## The Issue'—Dr. Mahoney's School Report

(Continued from Page 13)

Face The Lange question remains—do the American people want religlous education? Are they willing to recognize its tremendous value as a supporting bulwark to our society. If this is what the American people want then they must be willing to bring the question into open discussion and to consider every ressonable means for its solution. The question must be fairly and squarely faced, dispassionstely and without prejudice and without the contentious emotions that have characterized its discussion in the past. It is a matter that must be considered grave because it affects the whole future of our nation. It must be brought out in the open both in the grass roots of America in the halls of government, in state legislatures and Congress,

Nor should the Supreme Court decision in the McCollum case which forbade government agencies from approprialing monies for religious education stand in the way of seeking and honest and salutary solution. It must be pointed out that this Court has frequently reversed decisions when the light of justice has been shed upon them. In fact the decision in the McCollum case was in reality, by implication at least. a reversal of the decision of the Oregon school case wherein the Supreme Court stated "The fundamental theory of liberty upon which all governments in this Union repose excludes any general power of the State to standarize its children by forcing them to accept instruction from public teachers only. The child is not the mere creature of the State; those who nurture him and direct his destiny have the right coupled with the high duty, to recognize and prepare him for additional duties." U.S. Supreme Court Decision in the Oregon School Case, June 1,

There is no reason why a true interpretation of the Consillution cannot be brought to bear in this grave and serious matter. Nor should Americans lorget that there is another legal and democratic process that can be brought into action if the American people sincerely desire religious education in their schools.

Considering the question from the standpoint of Catholies they will not be at a loss for proper incentive and direction in the course laid down for them. This course that they are to follow has been clearly defined by Plus XI in the encyclical on the Christian Edu-. cation of Youth!

"last no mán say that in a nation where there are different religious beliefs it is impossible to provide for public instruction otherwise than by mixed or neutral schools. In such a case it becomes the duty of the State, indeed it is the easier and more reasonable method of procedure, to leave free scope to the initiative of the Church and the family, while giving them such assistance as justice demands. That this can be done with full satisfaction to the families and to the advantage of public peace and tranquility is clear from the actual experience of some countries comprising different religious denominations. There the school legislation respects the rights of the family, and Catholics are free to follow their own system of teaching In schools that are entirely Catholic. Nor is distributive justice lost sight of, as is evigranted by the State to the several schools demanded by the families."

It may be said here in passing that because of the Mo-Collum decision forbidding public monies to religious schools, Catholics as a matter of policy have concentrated their efforts in securing transportation and health services because these as such are admitted under law as services to the child and not to the school.

Let us hope that we will not mistake the forest for the trees nor confuse the part for the whole, that Catholics will ever keep in mind the words of the Holy Father: "Catholics will never feel, whatever may have been the sacrifices alrendy made, that they have done enough for the support and defense of their schools and for the securing of laws that will do them justice."

Burden on Protestants But while Catholics ever stand ready to cooperate in arriving at an adjustment it must be said that the success or failure of returning religion to American schools depends on its fair consideration by Protestants for Protestants are in the majority. But if sincere and right thinking Protestants are to return religion to the schools they must be prepared to battle first with the minority group of Protestante who place blind prejudice before the welfare of the country and the moral good of its children. Such a minerity group is the Protestants and Other Americana United.

Secondly, they must be prepared to take issue with the forces of entrenched secularism that exert such an unwarrented influence in the control and direction of public school policy. Such forces are represented by the powerful National Education Association that has continually declared its opposition to tax monies being appropriated for education that is religious. Recently this orpanization extended even further its policy of opposition when it stated in the February issue of the National Education Association Journal "One . . . may properly question the wisdom in our democracy of segregating several million young citizens on the basis of religion . . .

This can refer only to the Catholic school system of religious schools and publicly questions the wisdom of the parochial school system in American democracy. This statement confirms a long standing fear that opposition from the National Education Association to bus rides and health and welfare services for parochial school children bus in reality has been opposition to the parochial schools themesives. The logical inference from the statement quoted above is that all children should attend perforce the public school system. This is the kind of a system that Hitler had in Nazi Germany, it is the system that Stalin has in Soviet Russia and its satelite countries today. One trembles at what might happen to the freedom of American education if this Association is allowed to extend further its influence.

Niebuhr Cited Nor will Protestants find themselves without leadership in taking issues with biased religious forces and secularistic groups in this matter. The recent forthright statement of Dr. Niebuhr might well be taken as a sound basis for approach, Dr. Niebuhr recognized as one of the Nation's foremost Protestant philosopher-theologians speaking on "The Heritage of Modern Man" disagreed with the" United States Supreme Court and other courts on the position they have taken that the Constitution forbids government to encourage or assist religious education. The whole question of Federal aid to education could have been settled long ago, he said, "If Protes-tants had not adopted as unreasonable, "dichard" opposition to welfare service for parochial school students."

