

## The Christian Church and Education.

Whoever proposes to discuss the relation of the Christian Church to the education of children must face at the outset the almost insurmountable difficulty presented by the popular understanding of the term education. Being of Latin extraction this term is what Luther would call a "blind" word to people of Teutonic stock; it conveys no meaning in itself, and its definition is wholly independent of the original significance of the root word\*). When speaking of education, our people rarely mean anything more than the conveying or acquisition of knowledge; at best, they include the idea of training in the profitable use of knowledge. To educate is almost universally understood to denote the development of the intellect—and nothing more. Even persons of uncommon broadness of culture will only in very exceptional cases recognize the deeper significance of the word and will use it as denoting the proper training of the emotional and the volitional phases of soul life *primarily*. Yet as there is no other English word which expresses this idea, we must needs put the burden on the word education, warning all who read this that we speak of education as meaning much more than the mere act of imparting knowledge. Teaching that has no higher aim than to cultivate the child's intellect is not truly educative. The true educator aims to influence both the emotional and volitional life of his pupil and to shape his character permanently by means of proper instruction. This aim guides him in the selection of the knowledge material as well as in the application of scientific method in his school work.

While it may be assumed that all educators worthy of that name are in full agreement as to the general description of education given above, their unanimity will disappear at once when we raise the question as to the proper description of that character which is to be recognized as the desired result of education. Superficially considered the diversity of opinions voiced gives the impression of a veritable Babel of confusion. On closer view, however, we will soon realize that these opinions *always* reveal the religious opinions of the persons holding them. In fact, religion and education are so intimately related that a person's views on the fundamental questions of education may be deduced from his religious standpoint. Broadly speaking, there are only

\*) Those familiar with German terminology will readily see that the distinctive meanings of Unterricht, Erziehung, and Bildung are arbitrarily and confusingly combined in the word education.

**THE SEMINARY LIBRARY**

**Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary**

**Mequon, Wisconsin**

two primary distinctions of religious life, the Christian, and the Non-Christian. It follows that educators will describe the character to be developed in the child either from the viewpoint of the Christian faith in the redemption of Jesus Christ, or from that of natural religion. The Non-Christian educator will see no reason whatever why he should not make his pupil a true child of the world, while the Christian educator, by the necessity of conviction will see that faith in the salvation of Jesus Christ is the determining factor in true character building. The result of educational effort in either case is easy to forecast. The Non-Christian educator finally dismisses his pupil *essentially unchanged*. Born as a child of the world the boy or girl meets no influences in the Non-Christian school which might change his, or her, native tendencies. But if the Christian educator succeeds in his purposes, the result will be that the pupil leaves his hands as a child of God, the antithesis of the child of the world. In the first case, there may eventuate a partial inhibition of the wicked impulses inherent in every human heart, and some recognition of certain moral requirements may have been established; but the inhibition will be based entirely upon the desire to avoid personal disadvantages, and whatever influence the moral requirements may exert will be due to the profit to be expected from their observance. Beyond this, Non-Christian education has never progressed, nor has it ever visualized a higher ethical aim. Christian education, on the other hand, by establishing and nurturing faith in the living God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, sets up the holy will of the Savior God as the one true and unalterable standard of all morality; it seeks to develop a live energy tending to counteract wicked impulses and to strive after true righteousness, not for selfish profit, but for the sake of the loving God. This comparison unavoidably leads to the conclusion that Non-Christian education, tho it succeed in developing and establishing some kind of character, never gives the pupil any thing that is not in him by nature, and does not really deserve the title of education at all; whereas Christian education, if it succeeds, lifts the child out of the muck of sinfulness and sets him on a new plane, with a new outlook upon life and a strong tendency toward righteousness. This, again, is merely another way of stating the familiar axiom that the only educative force in the world is the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the power of God unto salvation, which creates spiritual life in man who otherwise is dead in sins and transgressions. "He that is spiritual judgeth all things, and he himself is judged of no man". (1. Cor. 2, 15)

In our country, the government has taken upon itself the task of furnishing school education for the children of the citizens. In the course of inevitable development, a complete school system

has been built up in almost every state of the Union, designed to carry the child thru the whole course, from the kindergarten to the university. Many millions of dollars are collected as school taxes to support this system which, by virtue of the emotional character of our people, has come to be looked upon as one of the pillars, if not the principal support of our American institutions. It does not affect the intensity of this opinion in the least that it is based upon a number of largely hypothetical premises. In the hysterical manner with which we have become sadly familiar, that opinion has been proclaimed as one of the unerring tests of true Americanism, and every loyal citizen is required to accept it with blind, unthinking faith. Many consider it a crime even to question its reasonableness. But an institution which cannot bear the probe of calm investigation is surely not worth the expenditure of millions of the people's money. The state systems of education could not be arraigned more effectively than by asserting that those who owe them their training, are unable to give fair consideration to an argument directed against them.

