorious. When either aspect of their faith has declined, they have lost ground. Without optimism, they lose their zeal to exercise dominion over God’s creation

(Genesis 1:28); without revealed law, they are left without guidance and drift along with the standards of their day.

Once Christians invented the university; now they retreat into little Bible colleges or sports factories. Once they built hospitals throughout Europe and America; now the civil governments have taken them over. Once Christians were inspired by “Onward, Christian Soldiers”; now they see themselves as “poor wayfaring strangers” with “joy, joy, by, joy down in their hearts” only on Sundays and perhaps Wednesday evenings. They are, in a word, pathetic. Unquestionably, they have become culturally impotent.

Chalcedon is committed to the idea of Christian reconstruction. It is premised on the belief that ideas have consequences. It takes seriously the words of Professor F. A. Hayek: “It may well be true that we as scholars tend to overestimate the influence which we can exercise on contemporary affairs. But I doubt whether it is possible to overestimate the influence which ideas have in the long run.” If Christians are to reconquer lost ground in preparation for ultimate victory (Isaiah 2, 65, 66), they must rediscover their intellectual heritage. They must come to grips with the Bible’s warning and its promise: “Where there is no vision, the people perish: but he that keepeth the law, happy is he” (Proverbs 29:18). Chalcedon’s resources are being used to remind Christians of this basic truth: what men believe makes a difference. Therefore, men should not believe lies, for it is the truth that sets them free (John 8:32).

Finis