"I have seen in Washington again and again the possibility of solving this problem if Protestants had been willing to yield on this paint. I believe that Protestantism and secularism are too formally legalistic and righteous when they say that children in parish schools

should not get any support at all. I do not think this realis-

Lic." Dr. Niebuhr pointed out that every time Protestants and secularists were asked to consent to a slight compromise in favor of children in religious and private schools, their answer always has been: "No, this is the camel's nose getting under the tent." He added: "I am sick of cameis' noses." He declared also that freedom of conscience was the primary objective of the Constitutional Fathers.

"From the 17th through the 19th centuries a great debate raged on the problem of social peace among people of various religions", he said, "and the nation's founding fathers entered the debate with an affirmation that social peace could be guaranteed in such circumstances and that government should not try to force a "pluralistic society" into a par-. ticular mold. In this sense, separation of Church and State" the Founders conceived from a desire of freedom of considence. They did not want politics interfering in the field of religion or religion interfering in the field of politics."

He added," I, do not think that the Founding fathers stood for an absolute wall of separation of Church and State," and advocated that Protestants retreat from their position of opposition to services for children in religious schools.

Secularistic education recently was also assailed by Henry Van Dusen another outstanding Protestant and president of the faculty of Manhattan Union Theological Seminary in his book God and Education. Dr. Van Dusen advocated a return to religion in American schools not as an added course of study but as the central core and principle of the entire educational process. "What is required is revolution" he writes "converson, an about-face in both the assumptions and goals of our living and likewise of the training of our youth. "Religion that is. a true knowledge of God is the Queen of the Sciences. This is its rightful position, not because the churches say so but because of the risture of Reality, because if there be a God at all. He must be the ultimate and controlling Reality through which all else derives its being, and the truth concerning Him ... must be the keystope of the ever incomplete arch of human knowledge."

Discussing the principle of the union of Church and State, Dr. Van Dusen also points out that it was never the intention of the Founding Fathers to eliminate religion from education, or to educate "a nation without religious faith, or (build) a system of education, for that nation's youth without implicit, and probably explicit, recognition of God as the ground of Truth. It has been aptly said: they were seeking to provide freedom of religion, not freedom from reli-gion . . ." In its recent decisions, therefore, the court has travestied history. The theory of separation "as currently propounded, far from being a perpetuation of the national tradition, represents a povel innovation in direct contradiction to the conviction of our forebears and the established habits of the nation. At the present hour, this cherished American principle is being refurbished and redefined to ends for which it was never intended. The Constitutional guarantees of 'freedom of religion' have lately been reinterpreted by no loss august a body than the United States Supreme Court with meanings which were never forseen by, and which, it may safely be suggested would have outraged, the framers of the Constitution."

The purpose here has been . to show the possibility of removing from our American life a condition which was forced upon the American people by

a group of realors in the last century. No sympathy should be extended to the plea of some that this condition has endured so long and is so strongly established that its ametioration is tropossible. Let them be reminded that similar situations formerly obtained in other countries in Holland. for example, and in Canada and that just solutions were uitimately obtained to the immeasurable benefit of their peoples and to the peace and tranquility of the State.

Admittedly there are difficuities to be avercome, but there is no reasons why American statemanship cannot achieve what staffermanship in other countries has achieved. This is a problems, which calls for men of justice, of high intelligence, of sincere love of country.

Nothing is to be gained by hurling definice. The end de-sired is to sacred to have sincere effort to chase this unhappy struggle disturbed by entolional distribus. All desire peace Catholics and Protestants public admenters as well no Catholic educators are convinced that war present altuntion is wrong and that there can be no bacminany until this intelerable situation, so damaging to the cause of Christian society in made right. A just solution will remove from American life an injustice which is in discord with our spirit of freedom and equality. A just solution would enable the enlightened obsectors of the twentieth century to restore to the public achools the core of religion torm out by the misguided zeniota of he alacteenth century. It would enable all the educational forces of America to labor mightly together for the advancement of our true American way of life.

Respectfully submitted. (Rev.) Charles J. Mahoney Superintendent May 12, 1951

## THE PERFECT GIFT FOR YOUR LOVED ONES Passionist Fathers Purgatorial Society PERPETUAL REMEMBRANCE IN DAILY MASS

The Living and the Deceased May Be Enrolled Illuminated certificate and prayer book given for each member correlled—Enrollment \$5.00

Write to: VERY REV. FATHER RECTOR, C.P. St. Amm's Monastery, Screnton 4, Ponna.



## for the Graduate

OFF ON AN INTERESTING

GIVE A

HOBBYI

VIEW:MASTER

ENJOY attractions S CARRIC three dimension



Over 400 Subjects

FRANCE - EGYPT - AFRICA - IRELAND ITALY - VATICAN CITY - INDIA - SIAM AUSTRALIA - NEW ZEALAND - ENGLAND SWITZERLAND - HONG KONG **AMERICAN NATIONAL PARKS - CITIES** 

Reels 35c each-3 for 1.00 Reels for Children Include

COWBOY STARS - TARZAN - FAIRY TALES ADVENTURES TOM SAWYER - INDIANS WILD ANIMALS - MOTHER GOOSE RHYMES



332 EAST MAIN ST., mear East Avenue