For Christians, there is abundant reason to examine this matter of education by the state. Christian parents must *know* whether they are in any way justified in entrusting the delicate business of their children's rearing to the school opportunities offered by the state. The issue is sharply defined. We propose to show that, inasmuch as the schooling of children is universally recognized to be a community business, it is not the Non-Christian community of the state, but the Christian community of the Church which is properly qualified to furnish real education.

The state a Non-Christian community? Does not that seem to imply a denial of the fact that all government is of God? Not at all, since there are many things to which, tho they are created by God, the attribute "Christian" does not apply. Government belongs to the category of those creations which are produced by the mere fiat of God's will. Being the Ruler of the universe, He is in supreme control of the destinies of all men, and His providential guidance determines the form of government which in each human community maintains a certain civic order according to definite standards of law. But tho all secular governments of the world are used by God in the accomplishment of His greater and ultimate purposes, none of them is Christian as such. Thus, the political fate of many peoples of Europe is just now pending, and the outcome will be in accordance with the divine decree; but the fact of this supercontrol of God will not entitle any new nation now being formed to be called Christian. Christianity is not a matter of secular allegiance, but of faith in Christ, and only that which is created by the Gospel of salvation may properly be called Christian. As secular government

belongs to God's kingdom of power and is *never* called into existence by the Gospel, every secular government as such is Non-Christian.

This is true not only when the men who control the forces of government are strangers to the Christian Church, but even in the improbable case that all persons who are in authority are personally true followers of Christ and children of God by faith in the Savior. For tho many hopeful dreamers look forward to a time when the rulers of the world will themselves be under the control of beautiful ideas, the hard fact remains that there is not now, nor has there ever been a government which did not finally rest upon brute force. Paul uses a more polite expression, but his descriptions of those in authority as being wielders of the sword for the punishment of evildoers means nothing else. All secular governments express their will in laws and ordinances, and they do not leave it optional for the citizens to obey the laws or not. Unless the drawn sword stands behind the law, the law falls to the ground. Thus it has always been, is now, and will continue to be as long as this earth shall stand. Secular government has only one means of achieving results, and that is the enforcement of its laws. Nor does any rational government look for more than compliance with its demands. Those who wield the powers of state, may feel at times that it would be desirable to have all citizens approve of every law understandingly, and may even launch a campaign of popular education to obtain general acquiescence in some proposed measure. But the enforcement of the law cannot wait for the approval of the citizen, as any policeman will readily show the obvious transgressor. Even laws of the most doubtful wisdom and necessity, such as our new edicts establishing bonded prohibition, will be made effective by the sword of power, not by persuasion. No secular government can stand for a minute unless it is ready and competent to use brute force against all transgressors of its laws. That is as it should be; it is God's own arrangement. By force of corollary, this means that secular government is not given by God for the purpose of making the world morally better, and also that every effort in this direction is a departure from the only work which government is competent to perform. Wherever and whenever such schemes have been carried thru they have worked disaster.

But if physical force actually and always is the ultimate and only convincing argument secular government can bring to bear, it should be easy to see that no secular government as such is competent to furnish education. The law may compel the citizen to pay school taxes, and it does so; it may prescribe a definite school curriculum, and it does so; it may fix standards which make it possible to eliminate incompetent teachers, and it has

tried to do that; it may proscribe truancy and compel regular attendance of pupils during a definite period of life. Beyond such laws and their physical enforcement no government can go; but their enforcement surely is not even the beginning of education. No fiat of legislature will produce a single competent teacher. No physical compulsion ever filled a pupil with that eager desire for knowledge without which even intellectual acquirements are impossible. The state may furnish a magnificent shell for a school, but no law was ever devised which could produce that which is the very life of a school.

This, however, merely begins to show the limitations of the state in matters educational, and optimistic souls might be inclined to demur by asserting that government will always find persons who are willing and competent to make the school the living organism it ought to be. This, however, is merely a restatement of the hoary axiom that the teacher makes the school, and is in itself sufficient proof that the state cannot make a school. Moreover, educative results do not depend upon the willingness of competent teachers and the apperceptive interest of pupils alone. If education means character building, the third vital factor of school work is the knowledge material prescribed by the curriculum. There is a vast fund of available knowledge which does not serve to build up character, but leaves it exactly where it was, and may even work for deterioration. The world has had many opportunities to deplore the activities of "educated" crooks and scoundrels.

What, then, has the state to offer in the way of a curriculum? As we have shown, government can work only by command, by law. It knows of no other means to compel attention to its demands except physical force. What curriculum will it therefore prescribe for the schools which it creates by its fiat? It should be plain that, if the government is the educator in our state schools, working its designs thru the instrumentality of the teachers, every item of knowledge offered in those schools actually becomes a law, since government can speak in no other way. "Thus shalt thou perform this arithmetical operation; thus shalt thou think and speak of this historical occurrence; thus shalt thou understand the facts of science," etc. etc. We might extend the series, letting it culminate in the governmental decree that "thou shalt believe that the universe has reached its present development by a process of organic evolution."

But our argument will be the more convincing if we cut straight to the heart of the matter. By favor of divine providence our fundamental law makes it impossible for the government of the union and of the states to place on its school curriculum the only item of knowledge in the world which makes for character

building; the one Truth by which boys and girls may be powerfully influenced in the right direction; the one spiritual power which can turn the soul of man from sin to righteousness; the Gospel of Jesus Christ. For our present purposes it is sufficient to state the fact; for fact it is that by introducing Christian instruction into the state school government would at once establish the Christian faith as the official religion. This would be unconstitutional. Let us hope fervently and pray insistently that this limitation of the powers of our government may remain unchanged forever. It has always proved detrimental to the cause of the Gospel whenever secular governments have tried to dabble in religion. The difficulty is not accidental, but is inherent in the nature of the Christian faith. Secular government has no business to interfere with it in any manner whatsoever.

Thus the state, assuming educational functions which are in themselves foreign to its nature, becomes a Non-Christian educator. As we have seen above this means that state education at its very best leaves human nature unchanged. Knowing that human nature is totally corrupted by sin so that there is not a spark of true morality in any human being as *God* rates morality, we recognize the futility of all efforts of the state to educate children. It cannot be done with the means at hand. Filling the mind with a conglomerate mass of knowledge is not education. But in all the branches of the Non-Christian school curriculum there is nothing to reach and really mould the center of human personality, i. e. the emotional life of the soul from which the will derives its impulses. To be unable to touch this vital feature of soul life in a regenerative way makes all efforts at true education come to naught. To make a child realize that honesty is the best policy because the dishonest man will eventually lose out; or, that sexual uncleanness is unprofitable because it ruins bodily health; or, that social conscience cannot countenance murder—all this is not education, nor is that conduct moral which complies with these and similar rules for such reasons as the state school can give. Unless a person is convinced that transgressions of the moral law are sins against God and must be avoided for *that* reason, and that certain things should be done, not because they are profitable, but because *God* wills them, and unless his will be regenerated so as to agree with this will of God, his conduct does not deserve to be classified as moral, unless you are willing to indicate its moral defectiveness by designating it a *civic* morality. The most impeccable behavior regulated according to all the dictates of social convention is not in itself true morality. Morality may even be lacking when a certain impression has been made upon the emotions. You may train a child so that certain forms of wickedness become positively distasteful and abhorrent to it

without improving the child's moral nature in the least. Unless you also supply an unshakable religious fundamentation, that is, unless that distaste of uncleanness is firmly based on the consciousness that such things are in violation of God's holiness, it has no real moral value. Yet that is about the best that state education can accomplish. There is no character building because mere civic morality, being nothing more than a recognition of human conventions, disappears immediately when the urgent desire of the opposite arises and is coupled with a sense of security from observation and punishment.

For this reason alone, aside from all other possible shortcomings of the school system, the educational efforts of the state are foredoomed to failure, and a failure all the more tragical because it may not become apparent until the connection of the outbreak with the preceding school training is not traceable in the individual case. But take the results of state education in the whole, and you will begin to see things. Our school systems have been firmly established for several decades, and their influence in the way of character building should have become clearly observable at least in the present generation. Its actual blessings should be visible to the naked eye of anyone not willfully blind. No honest and reasonable observer, however, will dare to maintain that this is the case. There is no country in the world in which there is less respect for the law and less willing submission to its requirements, than ours. It may be stated as a general truth that our citizens obey the law only so long as they must or find it profitable; otherwise they never let the law stand in the way of gain or enjoyment. The art of training children properly is as much a lost art among those reared in the state schools as the art of coloring glass practiced by certain artisans of antiquity. At any rate, there is hardly a country on earth where parental authority counts for so little, or where children are so much their own masters. Our moral perceptions are dulled to such a degree that we do not feel the biting satire set before us by the cartoonist when he treats the subject of "bringing up father." That means that the divine commandment which requires the morality of honoring parents and other persons in authority by willing submission to their direction, is practically non-existent as a moral motive. In direct consequence of the deterioration of family discipline the population of our prisons and institutions of correction, where only the worst cases are gathered, has not decreased, but has at least kept even step with the growth of population. Our courts are overburdened with criminal cases, the offences running the entire gamut of all the most heinous violations of morality; yet everybody knows that for every lawbreaker who is rounded up, ten others go unmolested because they have succeeded in

avoiding detection. Murder has grown so common that the circumstances attending a particular case of manslaughter must be unusually atrocious to arouse more than a passing interest in the average newspaper reader. The divine precept, "Thou shalt not kill", has lost all its restraining and directive force where human life is held to be less valuable than money. A general breakdown of moral intuition in that respect is one of the most lurid signs of our retrogression. Those who are in a position to know actual conditions, which must not, of course, be discussed before the highly moral ears of the general public, are apt to smile very cynically when they hear the universal cant of our "clean" young men and women. Also let the divorce courts set forth their particular tale of corruption. We take deep pride in the fact that polygamy in the form peculiar to Mormonism has been suppressed by force; but where are the moral people who shudder as they realize that our divorce practice has developed a legal form of progressive polygamy which flaunts its immorality shamelessly before the eyes of the world, secure in the assurance that there is no popular opinion concerning the vice? A country where the sanctity of the marriage tie has become a joke can hardly be said to stand high in morality.

To proceed with our present arraignment, let us ask whether there is another country on the face of God's earth where blasphemy in the form of cursing and swearing has been developed so deliberately as in ours? Formerly, children were at least taught that polite society frowns upon such coarseness of speech because it might be shocking to some religious ears. Now, even that slight and inefficient restraint has broken down. During the dark days of the war it suddenly became a popular and patriotic pastime to damn this or that offensive enemy and to consign him to hell. Flaring posters instructed everybody that this flagrant violation of God's prerogative was not only permissible, but even commendable. And did the moral education of our people prove effective to resist this shock? Not if the popular magazines represent their readers' taste. Formerly it was considered needful to indicate a curse or other blasphemy by a discreet dash, and it was only the coarse adventurer who was represented as using such language. But now, not only have the dashes been replaced by the words, but the writers of fiction may dare to put the "damn" and the "hell" into the mouths of men and women whom they otherwise represent as being adorned with all the graces of refinement. They know what their readers will stand for; the educational campaign in blasphemy has borne fruit in abundance. Thus it would seem that the education furnished the present generation did not develop an abiding and controlling conviction that the name of the Most High must not be taken in vain. Finally,

if it should seem to be of minor importance that the American people is far from being imbued with a true religious spirit which recognizes and venerates God, every American must surely deplore the prevailing ignorance of the fundamental rule of all social order that no one must take the law in his own hands except perhaps in the defence of life. The spirit of lawless coercion or punishment lies so close to the surface everywhere that no police officer would dare to consider any community immune against volcanic outbursts of mob violence. Men and women are not trained to self-restraint, the first requirement of social security.

Have we sustained our contention that education by the state is foredoomed to failure? Let no one misunderstand the drift of our argument. We are not now examining the work of the public school in the concrete; that is a different chapter. The question was whether the state, having assiduously tried to educate several generations in non-religious, Christ-less schools, has succeeded in building up a spirit of true morality which sincerely shuns wickedness of all kinds and strives after all manner of good works. The schools undoubtedly have done their best, and that much may be placed to the credit of the state. But the obvious results of all this well-meaning effort are so disheartening that the leading spirits of state school work have long been enquiring most anxiously to what particular shortcoming the failure may be due. They are looking for a remedy, but they will never find one, because the state is not equipped to make educational work truly effective. It can check violent outbreaks of wickedness by the sword to some extent; but it has no means to reach and change sinful hearts.

In clear distinction from the task appointed for secular governments and their influence upon human actions we find the Church of Jesus Christ empowered and equipped to wield *spiritual* control over men. The distinction lies not only in the sphere, but also in the means and the manner of the control. While the state may hope for more or less intelligent and willing co-operation of the citizen and may even adopt certain measures calculated to promote understanding of its aims, which may then serve to produce voluntary submission to its laws, no government can exist unless it is ready to enforce its will by physical coercion as the ultimate resource. In other words, while the *persons* who are in authority may find it desirable to secure and maintain the good will of the citizens, the government which they wield is never, in the final analysis, a control of the mind, but of external conduct alone. All governments rule by physical force, and their authority ends where the compelling argument of the sword fails. The Church, on the other hand, has no authority whatever in

the sphere of mere physical activity. Tho it may seek to influence its members to perform certain acts, it has no means to enforce performance against the will of the persons concerned. Its *sphere of influence* is confined to the spiritual side of human nature.

What does that mean? In the broadest sense of the term it signifies that the Church exerts whatever power it possesses upon the *souls* of men, not upon their bodies. In the narrower sense in which we propose to use the term here, the spiritual side of human nature is not so much the mind (intellect), but rather the *emotional* life of the soul. In this the personality of man centers. All intellectual acquirements serve as thought material from which the emotions spring, while our volitions in their turn originate from our emotions. Influence a man's emotions, and you are indeed influencing him in the heart of his soul. This is a familiar truth to Lutherans who understand that the first and greatest commandment of the decalog is that we should *fear, love* and *trust* in God above all things. Direct these three powerful emotions toward the proper object, and you have given the whole soul life of such a person a character, an impression which will make itself felt in all directions. Now it happens that to the Church is entrusted the proclamation of that Word which alone can produce the highest of all emotions, faith, i. e. trustful confidence in God. By this a sinner returns into proper relations with his God. This is the unique task of the Church because no one but the Church can accomplish it. Some would probably prefer to say that the Church preaches religion; but this does not express the thought of Christ. It was not his intention that the Church should merely proclaim His Truth as one religion among many, but that by service of the Church the one true religion, faith in Jesus Christ, the Savior-God, should be put into the hearts of men. Lest we be misunderstood, let us hasten to add that this is at the same time the description of true morality. For morality never consists in the outward physical act: no act is truly moral and approved by God unless its roots lie in saving faith. Thus it follows that, tho it is not the primary object of the work of the Church to establish proper moral relations between man and man, such relations not only follow by necessity where saving faith is established, but they actually cannot exist unless that change has first been wrought by which the heart of man is turned to faith.

For this spiritual work the Church alone controls the *means*. We have shown above that the Creator has put into the hands of secular government the only efficient and necessary means to accomplish its purposes, the sword of physical power. As long as government directs its activities to such ends which may be

reached by physical compulsion, it may confidently look for a measure of success. Woe to the government which is so weak physically that its only hope for success lies in an appeal to the emotions! Did you ever realize that the philosophy of the world taken in its highest development has so far failed, and will forever utterly and miserably fail, to supply a single truth endowed with inherent compelling force to produce right emotions? The human mind cannot rise above itself. The sublimest truths developed by philosophy naturally lie within the grasp of every normal human mind. They can never lift the human soul out of its limited circle of thought, nor furnish the impulse of other than natural emotions. Philosophy has never taught men to think morally better thoughts, nor has it kindled emotions not tainted by the corruption of selfishness. This is not a theory, but a historical fact. If it were not, the world would not now be compelled to pin its doubtful hope of peace upon the questionable experiment of a league of nations. The magnificent and unexcelled philosophy of Plato would long ago have created Utopia.

But the Church has the Truth which comes from the heart of God. It is at the same time the one *real* Truth, and the only *satisfying* Truth. It has inherent power derived from its source, divine power to create and sustain a new life of the soul. It lifts man out of the slough of corruption and sets him free from the shackles of sin. To the Church is given the Gospel of Jesus Christ, a message intended for all mankind, and yet possessed as Truth only by those who embrace it with the God-given emotion of faith. It is true that the Gospel conveys a multitude of divine thoughts expressed in the language of man so that men may and do acquire divine knowledge intellectually. It is also true that in the believing heart the Gospel becomes a living force influencing the will and external action. But the primary, the all-important, the one needful effect of the Gospel is—faith. The Church alone possesses this means of influencing men in a new direction, away from sin unto God and His righteousness. This is the reason why Jesus calls His believers the salt of the earth. What-ever can be done for the salvation of men and for their real betterment must be done by the Church. It would be foolish to expect an unbeliever to recognize and acknowledge this fact; for he is an unbeliever because he persists in seeking his salvation in human philosophy. But a fact it is nevertheless.

The Church is also unique in the *manner* in which it uses the powerful means put into its hands. Indeed, no one can use the Gospel efficiently but the Church, which is not the body of those who profess the Christian religion, but the invisible, spiritual body of those who believe in Jesus Christ. There are numer-

ous professing Christians who imagine that the state may not only teach religion generally, but may actually preach the Gospel and work Gospel results. These misguided souls think that state education would at once become Christianized by the mere process of "putting the Bible back into the public school", as they phrase it. It would lead us too far afield to discuss the questionable merits of this suggestion in all its aspects. But let us remember that government cannot guarantee and will not even try to furnish teachers who, being filled with the Spirit of the Gospel, would make Bible reading a source of spiritual blessing to the pupils. The state must not apply any religious test to those whom it employs. Moreover, we have learned that the only language in which the state can speak is the law. All studies pursued in the schools of the state are put there by law, and their pursuit itself becomes a matter of lawful requirement. Put the Bible into the state school, and its reading and study automatically becomes law—the very antithesis of the Gospel. Make the Gospel a law of the state, and it is not only modified, but destroyed, its very essence being annihilated. We admit that the reading of the Bible so imposed on children *may* produce some spiritual results because of the inherent power of the Gospel it contains; but these results would be achieved by the Spirit who works when and where it pleaseth Him, and could not be written to the credit of the state and its schools. Indeed, they would come to pass *in spite* of the state law which is of the letter that killeth. Hence by proclaiming the Gospel in the only way possible to it, the state would nullify its effects. The state *cannot* preach life-saving Gospel.

The Church, being of the Spirit spiritual, preaches the Word in a *spiritual* manner. Not as a new law, or as an improvement upon the original law of God, but as a message of facts to be accepted by faith. The love of God in Jesus Christ, the reconciliation of the world to God, the forgiveness of all sins actually achieved by the redemption of Christ, the peace which is in God's heart towards all sinners, the righteousness which is imputed to sinners for Christ's sake—these are the facts placed before a dying world by the Church, with the insistent and compelling invitation to accept the free offer of salvation. There is only one way for the Church to do her appointed work, and that is by preaching, teaching, setting forth the divine Truth in all its saving beauty. To be heralds of the truth, messengers in the stead of Christ—that alone is the business of the Church. There is to be no compulsion or coercion whatever, but a free offer to be freely accepted. It would be treason to Christ to tack any condition to the offer which He makes. To call faith a condition of salvation, or repentance a prerequisite of forgiveness of sins, at

once changes the Gospel into a law and makes it ineffective. To attempt moral reforms by compulsion, especially in co-operation with the state, is a mischievous and perilous departure from the plain instructions given the Church by her Lord. An efficiency expert as the business world knows them would reject such a system out of hand; how could he hope to get results except by force of stringent rules and regulations? And yet this preaching of the free Gospel has always been, and now is, the only effective means available on earth to reach the hearts of men, to make them children of God, to lead them from darkness to light, from spiritual death to spiritual life, in short, to give them a real education which carries them upward, upward, upward!

This answers our original question which of the two divine institutions, the state or the Church, is by nature equipped to undertake the work of education with some prospect of a successful issue. We have seen that only the Church can claim the prerogative of being an educational force. Tho the state may devise means for disseminating all manner of human knowledge, the proclamation and dissemination of that Truth which alone can really educate sinful man is the peculiar and exclusive function of its Church. No skill of wise men of the world will ever be able to change the divine arrangement. Perhaps it is as well to add that the Church has no immediate call to undertake the *school* education of any other children than those voluntarily entrusted to her care by the parents. We have never raised objections against the plan that the state do the best it can for the children of those who refuse to accept the Gospel as the only saving truth. Nor are we here concerned with the problem concerning the best way in which children of all ages may be given appropriate Christian nurture. Of the many corollaries suggested by our main proposition, we shall point out but two. The first, that the Church, having a definite call to meet the educational needs of her own children, will betray a sacred trust if she compel her children to seek education at the hands of the state. Thus the Christian day school established and controlled by the Church (the parochial school) acquires the character of a vital issue for every Christian church organization under modern conditions. The second corollary: That the state has no moral right to interfere with any educative efforts the Church may make. Any scheme of political lawgivers to curtail the right of the Church in the premises is an obvious outrage upon religious liberty. Unless the constitutional guarantee of religious freedom is misleading and untrue, it provides that the Christian Church and it alone may determine whether and to what extent the education of her children is a religious duty or privilege.

J. SCHALLER.